

THE



ommunist

FULL TEXT OF CORRESPONDENCE
BETWEEN I.F.T.U. AND R.I.L.U. ON
UNITED FRONT

PROBLEMS OF FASCISM. R. P. Dutt
THE VICTORY OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY

International

VOLUME XII

9

MAY 5th, 1935

THREEPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 9

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

1. The Responsibility is on the Amsterdam International. 379
2. Text of the Reply of the International Federation of Trade Unions to the United Front Proposals of the Red International of Labour Unions. 385
3. Text of the Reply of the Red International of Labour Unions to the International Federation of Trade Unions. 386
4. What is Happening in the Ranks of the American Socialist Party. By E. Browder. 389

TRIBUNE FOR THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

5. (a) Some Problems of Fascism (Part 2.)
By R. Palme Dutt. 396
6. (b) Our Fight Against German Chauvinism.
By Rudolph Gerber. 404
7. (c) Resolution of the Political Bureau of the C.P. of Spain on the Preparations for the Seventh Congress. 413

IN THE U.S.S.R.

8. The Victory of Public, Socialist, Ownership and the Development of Soviet Democracy. By E. Pashukanis. 414

DOCUMENTS.

9. Letter Circulated by the Initiatory Group of Korean Communists concerning the Tasks Connected with the Struggle Against Factional Groupings. 420

THE COMMUNIST PRESS.

10. Review of the Central Organ of the C.P. of New Zealand. By L. Andrews. 423
-
-

THE RESPONSIBILITY IS ON THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL

"The working class has sufficient forces at its disposal to beat back the offensive, to defend its interests, and to prevent the outbreak of a new international bloodbath. But to achieve this, what is needed is its united efforts in the struggle against the common enemy, what is needed is that all trade union organisations should undertake united action against the bourgeoisie so as to realise the direct and general aims of the working class movement, what is needed is that the trade union movement, which has been split, should have its unity re-established."

THIS is the main point of the most important document that has appeared in the international trade union movement in recent years, namely, the appeal made by the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions (Profintern) to the Amsterdam International of Trade Unions. The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) made the proposal to the leaders of the Amsterdam International that a joint discussion take place about the conditions, methods and forms of unifying the world trade union movement, about joint demonstrations on May 1st, etc., and particularly about concretely proceeding to re-establish the free trade unions in Germany and unifying the trade unions in France and Spain.

The leaders of the Amsterdam International who have tied the trade unions to the chariot wheel of capitalism by their policy of class collaboration, have on this occasion as well, one so full of importance to the international working class, decisively rejected this proposal made by the Profintern — thereby continuing the split in the ranks of the working class and collaboration with the bourgeoisie, while ignoring the mighty urge for the united front and trade union unity in the ranks of the millions of members of their own organisations.

The bourgeoisie are rallying all their forces so as to cast the whole weight of the crisis on to the shoulders of the toilers. The exploitation of the workers has increased to an extraordinary degree. In spite of two and a half years of depression, the standard of living of the masses is being ever worsened. In spite of the fact that there are 17 million more unemployed than there were at the beginning of the world economic crisis, inroads into social insurance still continue. The youth of the working class, deprived of all prospects for the morrow, are being driven into the forced labour camps, become declassed, and become an easy prey for fascists and those engaged in recruiting cannon-fodder for a new imperialist bloodbath. In a number of capitalist countries, and in Germany first and foremost, the split in the ranks of the working class due to the policy of class-collabora-

tion pursued by the Social Democratic leaders, has made it possible for the bourgeoisie to deal heavy blows at the working class, to establish a bloody fascist dictatorship, to smash up the trade unions and to transform them into pariahs without rights in capitalist society. The workers must expect hunger, poverty, fascism, and to be completely deprived of their rights, they must expect a new imperialist bloodbath if they stand silently by and watch how the capitalist offensive develops, if they do not unite their ranks for joint action. The example provided by the Austrian Shutzbundlers and the miners of Asturias in Spain is an indication to all workers that the fascist offensive CAN be beaten off, and at the same time points to the means to be adopted, and the path to be taken in the struggle against fascism. This is, first and foremost, united action by the working class.

The Communist International has been carrying on an intense struggle since the time when the fascist dictatorship came into being in Germany, to bring about the united front of the proletariat against the capitalist and fascist offensive, against the military gambles of the imperialists, and has approached not only the Social-Democratic workers but also their organisations, both national and international. The leaders of the Second International, to whom the Comintern directed its proposals regarding a joint international struggle to liberate the proletarians of Germany, to give freedom and life to those held prisoners by German fascism, to give freedom and life to those who defended the barricades set up by the Austrian Schutzbund, and to the heroes of proletarian Asturias, have invariably replied in the negative. On the other hand, the real united front of the proletariat has been built up in the fire of class battles. And it was only when taking this mighty urge of the workers towards unity of action into account, and the fact that the united front was being established in various countries with a view to carrying on a concrete struggle, that the leaders of the Second International, while rejecting unity of action on an international scale, were compelled to make at least partial concessions to the demands made by the masses of Social-Democratic workers, and to withdraw the ban on the establishment of the united front between the individual sections of the Second International and the Communists. For the fact that the united front has been brought about in France and Spain, in Austria and in the Saar, showed very wide

masses of proletarians what a force united action by the working class represents, and what could be achieved in the struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive, if the united front of the proletariat were brought about in good time, and if all those who participate in it carry on the struggle to the end. WHO is there who could now CONVINCE the Socialist workers of France that unity of action with the Communist workers in February, 1934, did NOT inspire the ranks of the proletariat with a mighty enthusiasm to give a victorious repulse to the fascist offensive, and that the united front pact did NOT strengthen the proletarian front against the offensive of the French bourgeoisie? WHO could PROVE to the Austrian Schutzbundlers who, at the initiative of the Communist Party, re-established their fighting proletarian organisation on the basis of a united front with the "Revolutionary Socialists," that the united front did NOT prove to be a mighty lever for re-establishing the fighting power of the Austrian proletariat the very next day after the Schutzbund was defeated in its first open battle? WHO would dare to DENY that the united front was an INEXHAUSTIBLE SOURCE OF ENERGY for the proletarians in Spain who rose up in arms against fascism, and that their struggle would have achieved greater success had not only the Communists and the revolutionary trade union organisations unswervingly fulfilled their united front obligations to the end, and had the entire class collaboration policy pursued by Social Democracy in the preceding period not placed tremendous obstacles in the way of the establishment of a complete united proletarian front and of rallying the anti-fascist people's front around the proletariat? Fundamentally only the first steps have been taken towards establishing the united front of the proletariat. But these first examples of united front action by the working class have infused new life into the international working class movement. They have scattered the defeatist legends spread by certain theoreticians of the Second International about a "counter-revolutionary situation" and about an "epoch of reaction" to the winds. These legends allege that it is useless to organise active resistance to the capitalist and fascist offensive, and that the working class have only one thing to do—namely, retreat, cast themselves without a struggle on the mercy of the victors, and to implore a softening of the bourgeois régime. These first actions have already shown that the united working class front is incompatible with the policy of class-collaboration, and that only the bourgeoisie and those who strive to secure unhindered collaboration with the bourgeoisie are interested in the working class being split.

It is not for nothing that the international bourgeoisie as a whole were alarmed by the appeal made

by the Communist International regarding the united front. It is not for nothing that *The Times* was highly indignant at the very thought that the Labour Party might participate in a united "Communist Front" to defend the Spanish workers. "One thing is absolutely clear," wrote this pure-blooded newspaper of the exploiters, "anyone who unites with the Communists extends the Communist front." *The Times* scares the labourites and gives them the threatening warning that:

"The Marxian theory is so widespread that if you scratch the continental Socialist who thought he was a Democrat, you will find a Communist . . . The British Labour Party is the most powerful section of the Socialist International, and it must, in correspondence with the declarations made in its own country, come forward unequivocally for an alliance only with the friends of democracy."

In other words, "Down with the united front with the Communists!" This is the line which the *Diehard Times*, the "friend of democracy," advised the British Labour Party to adopt. *The Times*, by the way, seems to have been needlessly disturbed . . .

A gigantic struggle between the classes is taking place, for the capitalist or the revolutionary way out of the crisis. From the very beginning of the world economic crisis, the leaders of the Second International undertook the thankless task of DOCTORING CAPITALISM. We all remember how the British trade unions took part in the Ottawa Conference, and the memorandum issued by the General Council of the T.U.C. to the National Government in regard to the International Conference held in 1933, a memorandum which evoked Chamberlain's flattering estimate that it "almost expresses the policy of the Government." We all still remember the resolution adopted by the Brussels Congress of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, which called on all countries to follow the famous "Roosevelt Plan," and also the declaration made by Jouhaux that he "congratulated the American Federation of Labour on their support for the efforts" being made by President Roosevelt. Now, when the bourgeoisie throughout the world are exerting unbelievable efforts to bring about capitalist prosperity anew, at the expense of a reduction in the standard of living of the masses, when wages and social insurance are being reduced throughout the world, or when such reductions are being prepared on a wide scale, when the cost of living is being artificially raised, and when in a whole number of cases united action by the trade unions has secured success in the struggle of the workers against the capitalist offensive, the reformist leaders of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals are calling on the masses of workers to prepare themselves for the struggle "for socialism," are calling on them "not

to scatter their forces" on the "petty exhausting" struggle for day-to-day demands. There was a time when these very leaders identified the struggle for day-to-day demands with the struggle for the ultimate aims of the working class. Every success in the day-to-day struggle, they said, is a "slice of socialism." Now, just as then, these slogans of the reformist leaders represented and now represent their rejection of the struggle to abolish the capitalist system. But whereas the policy pursued by the reformist leaders of the trade unions was at that time directed towards satisfying the day-to-day needs of the masses of workers to a certain extent, now, on the other hand, their slogans imply that they are abandoning even this as far as the workers are concerned. Such slogans can never become the slogans of united class battles. Their starting point is the privileged position of certain sections of the proletariat OUTSIDE of the general united front of the proletariat, and implies that they are seeking their own way out along the lines of compromise with the ruling class.

The same is true with regard to the question of TRADE UNION UNITY. This is one of the sorest questions facing the international working class movement since the end of the war. The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) was established because the reformist leaders of the trade unions, in helping the bourgeoisie to beat off the proletarian revolution after the war, and in working hand in glove with the world bourgeoisie to defeat the mighty proletarian October Revolution, expelled the revolutionary workers from the trade unions, mercilessly suppressed all democracy in the unions, left the trade unions and split them if they, the reformists, proved to be in the minority, and ignored the interests of the very wide masses of unorganised workers, thereby deepening the split in the ranks of the working class. The entire history of the Profintern (R.I.L.U.) is a history of the struggle for the unity of the trade union movement. As against the whole of international Social-Democracy, the Communists have never split up the trade union movement. WHERE is the revolutionary trade union which has EXPELLED Social-Democratic workers from its ranks for being Social-Democrats? WHERE is the revolutionary trade union that has demanded that Social-Democratic workers should sign documents renouncing association with the Communists under the threat of unemployment and of depriving them of their benefits? Who split the ranks of the railwaymen of France in 1921, when the revolutionary workers obtained an overwhelming majority at the railwaymen's Conference? Who split the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers of Czecho-Slovakia, in spite of the fact that only an insignificant minority

declared in favour of the reformists? Who split the trade unions in Rumania?

From the very first days of its existence, in face of the capitalist offensive, the R.I.L.U. issued the slogan of a united trade union front. And from the very first days of its existence, the R.I.L.U. declared at all its Congresses that it was ready to unite with the trade unions organised in the Amsterdam International to carry on the class struggle, on the one condition only that there should be proportional representation at the unity congress, and that trade union democracy, in favour of which the leaders of the Amsterdam International are so fond of uttering wordy declarations, should be strictly observed. But it is precisely because the united front hindered the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and made immediate concrete action necessary, that the reformist leaders turned it down, and in opposition to this advanced the demand for "the unity of the movement" and "unity of organisation." But in actual fact, they also turned down unity of organisation, by interpreting it as meaning subordinating the entire world trade union movement to the reformist leaders of the Amsterdam International. "WE are the trade unions," declared the reformist leaders of the Amsterdam International.

We need only cast our mind back to the history of the trade union movement in the biggest capitalist countries in recent years, to convince ourselves of the extent to which the need for the united front and for trade union unity has matured, and what obstacles lie in their path.

In FRANCE the united front pact concluded between the Socialist and Communist Parties also served as a tremendous stimulus in the struggle for the unity of the trade union movement. Here the period of the propaganda carried on by the Communist Party in favour of the united front, which served to rally the masses on a wide scale for the struggles which came to a head last year, is passing to the state where the united front is being established in the mass battles of the proletariat. But the struggle for the unity of the trade union movement has met with tremendous difficulties as the result of the open resistance offered by the reformist leaders of the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) to the unity of the trade union movement. But the urge towards trade union unity is so great that in spite of this resistance it has been possible in France for the first time since the reformists split the trade union movement in 1922 to bring about concrete forms of unifying various trade unions. It is sufficient to point to the example of the railwaymen's unions, three-quarters of whose members were already united in January, 1935. And this is not merely

a gathering together of the members of the Railwaymen's Trade Unions, but at the same time represents a real strengthening of the trade union as a class organisation where the masses have a clear sense of the idea and importance of this unification.

The unity of the trade union movement would have faced the leaders of the C.G.T. with the necessity of breaking with their whole line of class collaboration. Herein lies the source of all their resistance to unity. Leon Jouhaux, the leader of the C.G.T., in his speech made at a meeting of the National Federal Committee of the C.G.T. in October, 1934, openly declared the following:

"As regards an increase in the membership of the trade unions as a result of unity . . . allow me to say that I don't believe in it . . . Do you think that you will gain much by uniting with your opponents of yesterday, and by parting with your friends of to-day and yesterday! . . ."

It is for the same reason that the leaders of the C.G.T. altogether reject the united front with the unitary trade unions (the revolutionary C.G.T.U.). In exact line with the exhortations of the *Diehard Times* they reject the proposals made by the C.G.T., they reject joint action on the anniversary of the February events, their argument being that "the workers and the masses of the people in our country are firmly convinced of the superiority of the régime of freedom over the régime of dictatorship, irrespective of the nature of the ticket with which this régime covers itself."

This provocative method of drawing comparisons between the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. on the one hand, and the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie on the other (to prepare which the reformist leaders did not a little by the policy of class collaboration they pursued), has become the common property of all the reformist leaders of the international trade union movement who wish to undermine the great cause of uniting the trade unions of the proletariat. Did not Coopers, the representative of the Dutch trade unions, declare at the Brussels Congress of the Amsterdam International, that "the Amsterdam Trade Union International must come out precisely and clearly against the Communists: we make no distinction between Communism and fascism"? Did not Citrine, the chairman of the Amsterdam International, repeat the same thing at the recent congress of the American Federation of Labour? The reformist leaders of the C.G.T. prefer to maintain contact with the "neo-Socialists" and with the "social minister" Flandin, to the united front pact between the Communists and Socialists, against which they are carrying on undermining work, by instilling the idea into the minds of the French workers that the fascist danger in France "has been postponed," and by diverting the discussion away from the inconvenient question of

class collaboration, pursuing instead a FORMAL discussion about the independence of the trade unions. For what can be the nature of the "independence" of the C.G.T. when its leaders support all the measures adopted by the ruling parties of the French bourgeoisie? Do not the reformist leaders of the trade unions in each capitalist country support the Social Democratic leaders? In France itself, do not the leaders of the C.G.T. call on their followers to vote for the Socialists at the parliamentary elections? It can only be a question of one sort of independence, namely, that of the class trade unions of the proletariat being independent of the bourgeoisie and its state.

In England the General Council of the T.U.C. has unwaveringly pursued a policy of open class collaboration over a period of nine years, following the general strike and the miners' strike. The General Council of the T.U.C. plays a leading part in the Amsterdam International. The German free trade unions which, in the period of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, attempted once again to win the position they formerly held in the International Federation of Trade Unions, have been smashed up by fascism and, in fact, do not exist. And so, in order to re-establish the shaken equilibrium, the leaders of the British trade unions, instead of raising the question of bringing about INTERNATIONAL UNITY IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT so as to increase the fighting power of the working class against fascism, which has destroyed the trade unions in a number of capitalist countries, are directing the whole of their energy towards drawing the American Federation of Labour into the Amsterdam International. And they COUNTERPOSE the A.F.L. to the mighty army of 20 million members of the trade unions of the U.S.S.R., and are still further intensifying the slanderous campaign against the Soviet trade union movement for the benefit of the ultra-reactionary leaders of the A.F.L.

At the same time the General Council of the T.U.C. has decisively rejected all proposals regarding the united front, in spite of the growing efforts of the masses of the British proletariat to bring about fighting unity. For the establishment of a united front would signify the growth of the economic struggles of the British proletariat, a point which possibly does not enter the calculations of the leaders of the General Council, who are clearing their way for ministerial posts, in view of the forthcoming parliamentary elections, and who do not wish to "annoy" the British bourgeoisie. The Scottish Mine Workers' Union has made the proposal that the Scottish miners' revolutionary and reformist unions be amalgamated—WITH NO RESULTS. The Communist Party of Great Britain advanced united front proposals in

connection with the movement of the unemployed, WITH NO RESULTS. The leaders of the General Council preferred to give a guarantee of their loyalty to the British bourgeoisie, by publishing in October of last year their famous "Black Circular," according to which no local Trades Council will be recognised by the Trade Union Congress

"if it allows delegates into its ranks who are in one way or another connected with Communist or fascist organisations, or with organisations subordinate to them."

and in its last letter threatens to expel those trades councils from its ranks which do not subordinate themselves to the General Council and begin to operate the Black Circular.

But here as well the idea of trade union unity is making its way not only to the masses of trade unions, but is also occasionally covering entire trade union organisations.

The question then arises, Who is against the unity of the trade union movement?

In the U.S.A. after the splendid strike in San Francisco, Green, the chairman of the A.F.L., issued a general circular regarding the expulsion of Communists, which met with resistance from the wide masses organised in the trade unions affiliated to the A.F.L. Even the Socialist *New Leader* had to recognise the extent of this resistance. In the U.S.A., where company unions are so widespread and where even the A.F.L. unions have to fight for their mere recognition, the establishment of a united front and of trade union unity would play a tremendous rôle in helping the trade unions to penetrate all enterprises and all branches of industry. Only a few weeks ago the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. made the proposal to the leaders of the A.F.L. that they jointly prepare the struggle for the economic demands of the workers and for the recognition of the trade unions in the automobile, textile and steel industries. WITH NO RESULTS! Here also the idea of trade union unity can already record symptomatic successes, for instance, in the steel industry.

In CZECHOSLOVAKIA where the reformists split the trade union movement 13 years ago, the leaders of the revolutionary trade union federation made a proposal to unite the trade unions in Czechoslovakia during the recent congress of trade unions belonging to the Amsterdam International. WITH NO RESULTS!

In POLAND the struggle of the revolutionary trade union opposition for the unity of the trade union movement on a class basis, and for the unification of parallel trade unions, has met with the determined resistance of the leaders of the P.P.S. and of the Bund. It is only very recently that the leaders of the so-called Landrat, which is led by

the Bund, have agreed under the pressure of the masses and of the development of the united front by the revolutionary trade union opposition, to engage in negotiations about establishing trade union unity. But concrete facts showing that the unity of the trade unions is being brought about by the organisations themselves in the localities (in Tomashev, etc.) such cases becoming more and more numerous.

In GREECE the unitary trade unions are carrying on a splendid struggle for the united proletarian front, and when the reformist leaders split their own reformist unions, the leaders of the unitary trade unions protest energetically AGAINST splitting the reformist unions into REFORMIST groups.

Who, then, stands for the unity of the trade union movement?

In fascist AUSTRIA where the reformist leaders in the days immediately following the February battles left the free trade unions to their fate, the Communists took the initiative in re-establishing the organisations which had been destroyed, and in continuing their activity underground. Some of the former leaders of the trade unions, under the guidance of the Amsterdam International, then began in their turn to establish new PARALLEL organisations. Hitherto, all proposals regarding the unification of both organisations made by the Central Commission of the Trade Unions, which has by its courageous revolutionary work in the enterprises achieved important successes in re-establishing the free trade unions, have met with no positive results.

In SPAIN, the unity of the Asturian miners, rendered secure by the blood shed in the heroic October battles, immediately led to the unification of the miners' union in Asturias. A similar movement from below is going on throughout the country, one which has embraced a section of the officials of the reformist unions and even certain of their leaders who are beginning to recognise that their only salvation from fascism lies in bringing about the united front on the widest possible scale, and in rallying all the forces of the proletariat for the struggle, and primarily in securing the unity of the trade unions.

Finally, in GERMANY, where, on the admission made at the Paris Conference of the Second International, by Aufheiser, one of the former leaders of the A.D.G.B. (Reformist Trade Union Congress), the reformists "have lived through their own trade union policy, which ITSELF PROVED ON THE BOUNDARY OF NATIONAL SOCIALIST POLICY," the proposals made by the Communists regarding the joint re-establishment of the free trade unions which the revolutionary trade union opposition and the Red Trade Unions are joining, are being met with

determined opposition from the overwhelming majority of the reformist leaders.

The question then arises, **WHO IS AGAINST THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT?**

The masses of workers throughout the whole world are following with very great alarm the Bacchanalia of the fascist pogrom-mongers, and the actions of the voracious capitalist hounds who are attempting to transfer the whole burden of the crisis on to the backs of the toilers, and who are ready, for the sake of their profits, to fill up the trenches with the corpses of millions of workers slaughtered in a new imperialist war.

The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) is convinced that its proposals received **THE FULL ENDORSEMENT OF ALL WORKERS ORGANISED IN THE TRADE UNIONS AND MET WITH A MIGHTY RESPONSE FROM THEM.** But the leaders of the Amsterdam International have remained true to their policy of maintaining the split in the international trade union movement. Their reply to the proposals of the R.I.L.U. repeats the worst arguments of the bankrupt leaders of the A.D.G.B. (reformist Trade Union Congress in Germany) who went to no little trouble so as to clear the way for National Socialism, a fact recorded by their own comrades at the Paris Conference of the Second International held in 1933.

The fact that the Bureau of the Amsterdam International has rejected the proposals made by the Profintern and the bureaucratic excuse made by referring to the decisions of Congresses and of the General Council of the Amsterdam International at Weymouth, i.e., the rejection of trade union unity under the flag of the formula "the unity of the trade union movement in the Amsterdam International," show that the Amsterdam International has completely forgotten the interests of the working class in face of the furious onslaught of fascism and that the leaders of the Amsterdam International are deepening the split in the trade union movement. They show, finally, that there is a deepening of the divergence between the millions of trade union members in the Amsterdam International who are thirsting for struggle against fascism and for united action, and their leaders who are deepening the split in the ranks of the proletariat and weakening the latter, at the very moment when their worst enemy is undertaking the offensive. The leaders of the Amsterdam International bear the full responsibility for this policy before the proletariat throughout the world.

The Red International of Labour Unions, unlike the Amsterdam International, whose influence does not extend beyond the bounds of several European countries, is a trade union organisation with world ramifications. It is not a question of liquidating the international centre of the revolutionary trade union movement, the R.I.L.U., and of clearing the way for the leaders of the Amsterdam International to carry on their day-to-day co-operation with the bourgeoisie. It is a question of bringing about trade union unity on a world scale. And this can and will be brought about only if the negotiations are conducted on the basis of equality between the two Internationals, if unity is built up on trade union democracy, proportional representation in the leading bodies and for the struggle against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and war.

This is why the Profintern (R.I.L.U.), for whom trade union unity is not a question of doing away with one organisation in favour of another, or of the petty personal pride of its leaders, but is the mighty question of uniting all the members of our class into powerful united trade union organisations so as to deliver a decisive counter-blow at our class enemy, calls on all members of trade unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International to discuss the proposals made by the Profintern at their meetings. The R.I.L.U. calls on all trade union organisations in all countries to carry through a ballot of their members on the following issues: for or against joint action by all the trade unions, for or against trade union unity. The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) calls on all the trade union organisations in all countries not to wait for the results of the ballot but to organise united action on the 1st of May.

The Profintern is ready at any time, in spite of the fact that the Amsterdam International has rejected its proposals, to discuss these proposals with it.

Time does not wait. Our responsibility is great. Let all those who are for the destruction of hated fascism, who are against oppression and exploitation by capital, who are in favour of free trade unions, and in favour of the workers living a better life, who stand for Socialism, muster their forces for united action by the working class:

For the United Working Class Front!

For the Unity of the Trade Unions!

REPLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS

On the Question: **United Front. No. 6**

To the Red International of Labour Unions.

Solyanka 12, Moscow.

CITIZENS,

The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions, which acquainted itself, at its meeting held on March 14th this year, with the proposals set forth in your letter from Moscow, dated March 7th, instructed me to answer you as follows:

The attitude of the International Federation of Trade Unions towards the Communists' proposals for unity of action, a united front or a common front was so often established and confirmed by the decisions of the Congresses and of the General Council, including the recent decisions made in Weymouth, on August 29th, 1934, that it may be considered that this attitude is sufficiently known to the workers' trade union organisations of the world. The Bureau has neither the right nor the desire to abandon this line of conduct, established by the Congresses and sessions of the General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions. On the other hand, the International Federation of Trade Unions, which observes trade union discipline, cannot accept on an international scale a united front rejected on a national scale by all its affiliated national trade union centres.

Therefore the Bureau of the I.F.T.U. believes that a conference for the discussion of the three points of the united front, proposed in your letter, can give no practical results.

As for the problem of restoring organisational unity of the international trade union movement, the Weymouth resolution of August 29th, 1934, determines the attitude of the I.F.T.U. and says, basically, as follows: The International Federation of Trade Unions has been struggling for trade union unity since 1919: this Federation declares that this unity is now more necessary than ever and considers that the I.F.T.U. is the base on which the workers of the

world can unite. Therefore the I.F.T.U. calls again upon the workers of all countries to join the regular organisations and through them the International Federation of Trade Unions. The latter believes that through applying the slogans of unity put forward by Moscow the Communist trade unions and the Red International of Labour Unions are prepared to take up this path.

The Bureau was able to state with great satisfaction that the National Trade Union Centre of Norway which kept aloof from the International Movement for many years and consequently aroused certain doubts as to its viewpoint on International trade union unity, made a decision clarifying this question at its last Congress, held in December, 1934. In agreement on all points with the spirit of the decisions of the International Federation of Trade Unions, this attitude of the Norwegian Trade Union Centre is outlined in its letter dated February 14th, and addressed by the Norwegian Secretariat to the R.I.L.U. in the formal question worded as follows: "Is the Red International of Labour Unions prepared to encourage the restoration of trade union unity in all the countries where certain groups in the past disaffiliated from the National Trade Union Centres? A Trade Union International should be based on one national organisation in every country."

Therefore it is necessary that the Red International of Labour Unions inform the Bureau of the I.F.T.U. first of all whether it is prepared to accept the preliminary conditions which the International Federation of Trade Unions (and also the National Trade Union Centre of Norway) consider necessary with a view to the realisation of this international trade union unity.

Accept, Citizens, our Trade Union Greetings,

On behalf of the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions,

V. SCHEVENELS, *General Secretary.*

(Continued from page 424.)

toilers against exploitation by the employers, big landowners and financial magnates.

The Party press must consistently expose the part played by the Labour Party in assisting the military designs of the government and of the Japanese warmongers, who are preparing an attack on the Soviet Union. It must devote all its energy to improving its methods of ideological struggle against our opponents. Only if it carries on a consistent struggle to establish the united front, and if

it develops explanatory work on a wide scale among the masses, and makes use of the experience of the masses themselves, will we be able to convince the toilers of the correctness of the Party line. It is important that the paper should always be linked up as closely as possible with the entire mass work of the Party, and give a popular explanation to the workers as to why they should join the Party, should explain to them what the Communist Party is, what its programme is, what it fights for and

(Continued on page 395.)

ANSWER TO THE OPPONENTS OF THE UNITED FRONT AND TRADE UNION UNITY

To the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

CITIZENS, Paris.
The Executive Bureau received your negative answer to the proposal of the Red International of Labour Unions of March 7th concerning joint organisation of May First, assistance in the amalgamation of the trade unions in France and Spain, restoration of the free trade unions in Germany and initiation of negotiations on international trade union unity.

You write that in view of the decision of the Congresses and General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions in Weymouth, the united front and unity of action are out of the question and that "a conference on the three points proposed by the R.I.L.U. can give no practical results."

Your repudiation of joint action does not meet the interests of the working class. Hardly any member of any trade union can deny the appalling conditions of the working masses caused by the offensive of capital against their living standards, growth of fascism and of the fascist organisations, and the resulting necessity for the workers to unite all their forces, all their trade union organisations for a joint struggle against their common enemy.

The wages in all capitalist countries were reduced markedly during the period of the crisis. Even according to evidently minimised official data the working class lost tens of billions of dollars in wages alone. The exploitation of the workers increased tremendously as the result of the savage speed up and direct economic and political pressure brought to bear on the working class. Simultaneously with the unheard-of growth of poverty, suicides, prostitution—social insurance and social legislation are worsened and completely done away with in such countries as Austria, Germany and Poland. With the exception of a few countries where curtailed state insurance still exists, millions of unemployed have to live on charity doles. Instead of benefit fixed by law at the expense of those responsible for unemployment, i.e., the employers and State, the workers are getting miserable doles, instead of work they are sent to labour camps. Only the war industry works at full speed, it works to enable the imperialists to secure a new redivision of the world by means of a new world war, even though it would cost tens of millions of human lives again. Monopoly capital, which strives for a further intensification of exploitation, established a fascist dictator-

ship in a number of countries and smashed not only those workers' organisations which declared against collaboration with the bourgeoisie, but also the trade unions which co-operated with the capitalists. In the heart of Europe, in Germany, the dictatorship of the frantic fascist murderers was established. This happened because the working class of Germany did not come out in a united front against oncoming fascism, because the leadership of the German Federation of Trade Unions (A.D.G.B.), the most powerful section of your International, expelled the revolutionary workers and not only kept rejecting the united front, but always sabotaged joint action, describing as provocateurs all those who called for joint strikes and for a real struggle against the fascists. The leadership of the A.D.G.B. kept repeating from year to year that a united front against capital would be to no effect, and now you are literally repeating the bankrupt policy of the A.D.G.B. leaders, a policy which cost the working class of Germany so much. Do not the world-shaking events in Germany and Austria cry out about the necessity for the greatest possible consolidation and unification of the working class forces in the struggle against the capitalists? Is not this clear what a great rôle the rebuilding of the free trade unions in Germany would play in overthrowing fascism, this main instigator of the world war?

If we consider the results of the economic struggles of the past period we shall see that in this field as well, the split, and the repudiation of joint action, which was by no means called forth by the interests of the working class, was very disastrous for the workers. Hundreds and thousands of strikes in France, U.S.A., Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Great Britain, Belgium, Scandinavian and Balkan countries were defeated because the united front of capital was faced by the split front of the working class as the result of the class collaboration policy pursued by the leaders of the reformist trade unions. On the other hand a large number of strikes were successful, thanks to unity of action of the workers of all tendencies, based on class struggle. Were there not scores of cases of the failure of strikes because of weak and inadequate international solidarity, because the capitalists of one country were backed up by capitalists of other countries during a strike, the strikers getting no necessary support and assistance on the part of the organisations of their own International? Remember the strikes of the miners, transport workers, textile workers, etc., in Great Britain, Germany,

France and Czecho-Slovakia. Where, then, is international solidarity? Where is the elementary community of class interests? Who can refute these irrefutable facts.

There is no attempt even in your letter to prove that joint action of the workers on May First, or assistance in amalgamating the trade unions of France and Spain and assistance in rebuilding the free trade unions in Germany are not demanded by the interests of the international proletariat. You simply reject a united front with the revolutionary workers, at the same time practically supporting a united front of the leaders of your International with the bourgeois parties in the Government of Belgium (Delattre), the united front between Leon Jouhaux, Vice-President of the Amsterdam International, with Garnier, President of the Chamber of Commerce of France, and with the big officials on the National Commission for Public Works, the composition of which is determined by a special decree issued by Lebrun President of the Republic, on March 30th, 1935. Many other examples could be given of the leaders of your International finding the basis for a "united front" and for "joint action" with the representatives of the employers' organisations. At the same time you have no desire to establish a united front between the trade unions affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions and the trade unions affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions in the struggle for the common demands of the working class as a whole.

The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions rejects a united front without the knowledge and consent of the Trade Union masses, but in their name, while in a number of countries the members of the trade unions affiliated to your International eagerly and energetically come out for a united front and unity of action. The most striking proof of this may be furnished by the general strike in February last year and by many economic strikes in 1934 and in 1935 in France during which the members of the Unitary General Confederation of Labour and of the General Confederation of Labour fought shoulder to shoulder, by the armed battles of the Austrian workers, by the strikes and armed fights of the workers in Spain, during which the members of both the Trade Union Internationals fought together against the common enemy and finally by the setting up of a number of unified trade unions in France, Austria and Spain which unite the workers affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions and to the International Federation of Trade Unions.

As to the part of your letter dealing with the question of international trade union unity, it deliberately complicates and confuses the ques-

tion which is clear to the working masses. The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. proposed to discuss the question of the FORMS, METHODS AND CONDITIONS OF THE UNIFICATION OF THE WORLD TRADE UNION MOVEMENT at a conference of the representatives of both the Internationals. In answer to this concrete proposal you refer to the resolution of the General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions in Weymouth. This resolution of yours proposes, as a preliminary condition, to form unified trade union centres in every country through the affiliation of the revolutionary trade unions to the so-called "regular" organisations and through the liquidation of the R.I.L.U.

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is also of the opinion that international trade union unity can and must be built on the basis of trade union unity in every country. The R.I.L.U. is not only "ready to encourage the restoration of trade union unity in all countries," but carries it through in practice, in conjunction with its sections. Considerable successes have been achieved in this field in France and even under the conditions of illegal work in Spain and Austria. The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions rejects unity of action proposed by the R.I.L.U. with a view to creating a powerful unified trade union movement in these countries, which would greatly facilitate and accelerate the organisational merging of the Trade Union Internationals. You have refused even to hold negotiations on this question, rejecting UNIFICATION on the basis of agreement and insist on an absolutely inadmissible formulae of the liquidation and dissolution of the revolutionary trade unions, thereby helping to aggravate the split.

As for the question of "regular" organisations, you do not proceed in your decisions from the fact of the actual existence of the Red International of Labour Unions and from the active struggle waged by the revolutionary trade unions against capital, but from the formal questions belonging to the past. You talk about "regular" organisations. But what are these "regular" organisations? Who seceded from whom? If we were to adopt your viewpoint it would mean that your trade unions in Holland are to reaffiliate to the syndicalist National Labour Secretariat from which they disaffiliated, it would mean that the reformist Railwaymen's Federation and a number of other federations of France are to return to the corresponding unitary federations, which they left in 1921, after the revolutionary workers received the overwhelming majority of votes at the congresses, and that the reformist union of agricultural workers of Czecho-Slovakia is to return to the Red Union of Agricultural Workers from which a small minority seceded. If we were to adopt your view-

point it would mean that the reformist Federation of Trade Unions in Rumania should have affiliated to the revolutionary trade unions, which had a considerable majority during the Congress of 1923 in Klausenberg. You are probably aware as well of the fact that the enormous majority of the Finnish Trade Union Federation consisted of R.I.L.U. adherents and that the adherents of your International seceded from the unified trade union centre, being backed up by not more than one-fifth of the organised workers. The adherents of your International are now at the head of the Finnish Trade Union Federation only because the Finnish Government smashed the old trade union federations and arrested hundreds of functionaries. The situation is similar in Yugoslavia and in a number of other countries.

You know perfectly well that it is not the matter of "groups" but of hundreds, thousands and millions of workers who are playing a great rôle in the class struggle of the proletariat of their countries and of the whole world. Organised in the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. there are at present over 19 million workers and employees who play an outstanding rôle in the destinies of their own country and of the international labour movement. The revolutionary trade unions of China, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Japan, Cuba, Chile, U.S.A., Italy, Canada, Philippines, Austria, Germany, India, South Africa, Argentine, Uruguay, Mexico, etc., are waging a struggle against the bourgeoisie. Although in some countries the number of members of the trade unions, driven underground, declined for the past three years as the result of terror, unheard-of persecutions and mass murders (Japan, Italy), even the bourgeoisie does not venture to deny the tremendous significance of these trade unions in the class struggle of the proletariat. An international trade union organisation under the present conditions cannot but have illegal trade unions in its midst in order to help the workers' organisations to become legal by means of its struggle.

It is not a matter of "seceded groups." The congresses of the General Council of your International may pass as many resolutions on this question as they wish, but it is a QUESTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION ORGANISATION UNITING THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS OF THE WORLD. It is the question of an organisation which is anxious for trade union unity, realising full well the degree and extent of our differences of opinion. Unity of the world trade union movement can and shall be established only if the negotiations are carried on ON THE BASIS OF THE EQUALITY of both the Internations, only if unity is built on the basis of trade union democracy, on the basis of proportional representation in the leading organs for the

struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and war.

The R.I.L.U. Executive Bureau rejects therefore any ultimatums whatsoever and CONFIRMS ONCE MORE ITS READINESS TO DISCUSS, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS and with the representatives of the trade union centres of all countries THE FORMS, METHODS AND CONDITIONS OF THE UNIFICATION OF THE TRADE UNIONS IN EVERY COUNTRY AND ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE. The attitude of the Bureau of the International Federation of the Trade Unions, which has rejected negotiations, is one of preserving and deepening the split, whatever phrases about unity are used to disguise its policy.

It is not a question of liquidating the trade unions affiliated to one of the Internationals, of liquidating of one of the Internationals in favour of the other, nor of the affiliation of one trade union organisation to the other, but it is a question of the merging of parallel trade union organisations on the basis of BROAD TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY, OF BUILDING A UNIFIED TRADE UNION IN EVERY INDUSTRY, A UNIFIED TRADE UNION FEDERATION IN EVERY COUNTRY AND A UNIFIED TRADE UNION INTERNATIONAL. He who wants to struggle in deed against the offensive of capital, against fascism and war, cannot and must not be opposed to unity of action and to trade union unity.

The number of members of your trade unions who insist on the necessity for a united front and unity is ever growing. This may be shown by the existence of 561 unified trade unions in France, by the newly-started amalgamation of the reformist and revolutionary trade unions in Spain, by the formation of illegal trade unions in Austria, through the joint efforts of the Communists and Social-Democrats. Your answer is not the answer of millions of workers organised in your International. The vital interests of the working masses imperatively dictate the necessity for unity of action. The R.I.L.U. wants to know their opinion. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to render a general and mass character to the joint demonstrations on May First. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to accelerate the amalgamation of the trade unions in France, Spain and elsewhere, on the basis of the class struggle, and through joint action against capital. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to rebuild the free trade unions in Germany, the trade unions which will wage a real struggle against fascism. The R.I.L.U. WILL DO ALL IN ITS POWER TO BUILD A UNIFIED TRADE UNION MOVEMENT IN EVERY COUNTRY AND A UNIFIED TRADE UNION INTERNATIONAL ON THE BASIS OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

The restoration of trade union unity will not

only strengthen considerably the fighting power of the working class, but also serve as a starting-point for the influx of huge masses of unorganised workers to the amalgamated trade unions.

The trade union split caused by the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie brought innumerable disasters to the working class. The bourgeoisie shifted the whole burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the toilers. In a number of countries the fascists smashed the trade union organisations. The danger of imperialist wars threatens the working class again as in 1914. The actions of the trade union leaders during the war, when they placed the trade unions at the service of the militarists, are still fresh in the memory of the workers. Such an utilisation of trade unions can be avoided by the establishment of the united front, by the struggle against the capitalists and by the carrying out of trade union unity. Therefore, the members of all the trade unions must take this matter into their own hands.

The Executive Bureau proposes to the organisations affiliated to the R.I.L.U.:—

- (a) To address the corresponding trade unions of other tendencies with the proposal to organise joint meetings, demonstrations and strikes on May First against the offensive of

capital, against fascism and the impending war.

- (b) To arrange for joint meetings of the members of the trade unions affiliated to both the Internationals for the discussion of the question of unity of action and trade union unity.

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. proposes to the trade union organisations of both the Internationals to organise a REFERENDUM AMONGST THE TRADE UNION MEMBERS ON JOINT ACTION AND ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRADE UNION UNITY. Thus, it will be left to the mass of the members to decide this cardinal question of the international labour movement.

We will pass our proposal and your answer to the judgment of the members of both Internationals. Let the working masses give their decisive answer. The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is firmly convinced that the MEMBERS OF YOUR TRADE UNIONS AND A CONSIDERABLE PORTION OF THE OFFICIALS, REALISING THE GRAVITY OF THE SITUATION, WILL DECLARE FOR THE UNITED FRONT AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY.

With Trade Union greetings,

EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE RED
INTERNATIONAL OF LABOUR UNIONS.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Extracts from Speech given by Earl Browder, on February 23rd

THE most important points of the struggle that is now rending the ranks of the Socialist Party, are, of course, the Detroit Convention and the Declaration of Principles¹ and especially the development of the struggle for the united front which is now making deep inroads among the Socialist workers in spite of the fight against the united front by all main leaders.

We can describe the general process taking place as a distinct leftward movement of the rank and file members of the Socialist Party and their working-class followers—a movement which is part of the general radicalisation of large masses of the working population in the United States. The response to this radicalisation of the workers on the part of the leading elements in the Socialist Party

¹ This declaration, adopted at the last Socialist Party Congress in Detroit, in 1934, representing the platform of the Thomas majority was, on the decision of the Congress, subjected to a vote of all the lower rank and file units of the Socialist Party.

is not uniform. It is quite varied. Out of this variation and difference of opinion as to how to deal with the radicalisation of the masses and how to meet the issues as they arise, there has come a series of divisions within the leadership of the Socialist Party.

One of the basic features of the division has been the constant exposure of the bankruptcy of the positions that have been taken up from time to time by the leadership of the party on various issues of the day, above all on the question of the attitude towards the New Deal, the N.R.A. and the Roosevelt administration generally. The overwhelming majority of the Socialist leaders, you will recall, in the beginning of the New Deal hailed it as a step towards Socialism. Norman Thomas, proud of being a non-Marxist, said the New Deal represented about as much as the workers could get under capitalism and that it represented a distinct step in the direction of socialism, although he also admitted that there were certain Fascist possibilities within it.

Leaders Forced to Abandon N.R.A. Support.

Already, now, this policy of support for the New Deal, the N.R.A., is so thoroughly and completely discredited that the whole position has had to be completely abandoned. This is true not only of the Socialist Party, even the leaders of the American Federation of Labour, firm and loyal servants of Roosevelt as they are, have been forced to break with Roosevelt on the auto code, the N.R.A. Boards, the \$50 per month wage on public works, the 30-hour week issue, etc.

In this abandonment of support of the New Deal, the Socialist leaders have not led the way even in relation to the A.F. of L. leadership. They have been driven to abandon their old position by the force of events just as the leaders of the A.F. of L. were driven. We can recall that there was no serious effort even to critically approach the New Deal on the part of the Socialist Party leadership until even the Republican Party finally launched its national attack against the New Deal last year. In this development of the political life of the country as a whole and the part that the Socialist Party leaders played in it, we can clearly see pictured the general process that is taking place, that is, a movement to the left of the masses of the workers and even considerable sections of the middle class, whilst the Socialist Party leaders, instead of leading and organising this leftward movement, resisted, struggled against it, tried to hold it back. It was only the rise of mass strike movements directed against the N.R.A., its Labour Boards² and codes, which finally forced these official leaders to break from open alliance with Roosevelt.

The methods of resisting this development by the leaders has not been uniform. There have been sharp differences of opinion on how to hold back this movement, that explain the break-up of the leadership into various groupings.

Genuine Left Trend in Rank and File.

There is a growing element of active workers and local leaders in the Socialist Party who are sincerely responding to the leftward movement of the masses to the best of their ability. These elements, to some degree represented in the Revolutionary Policy Committee and its adherents and also represented in those committees that have been set up in various places in the country for the support of the united front with the Com-

² The A.F. of L. leaders demand that they be given a more active part to play in the Labour Boards (bodies established under the N.R.A. to regulate the relations between the workers and employers), they insist on the unemployed engaged on public works being paid at the existing rates, i.e., above \$50 and demand that the thirty-hour week be operated without wage cuts.

munists (especially in the trade unions and unemployed associations), represent an earnest striving to go along with the leftward movement of the masses. It has very serious weaknesses and shortcomings, but in general represents a tendency which can only be welcomed, especially in so far as it rallies itself around the united front in immediate class struggles of the day.

Leaders' Tactics on Unemployment Insurance.

Before approaching more concretely the current events within the Socialist Party, we should also say a few words about the position of the Socialist Party leadership towards one of the most burning issues before the country, namely, unemployment and social insurance. As illustrating these general facts that I have just reviewed, we read in the newspapers just a few days ago the announcement on behalf of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party that it had endorsed the Workers' Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance Bill (H.R.2827)³ now before Congress. This is the first official word that the Socialist Party as a whole has spoken on this question—this in spite of the fact that the Workers' Bill has been in Congress for considerably more than a year and has been before the country for several years past. This in spite of the fact that the Communist Party and the National Unemployment Councils have made repeated approaches to the Socialist Party proposing united action in support of this Bill and offering to discuss with the Socialist Party any questions they wished to raise with regard to the Bill. This was further in spite of the fact that the Labour Committee of Congress itself had officially invited leaders of the Socialist Party to appear before it at its hearing on the Bill.

The Socialist Party was not able to make up its mind. The leadership was not able to speak on this question, to declare itself, until after the Congressional hearings had concluded; and even then declaring their support of the Bill a conditional support. They appointed, too late, a committee which was supposed to speak for them at the Congressional hearings. To make this seem plausible they named Socialist Party members who had previously appeared at the Congressional hearings as individuals or as representatives of non-party organisations in support of the Bill before they were authorised to speak for the Socialist Party. They were named too late to get to committee hearings.

Previous to this public announcement of support for the Workers' Bill, the Socialist Party leaders

³ There is no State Social Insurance in the U.S.A. H.R. 2827 was introduced into the U.S.A. Congress on the initiative of the C.P. of the U.S.A.

and organisations and members have been in a very confused position on the unemployment insurance question. Some have openly supported the Wagner-Lewis Bill,⁴ the Administration Bill. Some have supported the Workers' Bill. Others have vacillated between the two unable to make up their minds without guidance from the party; and even to-day when the National Executive Committee weakly declares its support of H.R.2827, in the same issue of the *New Leader*, which announces this, there is also printed an appeal to support the Byrnes Bill in New York, which is an emasculated copy of the Wagner-Lewis Bill.

Inner Conflicts Amongst Leadership.

This very weak and indecisive position on the most burning question before the American masses typifies the paralysis of the Socialist Party leadership to-day. There is no leader of the Socialist Party to-day who dares to come before the masses and boldly declare a position in the name of his party, without fearing he will immediately be repudiated by the other leaders of his party. This condition in the Socialist Party comes after a period of over ten months of the most intense discussion following a convention, a discussion which culminated in the referendum vote on the Declaration of Principles, in which "democratic procedure" was carried out in a most prolonged and extensive fashion such as is rarely seen in political life. But the more the Socialist Party applies these so-called democratic methods, the less it seems to be able to bring about any decisive conclusion to its inner discussion, the less able it is to unite on any well-defined programme of action, not to speak of a Declaration of Principles.

The referendum vote on the Detroit Declaration of Principles registered a majority for that declaration, a majority which was a victory for the centre group, usually identified with Thomas, the Militants, although this is not a unified homogeneous group, but a block of several groups. This victory for Thomas and his group in the referendum did not result, however, in clearing up the situation in the Socialist Party.

Thomas and his group were frightened by this victory. They did not seem to know what to do with the victory after they got it. They had not fought for the victory while the discussion was going on. They let the right wing do the fighting, and "let nature take its course." But "nature" produced a victory for Thomas that frightened him and his group.

⁴ Draft Bill of the Democratic Party, supported by Roosevelt and introduced into Congress by Congressman Wagner.

Thomas Group Surrenders to Right Wing.

The result of this fright was that afterwards the National Executive Committee, fresh from its victory, went into the meeting in Boston in December and used its victory in order to surrender to the right wing. The right wing brought its forces to the December N.E.C. meeting in a big demonstration. Thomas and the N.E.C. majority backed down completely on their former proposals with regard to the united front, further accepted measures directed against the revolutionary policy committee and its followers, and generally adopted decisions which were dictated by the "defeated" right wing.

The Thomas group had hoped to work out a compromise with the right wing on the basis of this capitulation, a compromise which would give the right wing its political demands, while saving the face of the Thomas group and preserving its position as ostensible leaders of the radicalising trend among Socialist Party members.

This hoped-for compromise with the right wing as a result of the concessions made in the December N.E.C. meeting did not materialise. Thomas sacrificed the united front, which was demanded by his followers, but despite this could not buy peace with the Old Guard. In spite of all of the concessions, in spite of all of the practical surrender of the majority of the N.E.C., they could not make peace with the right wing.

All efforts at a compromise failed. They failed so completely that to-day we see a new outbreak of factional warfare throughout the Socialist Party on a national scale with a sharpness that has never been seen before since 1919 when the Communists were expelled from the Socialist Party.

Thomas' resignation from the staff of the *New Leader* a couple of weeks ago is merely a symptom of that sharp factional warfare that is tearing the Socialist Party to pieces.

Right Wing Alliance With Capitalist Parties.

What was the cause of the failure to achieve a compromise settlement? We can point out two main causes. The first one was that the right wing elements, who had been on the offensive from the beginning of the fight, although in a minority, had been taught to have nothing but contempt for the N.E.C. decisions. They had seen time after time majority decisions registered against the right wing to be followed immediately by surrender to the right wing. The right wing therefore was not encouraged to compromise by the surrender of the Thomas group. They therefore sharpened up their demands and increased factional struggle in the Socialist Party instead of slackening it down and creating the conditions for a compromise.

The second factor which brought about this failure is that at the same time the Thomas majority was losing its authority by its incapacity to follow any one line, the right wing itself was being seriously compromised by the development taking place in the main leadership, i.e., the New York City leadership in the Socialist Party. This right wing itself is more and more being divided into two tendencies. One of them was entering into official relations with the LaGuardia⁵ Fusion Party. This was openly expressed in LaGuardia's appointment of Panken to a judgeship, with the endorsement of the New York Socialist Party leadership, a political alliance which was publicly celebrated at a banquet to induct Panken into his new position, a banquet at which Socialist Party leaders sat side by side with LaGuardia and at which Abe Cahan made a speech in which he welcomed LaGuardia as "one of us."

On the other hand, another part of the New York leadership represented by Waldman was entering into very practical relationships with Tammany Hall.

These two diverse political alliances within the same right-wing group at the head of the New York Socialist Party not only created the threat of a split among them, but served to seriously discredit the leadership as a whole and make it dangerous for Thomas and his group to conclude the compromise they had in mind.

Right Wing Expulsion Tactics.

The extreme belligerency with which the right wing was conducting its warfare against the Thomas leadership had created a whole series of difficulties for the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party. I will not take time to go into details of this factional fight, but it is necessary to point out a few outstanding developments. First, in the New York City and State organisations there was the developed offensive of expulsions against left-wingers, against adherents of the Revolutionary Policy Committee, which, while carefully excluding any public declaration that it was directed against Thomas and his group, was actually designed in the first place to undermine the position of Thomas. The New York leaders further reorganised the whole New York party in such a way as to effectively exclude the militant group from any real participation in the leadership of New York. They organised a whole series of new branches with a careful distribution of their trusted forces in such

⁵ LaGuardia, Mayor of New York, represents part of the so-called progressive republicans and democrats, and also various liberal and petty-bourgeois groups, linked in a movement which is carrying on a demagogic campaign against the corrupt bureaucracy of the New York municipality, headed by Tammany Hall.

a way as to secure an iron-clad majority in the City Committee.

At the same time in many Western States, controlled and directed by the Old Guard, they sharpened up the fight against Thomas, the N.E.C. Thus in California a State Convention has been called on the agenda of which is placed the question that the Socialist Party of California will withdraw from the Socialist Party of the U.S.A. pending the repeal of the Declaration of Principles for the declared purpose to safeguard its members from persecutions under the California Syndicalism Law, thus practically declaring Thomas as "illegal."

The Oregon State organisation carried through its decision to withdraw from the Socialist Party of the U.S.A. The Oklahoma organisation carried through its withdrawal. The Indiana organisation was conducting a referendum on withdrawal when Thomas and the N.E.C. finally stepped into the situation, revoked the Charter of the Indiana section of the Socialist Party, and seized the records and property of the Indiana organisation, proceeding to reorganise the party and excluding the leadership who had fought against the Declaration of Principles. It was this fight that finally led to the open break between the Old Guard and the Thomas N.E.C., which resulted in Thomas' resignation from the *New Leader* after the *New Leader* refused to publish the statement of the N.E.C.

Caucus of "Militant" Group.

The New York City and State organisation is now in the position of open rebellion against the national leadership of the party. At the same time rumours are current that they have prepared a list of 50 more expulsions of leading left-wing elements from the New York party. Norman Thomas is represented as saying in private conversations that these events have proved that the period of attempted compromise is over and that the attempt was a mistake in the first place. Just in the last few days the Militant faction has had a regional caucus—a caucus of their leading elements throughout the East generally. For some time Thomas had formally kept independent of caucus groups and had publicly criticised the Militants. But this recent caucus meeting received a message from Norman Thomas, I understand, a message of encouragement and support which is generally taken to be a formal, political unification of the faction as an organised group, an endorsement of the general course that was mapped out at this caucus.

The Militants are talking quite bravely now—speaking about demands to be placed before the N.E.C. to reorganise New York—reorganisation and reconstituting the membership, excluding the

Old Guard^a and restoring the Revolutionary Policy Committee members. (The Massachusetts State Committee on November 3rd formally brought charges against the New York Committee.) There is talk of expelling Waldman from the Socialist Party. With regard to this question of Waldman's position in the Socialist Party, there are even rumours that a section of the Old Guard itself is willing to throw Waldman to the wolves because they find his connection with Tammany is "worse" than their connections with LaGuardia.

It is interesting to note that the renegade from Communism, Gitlow, took a prominent part in this militant caucus. Gitlow was a sort of ideological leader in the caucus. In nothing else is their poverty of leadership so demonstrated as in this pathetic seizing upon the rubbish cleaned out of the Communist Party.

Continue Fight Against United Front.

While all this warlike atmosphere prevails in which the Militants come forward as brave fighters against the right wing, against the Old Guard, it is very instructive to take note that precisely at the same moment, the Thomas majority of the N.E.C. is actually carrying through the pledges that they gave to the Old Guard at the Boston meeting of the N.E.C. in December. That pledge was for an uncompromising struggle against the united front and postponing any consideration of this question until 1936. No matter what the changed relations may be with the Old Guard, this fundamental agreement with the Old Guard they are carrying through 100 per cent. Thus, just a few weeks ago, Clarence Senior, the Secretary of the N.E.C., sent out in the name of the Thomas majority of the N.E.C. a letter of instructions to States and localities from the N.E.C. not to consider any sort of a united front with the Communists. This action was even more drastic than that embodied in the resolution officially adopted in December. In fact the Old Guard had complained that the December resolution was too lenient in allowing State and local united fronts, so they carried out a referendum vote by mail after the N.E.C. meeting, changing the decision so as to prohibit State and local united fronts.

It is clear therefore that the fight which the Thomas group has been forced to take up against the Old Guard does not mean that they are modifying their course toward the left. The course of the Thomas majority is distinctly to the right of what it was during last summer and early fall when they were still playing with the slogan of the united front.

^a The "Old Guard"—the Right wing of the Socialist Party.

Flirt With Capitalist Alliances.

What we see taking place within the Old Guard in New York of orientation towards two different camps in bourgeois politics, is to a certain degree taking form on a national scale as between the Thomas group and the Old Guard group. All of the different leading groupings in the Socialist Party are looking forward and speculating upon the shifts that are expected to take place in national politics between now and 1936. That group that is typified by the partnership between Thomas and Hoan, mayor of Milwaukee, has a general orientation of flirting and negotiating for more formal connections with the LaFollette progressive and the Olson group in Minnesota. Their tendency is towards this open middle class section of the third party movements. The Old Guard is banking upon connections with the more solid elements such as LaGuardia in the New York Fusion movement, even with Tammany itself, and Tammany will probably emerge in the next elections as a fusion movement also. It might even be with Louis Waldman as candidate for mayor. It has orientated more towards the official A.F. of L. leadership, hoping to have a combination of a third party movement with at least a section of the A.F. of L. bureaucracy.

The chances for these two currents to be united in 1936 largely depend upon their finding a common leader from the camp of the bourgeoisie. Possibly they may be united in the new third bourgeois party under the leadership of Huey Long by that time. This is not idle speculation. Although only a few weeks ago it was very fashionable to speak of Huey Long as a clown, in the last few weeks wonderful changes have been taking place. Huey Long is taken into the sacred "progressive" caucus of the LaFollettes, the Shipsteads, the Wheelers.

McLevy Policies in Connecticut.

Another example of the orientation of the Old Guard leadership is to be found in Connecticut. Connecticut is one of the prize show pieces of the Socialist Party leaders. There they have the mayor of Bridgeport, and the city administration. Joseph McLevy, formerly a member of the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party, and one of the leading figures of the Old Guard nationally, is unchallenged boss, unchallenged effectively so far in the Socialist Party of Connecticut. His election victories have been hailed as one of the outstanding achievements of the Socialist Party. This morning's *Daily Worker*¹ reports a very typical example of what is going on among the Connecticut leaders, in the McLevy group. One of McLevy's associates, Mr.

¹ *Daily Worker* of February 23, 1935.

Harry Bender, Socialist representative from Bridgeport in the state legislature, introduced a Bill calling for the establishment of the oath of loyalty by teachers and all employees of the State educational institutions, a law which is a direct response to the campaign of Hearst and which is along the lines of the notorious Ives law in New York. This is such an open reactionary measure that no Republican in the State of Connecticut could be found to introduce it, and a section of the Republicans are criticising this proposal as too reactionary for them.

At the same time there are even more serious things going on in Connecticut. McLevy's group in the State legislature has formed an alliance with the Republican party for the control of the State. Local newspapers are openly speaking about the fact that McLevy, as they say, "is becoming too big for his party." McLevy is now a very serious factor in State politics, more serious than his party. They do not take his party so seriously, McLevy they take very seriously. They have excellent reasons to take him seriously, because he is going along with all the measures of the Republicans in his state. At such a time as this, in face of the fact that the Socialist Party organisation went on record against the sales tax in Connecticut, McLevy has openly been working for the sales tax and includes the revenues from it in his proposed budget for the city of Bridgeport.

It is generally known and discussed in Connecticut that McLevy is negotiating a form whereby his alliance with the Republicans will be made more organic and open with a view towards electing McLevy as the next governor of Connecticut with the support of the Republicans. The form of this fusion with the Republican Party may perhaps be covered by the name of "Labour Party." The Labour Party fig leaf will be provided by a group of Republican A. F. of L. leaders in the State of Connecticut. We have in the figure of McLevy in Connecticut a perfect American imitation of Ramsay MacDonald.

Some Serious Weaknesses in R.P.C.

Meanwhile what is going on with the Revolutionary Policy Committee? The R.P.C. has played a rôle which does not measure up in practice to the possibilities that it has within the Socialist Party. It has not been able to rally around itself the left wing trends, the revolutionary trends among the Socialist Party members. This weakness has been due to the lack of homogeneity in the R.P.C. leading group. It is not uniform either in ideas or in social position, subject to vacillations and retreats, which hamper its effectiveness as a revolutionary force. It tries to manoeuvre in this very complicated situation within the Socialist

Party. Manoeuvres are, of course, necessary in practical political life, but the trouble with the manoeuvres of the R.P.C. is that most of them turn out to be retreats. They are manoeuvres which are undertaken without having established some advanced objective that they are manoeuvring towards. The result is that most of their manoeuvres degenerate into futility. For example, to illustrate this general criticism of the work of the R.P.C. we have their recent announcement that they had requested their former chairman and secretary, J. B. Matthews and Ruth Shallcross, to resign. Why did they request these leading figures to resign? Because the association embarrassed them in the inner party struggle, since Matthews and Shallcross had published a book in which they came out very sharply and categorically against the Old Guard in New York and characterised them as counter-revolutionaries, and at the same moment Matthews had declared openly for serious united front activities. Surely any fighting left wing within the Socialist Party should welcome the development of two of its leaders taking a strong and bold position in spite of previous vacillations. But the R.P.C. seems to consider boldness as the most dangerous thing in the inner party struggle, and when two of its leaders become bold they are asked to resign.

These criticisms are made in the most friendly spirit. We are quite friendly disposed to the efforts of the R.P.C. to find the path of revolutionary struggle in the United States.

Because we have a friendly attitude towards every revolutionary effort, no matter how confused, we consider that the best help is friendly criticism. This kind of politics in the fight within the Socialist Party is merely dragging along at the tail of Norman Thomas and centrism. It has the same relation towards the Thomas centrist⁸ Militant group that Thomas has towards the Old Guard—the same formal opposition while surrendering the essential political positions.

Thomas Group Executes "Old Guard" Policies.

Why do we criticise the Thomas group so sharply? Because in practice it carries out the line of the Old Guard. That is something every Socialist worker must understand if he expects to travel along the revolutionary path. It is not possible to find the class struggle line while carrying out a policy which is daily surrender to those who are in secret alliance with the old political machines. What is true of Thomas and his group in relation to the Old Guard is true, in spite of all

⁸ The Norman Thomas group occupies a centrist position in the Socialist Party between the Right wing, the Old Guard and the Left wing, the Revolutionary Policy Committee.

the best intentions, of the Revolutionary Policy Committee in relation to Thomas. Every time they attempt to be "clever tacticians," they repeat on a small scale what Thomas carries through in relation to the Old Guard. This is not serious politics. This is the politics of surrender, of Ramsay MacDonald—typical Social-Democratic opportunism—and is not improved because it is dressed in nice revolutionary-sounding phrases.

We have to speak so clearly, even when we are talking to the Revolutionary Policy Committee, whose intentions we have the greatest regard for. If our advice is worth anything to them, it has to be along these lines: take a bold and principled position and fight for it: establish thereby a centre around which can rally the large majority of workers who are really for united front of struggle, who are against the capitalists and the capitalist political machine.

We think we know the members and followers of the Socialist Party even better than many leaders of the Socialist Party. We have had quite a bit of experience coming in contact with Socialist Party workers. When some Socialist leaders say to us, "Yes, we are for the united front personally, but the members are against it; and we believe in democracy," we answer, "We know your members better than you do. You cannot place the responsibility on the Socialist workers." No, that responsibility has to be placed on the leaders who are blocking the workers in achieving their desire, which is to fight shoulder to shoulder with the Communists.

Need for Unity in Daily Struggle.

If we are to bring these members of the Socialist Party into the class struggle without allowing them to fall by the wayside—it is necessary that we Communists not only do everything to help these workers and establish working relations with them—(we are doing our best to overcome all our past weaknesses in this respect, we are learning how to work with all these workers)—while we do this we have a perfect right to call on those who aspire to revolutionary leadership among the Socialist Party

(Continued from page 385.)

in what way it is different from the Labour Party. It should explain the structure of the Party and its attitude as to the trade unions. It is important that the paper should give publicity in its pages to the experience of recruiting members to the Party, and to work done with the new members.

The paper should combine the struggle against fascism and war with the struggle against the capitalist offensive, and quote concrete examples of the reduction of the standard of living of the

workers, to ask them to adopt effective tactics of the united front, to come out boldly and courageously, raising high the banner of working class unity, and to join their efforts with ours in this fight for the uniting of all the revolutionary forces of the working class.

It is in the light of our most earnest and sincere desire to achieve this unification as quickly and effectively as possible that we criticise the past and to some extent the present tactic of the Revolutionary Policy Committee elements and many who are associated with them in the struggles now going on in the Socialist Party.

There is a burning necessity for unity on the everyday issues of the class struggle. There is a necessity that that unity be fought for everywhere where the workers are organised. The issue of the Workers' Bill (H.R. 2827) is merely an outstanding example of a dozen issues upon which working class unity can and must be built, such as unification of the unemployed organisations, the strike struggles and building the trade unions, the programme of the American League Against War and Fascism. The Communists are prepared to cooperate with everyone who is ready to fight for that unity. We are sure that the final solution of all problems of class struggle will only be achieved when one party—the Communist Party—has won the leadership of the overwhelming mass. But we recognise that this process of organic unity goes through a period more or less protracted. We must at once establish a unity which begins with and is forged around immediate issues that can unite groups and organisations of different ideologies and political opinions. It is this IMMEDIATE UNITED FRONT we are fighting for now because it represents not only the life needs of the masses to-day, but it also represents the highway towards revolutionary achievements and struggles, toward the defeat of our class enemies, towards revolution and the reconstruction of society.

This is why we fight for unity. It is from this point of view we evaluate current events in the Socialist Party.

workers and of the toiling farmers on the one hand, and of the tremendous growth of expenditure for war purposes and for maintaining the police, on the other hand.

The issue of the weekly Party paper and of the women's paper have played a big organising rôle in the struggle of the Party for the masses. Not only has the influence of the Party increased, but the membership of the Party itself has also grown. The fact that the Party membership has doubled, that there has been an increase of the number of

(Continued on page 422.)

DISCUSSION ON QUESTIONS FOR THE VII CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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

PREVIOUS ARTICLES WERE:—		No.
Problems of the Standard of Living of the Working Class - - -	By Sinani.	Vol. XI 20
The Question of the Middle Strata of the Town Population - - -	By P. Reimann.	20
Basic Lessons of the Struggle of the C.P. of Italy. - - -	By K. Roncollì.	22
The Question of Communist Cadres - - -	By Chernomordik.	23
The Nature and the Sources of Sectarianism in the Communist Party of Italy - - -	By Tunelli.	24
How to Prepare for the Seventh Congress of the C.I. - - -	By Al. Berg.	Vol. XII 1
Decision of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany - - -		1
Resolution of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia - - -		1
The Struggle to Establish Inner Soviet Regions in the Semi-Colonial Countries - - -	By V. Myro.	3
Decisions of the C.C. of the C.P. of the U.S.A. Regarding Preparations for the Seventh Congress of the C.I. - - -		4
The Conditions for Establishing Soviet Districts in the Interior in Semi-Colonial Countries - - -	By Li.	4
The Process of Development Towards Fascism - - -	By M. Galas.	5
Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland on the Preparatory Campaign of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International - - -		5
Some Problems of Fascism (Part I.) - - -	By R. P. Dutt.	8
Jugoslavia Pol Bureau Decision - - -		8

(a) SOME PROBLEMS OF FASCISM (Part II.)

By R. PALME DUTT.

III. "Fascisation," "Semi-Fascism" and "Pre-Fascism."

ONE of the outstanding characteristics of the second wave of fascism, developing since the world economic crisis, has been the enormous elaboration of the technique of fascist dictatorship and of the advance to fascism, and, in particular, the development of a manifold and extending variety of "BETWEEN-STAGES" on the road to the completed fascist dictatorship. The formal barriers between bourgeois democracy and fascism have been worn increasingly thin by this process (at what point did Dollfuss, the widely acclaimed "champion of democracy" in Europe, become Dollfuss, fascist dictator?) which has extended in greater or less degree to all imperialist countries.

This process corresponds necessarily to the wider and UNIVERSAL character of the second fascist wave, in contradistinction to the first. The first fascist wave affected only certain countries strongly, and the remaining countries only slightly or not at all (hence the liberal reformist illusions at the time as to the "backward" or "Italian" character of fascism). The second fascist wave has affected all imperialist countries in greater or less degree. In particular, it has been

marked by the extension to advanced industrial countries with a high degree of working class organisation. But the conditions for its extension in countries of this type necessarily differ from the conditions in countries of the earlier type. On the one hand, the completed fascist dictatorship, once established, has to act with far greater speed to consolidate its power and endeavour to smash all working class organisation (contrast the relative slowness of the evolution of the Italian fascist dictatorship to its completed form between 1922 and 1926, and the extreme speed of the Hitler dictatorship in immediately setting up its terror and striking at all working class organisation). On the other hand, if the final stage is thus carried through with greater rapidity, the preparation and process leading up to this final stage is far longer and more complicated, because of the intricate initial manoeuvres required to transform bourgeois democracy from within and to lull the opposition of the working class. Hence arises the characteristic new phenomenon of FASCISATION, of an enormous variety of PARTIAL AND PREPARATORY STAGES TOWARDS COMPLETE FASCISM, developing in widely different forms in many countries — a

phenomenon of which only the first signs and indications were visible at the time of the Sixth Congress.

The Mussolini fascist dictatorship in Italy was preceded by the interim process of the Giolitti and Facta régimes, with the formal maintenance of parliamentarism and actual state assistance to the fascist forces and their guerilla warfare on the working class organisations and property. But Hitler-fascism in Germany had to be preceded by the far more complicated process of the Brüning, Papen and Schleicher emergency régimes, supported by social-democracy as the "lesser evil" supposedly "against the menace of fascism," and in reality intensifying the bourgeois dictatorship in every field and paving the way for Hitler. The classic Brüning model was next repeated in foreshortened order by Dollfuss, who took on himself to fulfil in one person successively the rôles of Brüning and of Hitler. Still further, in the Western imperialist countries with the longest established and rooted parliamentary democratic forms, an even more complicated process of advance towards fascist forms began, illustrated by the National Government in Britain, the Roosevelt emergency dictatorship in the United States, and the unsuccessful Doumergue National Concentration Government in France, while a different and more direct type, developing within a process of revolution, was revealed by the Lerrox-Robles dictatorship in Spain.

How are we to characterise these manifold and varied "between-stages"? At what point does the intensified dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and gradual restriction of the older parliamentary democratic forms by new emergency forms, become definitely fascist dictatorship? There is no Chinese wall, and to dispute on rigidly fixed terms in relation to what is a dialectical process is nothing but barren scholasticism. Nevertheless, a distinction of a definite importance of degree can be made and is necessary. The essential answer to this question was given already by the Sixth Congress definition of fascism, which declared ("International Programme") that "the principal aim of fascism is to destroy the revolutionary labour vanguard, i.e., the Communist sections and leading units of the proletariat." This is the decisive characteristic of the completed fascist dictatorship, as demonstrated most fully in Germany and Italy. In the partial stages of the Brüning type the advance has not yet been made to the formal suppression and war of annihilation against the revolutionary working class organisations.

In the early stages of these transitional processes there was revealed a certain degree of confusion in terminology in our propaganda expression, which led to the frequent application of the

term "fascist dictatorship" without reservation to these transitional stages, thus blurring the sharpness of the issue in front with regard to the culminating stage of the completed fascist dictatorship. This tendency was in fact specifically corrected by the E.C.C.I. in relation to the Brüning dictatorship in December, 1930. The *Rote Fahne* of December 2, 1930, had written:

The semi-fascist Brüning Government has taken a determined step on the road towards the establishment of fascist dictatorship in Germany. The fascist dictatorship is no longer a menace—it is a fact. We are living now in a fascist republic.

The Brüning Cabinet has become a fascist dictatorship."

On this the E.C.C.I. issued the correction:

"The estimate given in the *Rote Fahne* of December 2 and 3 to the effect that a fascist dictatorship already exists in Germany is politically incorrect. The Emergency Decrees issued with the support of social-democracy and the reformist trade unions against the toilers represent a step on the road to the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, but is not yet a decisive step. That depends upon the power of resistance of the working class."

The subsequent development in Germany has fully confirmed the correctness of this analysis. Similarly, at the Twelfth Plenum, Comrade Kuusinen in his report, referring to the Papen dictatorship, declared:

"It would be incorrect to assert that the present régime in Germany constitutes a full and complete fascist dictatorship. This question with regard to the final setting up of a fascist dictatorship is not yet determined in Germany. The decisive struggles have not yet come to pass."

At the same time the Papen and Schleicher Governments were widely referred to as "fascist dictatorship" without reservation. Thus at the Twelfth Plenum Comrade Piatnitsky, after quoting the above-mentioned correction of the International Executive against describing the Brüning dictatorship as a fascist dictatorship, proceeded shortly after in the same speech to speak of "Papen's Government of fascist dictatorship." The Presidium Resolution on Germany in April, 1933, makes the distinction between "the fascist dictatorship in the shape of the Papen and Schleicher Governments" and the "open fascist dictatorship" of Hitler. With this may be compared the statement in Comrade Pieck's report to the Thirteenth Plenum, quoting Comrade Thaelmann's declaration to the Hamburg District Party Congress in December, 1932, that

"with the constitution of the Schleicher Cabinet we are entering upon a new and accentuated stage of the fascist dictatorship."

The analysis here is essentially correct. But the danger of its reflection in our local press may be noted in the editorial of the London *Daily Worker* on January 31, 1933, on the advent of Hitler to power:

"This is the new government of fascist concentration. A fascist dictatorship already existed in Germany. But

the new government means a sharpening of that dictatorship."

Here the decisive significance of the advent of Hitler or open fascism to power in Germany, in place of the previous governments of bourgeois preparation of fascism without the participation of the open fascist party, as constituting a landmark and vital issue for the whole international movement, is only weakly presented under the expression of "sharpening" of the "already existing" fascist dictatorship (i.e., precisely the same description as was already applied to the transition from Papen to Schleicher). The loose universal use of "fascist dictatorship," to describe all the stages, has led to the danger of a weakening of the vision of the decisive character of the issue at the most critical point of the struggle.

The formal contradiction between the two conceptions or stages of fascist dictatorship, both described under the same term, or between "fascist dictatorship" and "open" or "completed fascist dictatorship," is not basically a contradiction. Essentially, these governments represent successive stages of a **DEVELOPING FASCIST DICTATORSHIP**. Nevertheless, it may be valuable for greater clearness in the future to distinguish more definitely between the two types or stages (always with the provision that the border-line is not necessarily a sharp one), and to make a regular practice, as is already often done, of referring to the transitional stages as "SEMI-FASCISM," "PRE-FASCISM," "VEILED FASCISM," etc., rather than as "fascist dictatorship," without reservation. This is especially important because of the danger otherwise of blurring the significance of the final and decisive stage of the struggle.

There are in fact two dangers needing to be guarded against. One is the danger, already mentioned, of in such a way emphasising the character of the given transitional stage as already fascist dictatorship that the continual reiteration, instead of sharply awakening the workers to the struggle, as intended, may have the opposite effect of lowering the understanding of the serious issue of fascism into a catchword for reaction in general, and weakening the sharp alertness of the workers at the most critical point of the struggle when the open fascist dictatorship is for the first time attempted to be established. The other is the danger, most grossly expressed in the line of Social Democratic propaganda, of fixing the attention on the menace of fascism as solely the menace of a future "coup," and in consequence denying or minimising the significance of the actual growth towards fascism taking place within the forms of bourgeois democracy (in the case of the traditional Social Democratic line, even supporting this process as the supposed "lesser evil"

against fascism), and thus in fact weakening the all-important present struggle against the fascist offensive, although this present struggle is decisive for whether the future final stage will arrive or not.

Both these dangers, not only in their gross form, but even in a modified form, need to be guarded against. With extreme soberness, without exaggeration, we need to show the steadily growing fascist tendencies in the present transitional régimes in the various countries of still nominal bourgeois democracy; we need to show where this process has led in country after country, and must inevitably lead, to open and complete fascist dictatorship and terror, unless the workers already take up the united struggle against the present stage of the offensive; and on this basis we call the workers in these countries to the struggle against fascism and against the governments which are preparing fascist dictatorship.

The new manifestations, represented by the National Government in Britain, the Roosevelt régime in the United States, etc., will need special analysis.

In the case of Britain, the fascist significance of the National Government, as marking a step on the road towards fascism, lies in (1) the conditions of its formation, i.e., the bankruptcy and collapse of the Second Labour Government, the disillusionment of a wide body of workers as seen in the fall of the Labour vote by two millions, and the cunning utilisation of this situation by the bourgeoisie to conceal their old parties under a new "national" front, with a "National Labour" wing, and on this basis win a majority; (2) the intensification of the capitalist dictatorship by the National Government, diminution of the rôle of parliament, and increasing government by administrative and executive order within the framework of very wide enabling laws; (3) the economic programme, comparable in many respects to the Hitler type, of a highly fettered tariffs, quota and license system, state subsidies and regulation, compulsory reorganisation, restriction of production, raising of prices, etc., for the benefit of the big trusts, towards the aim of increasing national and imperialist "self-sufficiency," and towards war aims; (4) the intensified repression against the working class, both legislative measures such as the Sedition Act and Unemployment Act, and police measures, strengthening and militarisation of the police, prohibitions of meetings and demonstrations, increase of arrests, formation of training camps for the unemployed youth; (5) protection of the new open fascist formation, and assistance to them through the police and law courts.

In the United States, the Roosevelt emergency régime shows the whole process in a still clearer

and sharper form, the concentration of wide emergency dictatorial powers in the hands of the President, the state regulation of industry for the benefit of monopoly capital, extreme violence against the workers, and intensified war preparations, all under a cover of extreme social demagoguery. Here is the classic type of the most modern process of fascisation within the Western imperialist, still nominally bourgeois democratic states.

In France, the open fascist offensive of February 6, 1934, led to the ignominious capitulation of the weak "Left" Government, despite its parliamentary majority, and thus showed already the power of fascism over the parliamentary forms, forcing in this way by extra-parliamentary pressure the formation of the National Concentration Government of Doumergue, which proceeded to attempt to carry out the reactionary transformation of the constitution. Here, however, the strength of the workers' united front checked the advance, brought about the fall of Doumergue, and led to the interim Flandin Cabinet, under which the organisation and arming of the fascist formations has gone rapidly forward.

In Belgium, the parliament is openly replaced by the Emergency Powers (*pleins pouvoirs*) of the government, which rules by decree, as in the Brüning régime, at the same time as the chiefs of the Labour Party enter into direct coalition with the government Ministers in the National Commission of Labour. The offensive against the working class, carried out with extreme ruthlessness in the economic field, and in the political field directed in the first place against the Communists, extended even to the prohibition of the Labour mass demonstration in Brussels on February 24, 1935.

In Czecho-Slovakia we see an open Coalition Government, with the participation of Social Democracy, nominally for the "defence of democracy," which strengthens administrative measures against the working class and prepares the legislative prohibition of the Communist Party (proposed legislation for the registration of political parties, to give legal rights only to parties accepting the basis of bourgeois democracy).

In Canada the Bennett Government proclaims a Rooseveltian "New Deal" (amid the applause of the leaders of the Social Democratic Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), denounces the "old capitalism" as "bankrupt," promises wide social reform and "redistribution of income," and combines this social demagoguery with a ruthless offensive against the working class and legal prohibition of the Communist Party.

All these examples, which could be further illustrated from the experiences of Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, Australia, etc., show the enormous

variety and manifold paths of the process of fascisation in the different countries. There is no single line of fascisation for all countries, but only a common universal tendency of present-day capitalism, the detail working out of which requires to be analysed in relation to the concrete conditions of each country. Only on the basis of such a concrete analysis can we convince the workers in each country of the sharp reality of the menace of fascism in all these transitional forms.

Still more important, there is no single straight-line AUTOMATIC process of fascisation leading through a fixed gradation of stages to an inevitable conclusion. The process at each stage is dependent on the degree of resistance of the workers, and consequently can frequently take on a ZIGZAG character. This has been most powerfully shown by the example of France, where the strength of the workers' united front definitely checked the advance of the planned fascist offensive in 1934, and compelled the bourgeoisie to pursue a slower and more complicated course. Similarly, the armed struggle in Spain threw into confusion the rapid fascist transformation, and, despite the raging reaction, gives the possibility of further development of the workers' struggle and changing of the whole line of development. On a smaller scale, the still limited, but growing, united front from below in Britain compelled the National Government in February, 1935, to retreat in its offensive against the unemployed (hasty suspension of the new legislation under mass pressure), created confusion in the government ranks, and led to hasty plans for a "reconstruction" of the government, either by the inclusion of the demagogue Lloyd George in the government, or possibly for a Lloyd George-Labour Government or a Labour Government.

THE FASCIST OFFENSIVE CAN BE TURNED AT EVERY STAGE BY THE WORKERS' RESISTANCE. A continuous battle develops in all countries, the fortunes of which depend on the strength of the workers' united front at the given stage. So far from each country necessarily reproducing the experiences of those countries where fascism has won power, the experience of the latter countries and of the development of the fight in each country awakens and strengthens the working class in every country to learn the lessons and advance to the new conditions of the fight. The experience revealed in the chain Italy-Germany-Austria-France-Spain shows a continuous advance in the experience and strength of the fight of the international working class against fascism. In consequence the most important lesson with regard to the whole process of fascisation is precisely that it is NOT INEVITABLE, but that the strength of the workers' resistance

against the PRESENT stage of the offensive determines the future course of the struggle.

IV. Some Questions of Social Democracy and Fascism in the New Stage.

The special problems of the relations of social democracy and fascism have mainly developed in the period since the 6th Congress, and, while touched on by the 6th Congress, have received their fullest treatment so far (i.e., up to 1933, but not yet further) in the successive plenary sessions of the Executive from the 10th Plenum to the 13th Plenum.

The analysis of social-fascism, as the increasing new tendency revealed by social-democracy parallel to the transition of capitalism as a whole to fascist forms and methods, was first explicitly elaborated at the 10th Plenum in 1929. The 6th Congress, had already noted the "many points of contact with fascism" shown by the ideology of social-democracy, the "employment of fascist methods in a rudimentary form in the practice of many social-democratic parties," and that (International Programme)

"Social-democracy itself often plays a fascist rôle in periods when the situation is critical for capitalism; in the process of development social-democracy reveals fascist tendencies."

The 10th Plenum for the first time laid down the principle that

"in countries where there are strong social-democratic parties, fascism assumes the particular form of social-fascism, which to an ever-increasing extent serves the bourgeoisie as an instrument for paralysing the activities of the masses against the régime of fascist dictatorship" and further that in Germany

"Social-democracy prohibits May-Day demonstrations. It shoots down unarmed workers during May-Day demonstrations. It is social-democracy which suppresses the labour press (*Rote Fahne*) and mass labour organisations, prepares the suppression of the C.P. and organises the crushing of the working class by fascist methods. This is the road of the coalition policy of social-democracy leading to social fascism."

The 11th Plenum noted that

"The whole development of social-democracy from the time of the war and the rise of the Soviet Government of the U.S.S.R. is an uninterrupted process of evolution towards fascism."

Fascism and social fascism, which is no less important than the analogy:

"Both fascism and social-fascism (social-democracy) stand for the maintenance and the strengthening of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship, but from this position they each adopt different tactical views . . . The social-fascists prefer a moderate and 'lawful' application of bourgeois class coercion, because they do not want to contract the basis of the bourgeois dictatorship; they guard its 'democratic' drappings, and strive chiefly to preserve its parliamentary forms, for without these the social-fascists would be hampered in carrying out their special function of deceiving the WORKING MASSES. At the same time the social-fascists restrain the workers from revolutionary action against the capitalist offensive and growing

fascism, play the part of a screen behind which the fascists are able to organise their forces and build the road for the fascist dictatorship."

Finally, the 13th Plenum elaborated this distinction between the tactical methods of fascism and social fascism:

"The general line of all bourgeois parties, including social-democracy, is towards the fascisation of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie";

but

"the realisation of this line inevitably gives rise to disagreements among them as to forms and methods of fascisation. Certain bourgeois groups, particularly the social-fascists, who in practice stick at nothing in their acts of police violence against the proletariat, urge the maintenance of parliamentary forms when carrying through the fascisation of the bourgeois dictatorship."

It will be seen that the conception of social-fascism, or the rôle of social-democracy in assisting the advance of fascism, involves two main factors: (1) the NEGATIVE factor of assisting the advance of fascism by paralysing the struggle of the working class against it; (2) the POSITIVE factor of directly assisting the process of fascisation of the state, and use of fascist methods of coercion against the working class by social-democracy in possession of the state apparatus.

At the same time of the 10th Plenum in 1929 this positive factor was strongly to the forefront through the demonstration of the rôle of the German Social Democratic Government in suppressing the revolutionary working class press and mass organisations, prohibiting May Day demonstrations and shooting down unarmed workers. In consequence the question arose whether social-fascism might not prove in certain countries and conditions to be a SUBSTITUTE for open fascism, replacing open fascism where social-democracy was strongly organised ("In countries where there are strong social democratic parties fascism assumes the particular form of social-fascism" 10th Plenum Theses), or whether social-fascism should rather be regarded as a PART of the process of fascisation and a STAGE on the road to full fascism. In the 10th Plenum discussions Comrade Martynov put forward the view:

"In highly industrialised countries like Germany and England we are faced with direct civil war between the proletariat and the labour aristocracy, which is to-day the spearhead of the bourgeois counter-revolution. In these advanced industrialised countries the counter-revolutionary rôle of the pure fascist organisations will be no doubt of lesser significance. Pure fascism will in the situation of a war or civil war be our strongest enemy only in backward semi-agrarian countries, where pure fascism holds the reins." (Tenth Plenum Protokoll, German text, p. 231.)

It is clear that this formulation requires qualification in the light of later experience. In the same debate Comrade Bela Kun put the issue more sharply and clearly as follows:

"We need to determine whether social-fascism is only a stage to fascism, or whether it represents a distinct

phenomenon. However, too few facts are yet available to determine this. The development of social-democracy to social-fascism has not yet advanced so far as to enable us to decide whether social-fascism is a distinct and final form of fascisation for many countries, or whether it is only a stage to the full development of fascism also in countries like Germany." (Ibid., p. 190.)

History has now given the answer to this question. It is clear that social-fascism can represent no final resting place, no permanent system or realisation of fascist dictatorship in a peculiar form for advanced industrial countries, but only a factor in the process of fascisation, of the evolution to full and open fascism or "pure fascism" also in the advanced industrial countries. This, the example of Germany has shown. The decisive reasons for this lie in the whole character of social-fascism and of fascism, and in the conditions of the sharpening class struggle. In the first place, as has been repeatedly insisted in all our theses, social-fascism represents no final completed outcome of social-democracy in any country, but has only represented an increasing TENDENCY of social-democracy in the period of the capitalist advance to fascism ("the road of social democracy LEADING TO social fascism," 10th Plenum Theses: "evolution TOWARDS fascism," 11th Plenum Theses; "social-democracy turns MORE AND MORE into open social-fascism," Molotov at the 10th Plenum, p. 420); it is a moving process, not a fixed form. In the second place, this process cannot be other than a STAGE in the whole process of fascisation and the development of the class struggle. For, IN PROPORTION AS SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY ADVANCES TO SOCIAL-FASCISM AND SUCCEEDS IN ITS RÔLE OF STRANGLING THE STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING-CLASS AGAINST FASCISM, IN PRECISELY THAT SAME PROPORTION THE ADVANCE OF OPEN FASCISM IS FACILITATED, AND THE FINAL OUTCOME IS INEVITABLY, NOT THE RULE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AS THE SUBSTITUTE FOR OPEN FASCISM, BUT THE VICTORY OF OPEN FASCISM AND ULTIMATE THRUSTING ASIDE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY FROM THE STATE APPARATUS AND OPEN POLITICAL LIFE AS NO LONGER NECESSARY IN THIS RÔLE TO THE OPEN FASCIST DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE. This is the key process, the demonstration of the contradictory and ultimately suicidal and SELF-DESTRUCTIVE RÔLE OF SOCIAL-FASCISM, which has received its classic exemplification in Germany and later in Austria.

Up to the very last the German social-democratic leadership sought to carry through the rôle of social-fascism to its logical conclusion, and openly offered their services to the Hitler fascist dictatorship (May 17th Reichstag vote, and A.D.G.B. Executive declaration to Hitler). But they were thrust aside; their offer was not accepted; their party and trade-union organisations, which were the basis of their political value

to the bourgeoisie, were dissolved; and those of the leadership who did not pass over to fascism as individuals, or disappear from political life, passed into exile. Why were they thus thrust aside? Not because of any unwillingness on their part to serve fascism, but because, while their services were indispensable in the process LEADING UP to fascism, the completed fascist dictatorship could no longer have any confidence in their ability to control the workers in the interests of open fascism (it was on May 2 that the trade union central offices were occupied and Leipart arrested, the day after the ineffectiveness of the trade union leaders' call to the workers to participate in Hitler's May Day demonstration had been revealed), and above all because the completed fascist dictatorship could not tolerate the existence of any form of working-class organisations save under its direct control (ultimately even breaking up those under its own control, as in the increasing dissolution of the N.S.B.O. organisations).

This does not exclude the possibility that, if the situation of the open fascist dictatorship becomes critical, the social-democratic leadership may once again be called in to assist, as certain signs have already given a preliminary indication. Such a development, however, would be a characteristic sign of the WEAKENING, not of the strengthening, of the fascist dictatorship, and would, therefore only the more fully reveal the essential rôle of social-democracy as in the TRANSITIONAL stages, when the masses are in movement and require to be held back, and not as having a place in the completed fascist dictatorship. The present phase has thus sharply revealed the BLIND ALLEY at the end of the road of social-fascism, that even for the highest, most consistent and most shameless social-fascist leadership the end of the road is, not state power and the dominion of the completed fascist stage, but Prague and Brunn. This experience has had a profound effect on the other social-democratic parties, not merely on the mass of the membership, but also on a considerable proportion of the leadership, who have awakened sharply to the menace of fascism and in a number of countries have become ready to enter into a united front with Communism against fascism.

It is thus clear that, since the accession of Hitler to power and the dissolution of the German Social-Democratic Party, and the consequent crisis of social-democracy, we have entered into a NEW STAGE OF THE QUESTION OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND FASCISM ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE; and the whole question requires to be reviewed afresh in the light of the new situation.

The new stage (which should not, of course, be marked off too sharply, incorporating, as it does, also tendencies which had begun to arise with the

effects of the world economic crisis) is characterised by

(1) The dissolution of the powerful German and Austrian Social-Democratic Parties, which had formerly played a leading rôle in the Second International, and their replacement by smaller illegal formations, showing a degree of independence from the older leadership in exile, and the strong tendencies to the united front with Communism;

(2) the advance of a series of Social-Democratic Parties in important countries, especially France and Spain, to the united front with Communism;

(3) sharp division within the Second International between the minority, supporting the united front, and the majority, maintaining the old line; consequent raising of the ban on the united front;

(4) ideological confusion within social-democracy, and widespread repudiation of the old line (as represented by German social-democracy and the first two British Labour Governments) as mistaken and incorrect; declarations by a section, including a section of the leadership, in favour of the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

(5) conflict of tendencies within social-democracy and splitting off of sections both on the right and on the left;

(6) formation of a grouping of "Left Socialist Parties," outside the Second International, but not yet prepared to enter into the Communist International.

All this process reflects the profound change taking place within the working class consequent on the advance of fascism, and the varied effects of this mass pressure on the existing social-democratic Parties.

It is evident that we have here an extremely manifold and varied picture of present-day social-democracy, in contrast to the situation of 1928 (6th Congress) or 1929 (10th Plenum). Under these conditions, SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY CAN NO LONGER BE ADEQUATELY TREATED AS A SINGLE WHOLE, even in the sense in which, at the time of the Brussels Congress of the Second International in 1928, the various Social-Democratic Parties, despite divergencies, could be treated as representing a more or less uniform basic type. WE NEED NOW TO ANALYSE THE SITUATION IN EACH COUNTRY, OR IN EACH GROUP OR TYPE OF COUNTRIES, SEPARATELY, AND TO DEVELOP OUR TACTICS ACCORDINGLY. Similarly within each country we need to distinguish carefully between the different sections and tendencies.

First, in the countries under fascist dictatorship, with social-democracy illegal, as typified by Germany and Austria (in countries like Hungary and Poland, where social-democracy still enjoys legal privileges under the dictatorship, the old analysis of social fascism remains unchanged). Here it is essential to distinguish between the old leadership in emigration, as represented by Wels, and the illegal social-democratic groups, which, with whatever still remaining old or new prejudices and illusions, are striving to fight fascism, and in many cases are moving towards Communism or entering into united action with Communism. In the words of Comrade Knorin, at the Presidium

discussion in July, 1934 ("Communist International," English edition, XI 16, August 20, 1934):

"The situation in Germany has altered. But even now it is correct to call Wels a social-fascist, and it is true that the fascists and social-democracy led by Wels were twins. But the illegal social-democratic groups which are now carrying on work in Germany are not social-fascists and do not constitute the social support of the bourgeoisie."

The 13th Plenum in December, 1933, still laid down that

"Social-democracy continues to play the rôle of the main social prop of the bourgeoisie also in the countries of open fascist dictatorship."

It is clear that this analysis will require careful review and fuller working out in our future treatment, in order to prevent dangerous misunderstanding. We do not for a moment wish to suggest that the present illegal social democratic groups in Germany which are seeking to fight fascism constitute "the main social prop of the bourgeoisie" in Germany. On the other hand, if the reference was understood as being made to the Prague Executive, it is decidedly open to question whether this, at the present stage, has any such degree of mass influence as to make it capable of being "the main social prop of the bourgeoisie" in existing Germany. What, then, remains correct? Two things. First, in so far as social-democratic IDEOLOGY and the remains of passive social-democratic organisational traditions still hold back the mass of the industrial workers from the revolutionary struggle and from the united class front with the Communists, then it is true that this situation, inherited from the old social democracy, is still the decisive factor in making possible the maintenance of fascism in power and holding back the workers from its overthrow, and to this extent could still be described as "the main social prop of the bourgeoisie," since fascism could not maintain itself against the struggle of the united working class. Secondly, it is also true that the old social democratic leadership and the remaining old cadres still available or in contact with them do still constitute the POTENTIAL RESERVE for the bourgeoisie, in the event of the development of the mass movement, to endeavour once again, as they undoubtedly will endeavour, to strangle it from within and draw it back into servitude to the bourgeois dictatorship under new forms. Both these factors are of the greatest importance; and there could be no greater mistake than to regard social-democracy as "finished" in the countries of open fascist dictatorship because of the dissolution of the old Social-Democratic Parties. But it is evident that all these factors of the new situation will require very careful and thorough analysis in order to give correct guidance for the future.

The second main group and new type of situation is constituted by those countries where social-democracy has entered into a united front with Communism, as exemplified in different forms in Spain (where the present dominant leaders of the Socialist Party have proclaimed the aim of the dictatorship of the proletariat) and in France (where the Socialist Party remains on the basis of bourgeois democracy, but has entered into alliance with Communism for common struggle against the fascist menace). In this situation it is manifest that the analysis of social-fascism no longer applies. But this does not mean that the principles of social-democracy do not remain as the most serious inner danger to the advance of the working class, or that the united front can be regarded as a kind of solution of the issue of social-democracy and Communism. On the contrary, the further development of the struggle will inevitably bring sharper and more fundamental issues at each stage; and the future advance and victory of the proletarian front will depend on the majority of the workers becoming convinced, through the experience of the struggle, of the necessity of the revolutionary line, and rallying increasingly around the leadership of the Communist Party or of an ultimate United Communist Party embracing the effective majority of the politically conscious workers. The situation of the Social-Democratic Parties which have entered into a provisional alliance with Communism cannot be regarded as a permanent situation, but is necessarily TRANSITIONAL in character—an unstable equilibrium between the mass pressure to the Left and the still retarding effect of the old social-democratic forces and traditions. Further development must inevitably compel, through the successive unfolding of the struggle, the further development of these parties in one direction or the other, or rather, will compel the POLARISATION OF THE CONFLICTING ELEMENTS within these parties, either back to the bourgeois camp, or forward to the revolutionary line and increasing unity, ultimately unification, with Communism. In this process much will depend on our tactics, on our ability to combine pliability and sympathetic and comradely approach to the leftward process with basic firmness of revolutionary principle, in order to assist the development.

Finally, the third main grouping is constituted by the Right Bloc of social-democracy which continues the old line, and in particular, by the BRITISH-DUTCH-SCANDINAVIAN BLOC, which carries on the old line of German social-democracy in the most reactionary form. It is of the utmost importance to see the character of this line clearly, and its still so far dominant position in the Second International, in judging the changes and new

tendencies developing within social-democracy. We have here a demonstration in the highest degree of the INEQUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT of present social democracy. It would obviously be the greatest danger if, because the undoubtedly changed situation in Germany and France has led to the old type of analysis of social-fascism no longer being applicable in the same form to those countries, we should, therefore, fail to see that in the slower development of Britain the British Labour Party, in its official policy and leadership, is still advancing to the highest degree of development towards social-fascism yet reached in Britain. While German social-democracy has suffered shipwreck, the British Labour Party is carrying forward the same policy which led to that shipwreck, and is even reaching to a new temporary blooming, and going forward with marked electoral advance and rosy hopes towards a third Labour Government, as if it were still in a period corresponding to the 1929 period of German social-democracy. The leadership of the type of a Morrison, now dominant in Britain, is the clearest type of a social-fascist leadership yet reached in Britain. The Southport Programme, adopted at the 1934 Conference, with its "public corporations" system for industry, its open support for imperialist war, and its intensified ban on any even "loose association" with Communists, is the most extreme social-fascist programme yet reached in Britain. Certainly, the rapidly rising advance of the class struggle in Britain, and the growth of the united front from below, may bring considerable changes to this line of development in the near future; the fight for the united front is powerfully on the upgrade, despite all the bans. But at the present stage it is essential to recognise this position, and its enormous importance for the whole position of the Second International, in estimating the changes now taking place in social democracy.

The period since June 30, 1934, which first demonstrated the beginning of a crisis of fascism on an international scale, has opened a new situation. We are undoubtedly advancing towards the decisive struggles against fascism. In the countries of open fascist dictatorship, the mass basis of the dictatorship is contracting. In the other countries the bourgeoisie is compelled for the moment to manoeuvre and temporise and adopt more subtle methods for its preparations of the further fascist offensive. In France the Doumergue-Tardieu Government had to be replaced by Flandin; in Britain the National Government is preparing its demise and replacement by a "reconstructed" government, or possibly even by a Labour Government; in the United States the hold of Roosevelt is weakening. In all

countries the working class forces are gathering strength.

This process has a twofold effect. On the one hand, liberal-reformism and the Right social-democratic leadership, passing from their previous lugubrious prophecies of an "epoch of fascism," begin now to preach illusions of the "retreat of fascism," that the highest point of the fascist menace is passed, that fascism will "pass away" peacefully without revolutionary struggle.

On the other hand, the working masses, gathering new confidence, advance with increasing force to the struggle in all countries; the united front advances; the Communist Parties gain in strength in all countries.

This twofold effect is reflected in the process of differentiation and polarisation of forces within social-democracy, and the development for the first time in a number of important countries of the possibility and beginnings of realisation of a

united mass front with the Communist Parties in the leading rôle—the necessary condition for the defeat of fascism and the victory of the working class.

This is the situation which offers the greatest revolutionary opportunities in the coming period, but opportunities requiring the highest tactical skill, to mobilise the mass forces of the working class for decisive blows against fascism. For the guidance of this struggle we shall need at the 7th Congress to carry through the most careful analysis and fresh review of the present position, forces and methods of fascism in the different countries, of our own forces and the situation in the working class for the fight against fascism, and the consequent tactics to be followed, in order to give to the working class the leadership and perspective for the victorious struggle against the present culminating stages of the capitalist dictatorship in all its forms.

(b) OUR FIGHT AGAINST GERMAN CHAUVINISM

By RUDOLPH GERBER.

1. Pre-Conditions.

THE plebiscite in the Saar gave a clear reflection of the growth of German chauvinism, a wave of which took hold of even that part of the country where the proletarian population is in the majority. After March 16 these chauvinist sentiments are assuming new and sharp forms. Many millions of toilers are giving way to the chauvinist outburst, although they are learning from experience that the Hitler dictatorship, i.e., the dictatorship of finance capital only means an intensification of oppression and exploitation. The wide extent to which the slogan "for Germany in spite of Hitler" is spread shows that the influence of this chauvinism covers not only the circle of conscious supporters of the fascist dictatorship, but also those far beyond its bounds.

"It is impossible to discern the line dividing the venal eulogist of the hangman, Nicholas Romanov, or of the mutilators of Negroes and Natives of India, from the ordinary philistine who, thanks to stupidity or supineness, is swimming 'with the current.' In truth, such distinction is not important. What we witness is a broad and very deep ideological current whose origins are closely interwoven with the interests of the landowners and the capitalists of the great nations." (Lenin, Vol. 18, page 99, International Publishers, New York Edition.)

This wide extent of the chauvinist movement in Germany shows that it is not sufficient to criticise fascism to carry on the struggle against chauvinism. But it is just such a limitation, as pointed out by Comrade Pieck in his article in the "Communist International" that has been widely

practiced hitherto in our work. Chauvinism has taken deeper roots than fascism has. Mere criticism of fascism will not touch the roots from which chauvinism, and fascism which is closely linked up with it, can draw new strength.

This partial rejection of the special struggle against chauvinism, which goes beyond the general bounds of the struggle against fascist demagogy, is rooted theoretically in a mistaken estimate of the nationalist movement directed against the oppression of the Versailles Treaty. The growth of chauvinism in Germany must be a surprise to everybody to whom Scheringer and the "Aufbruchkreis" journal seemed the limit of the German Nationalist movement, who compared the highly developed imperialist country, Germany, though temporarily defeated and plundered, with countries like China under the rule of Chang Kai-shek. In his criticism of the Junius pamphlet, Lenin speaks of the possibility (but of the non-likelihood) of national wars on the part of imperialist countries that have long been in existence, but at the same time points to the conditions with which such a possibility is bound up:—

"If the European proletariat should turn out to be helpless for twenty years, if the present war should end in victories of a Napoleonic character, and in the enslavement of a number of live national States; if non-European imperialism (Japanese and American in the first instance) should also hold out for twenty years, without passing to Socialism, by reason, for instance, of a Japanese-American war, then a great national war would be possible

in Europe. This would be the development of Europe BACKWARDS for several decades. This is unlikely. But it is NOT impossible. . . (Lenin, *About the Junius Pamphlet*, Vol. XIX., page 182, Russian Edition.)

There is no need to go into great detail to prove that these conditions, which Lenin considers unlikely, have not come about, primarily because of the victory of the proletariat over one-sixth of the globe, and because of the international consequences following on this victory.

This mistaken estimate of the German nationalist movement one-sidedly took the epoch when the German bourgeois national movement bore a historically progressive character as its starting point. By comparison with the rest of bourgeois Europe, it was behind the times. The national unification of Germany was hindered and contradicted by the bourgeois national development of the neighbouring countries to a certain extent. Hence, at the time when the bourgeois revolution was being prepared, CERTAIN PARTLY REACTIONARY FEATURES of German nationalism arose, as compared with the neighbouring countries (France in 1813 and 1830, Poland in 1830 and 1848). The leading rôle of the Prussian Junkers who found their support in Russian Tsarism, with the unification of the empire, and the special rôle played by the Junker Army in this period of tremendous national upsurge, intensified these contradictions to a very great extent. During the war of 1870-1871, the reactionary character of German nationalism began to come to the forefront quite clearly.

Thus at the foundation of the chauvinist war line in the imperialist period were such pre-conditions as are by no means consistently bourgeois revolutionary. German imperialism entered the capitalist competitive field later than the other powers. Therefore, deprived of its share in the division of the globe, it fought for a new division of the globe, for its "place in the sun," while the aggressive character of this demand was inevitably combined with openly reactionary slogans.

In the pre-war period the social basis of German chauvinism WAS THE PETTY-BOURGEOISIE ON THE ONE HAND, and on the other, the LABOUR ARISTOCRACY. The latter, with its revisionist chauvinism, introduced certain specific shades into chauvinist calumny. For instance, such slogans as "the defence of the conquest of the workers," "now we can loose something more than our chains," "we shall vote for the war budget if the people are given new rights," "the development of civilisation in the colonies" and "war against Tsarist absolutism."

Versailles created a situation of a special kind in Germany by placing it in a position of being an imperialist country oppressed by other imperialist

countries. The people there, accustomed to oppress and exploit other peoples, were now themselves subjected to national oppression. The petty-bourgeois (and the whole middle-class crowd that surrounded him) howled about "the good old times," the glorious army, the colonies, etc. The more they were expropriated by inflation the louder they shouted. Apart from the petty-bourgeois elements there were also others. For instance, first and foremost the unemployed intellectuals, the petty-bourgeois youth and those of them who, though driven out of their economic positions, were still possessed of abilities. Partly these were "professional counter-revolutionaries," free-lances under Noske, Ebert and others. These were only the active minority of those millions, whose protest against Versailles, which had deprived them of their prospects, evoked the intense support of the masses as a result of the pressure of Versailles on all sections of the population. There was no time when German nationalism was simply a movement for independence without aggressive and chauvinistic tendencies. The year 1923 brought about a turn. It brought not war, but the beginning of the restoration of German economy with the aid of help from abroad, the Dawes Plan. On the other hand, as a result of the opportunist mistakes of the C.P.G., it did not bring revolution and with it the leadership of the proletariat over the frantic petty-bourgeoisie. The latter became transformed into a potential fascist reserve of finance-capital, all for the same constant reason that the proletariat, later on as well, did not succeed in securing the leadership over these elements by developing the mass struggle.

For there were two possible ways of doing away with Versailles and Dawes. One was the proletarian way under which the native expropriators should be expropriated along with the foreign ones, under which the toiling masses of Germany in alliance with the exploited and oppressed masses throughout the whole world and especially the masses in the Soviet Union, should conquer power, freedom and socialism. The other possibility was a finance-capitalist, chauvinist solution under which a certain weakening of the foreign yoke upon native finance capital would be purchased. The price would be a still greater pressure on the toiling masses, under which the funds needed for imperialist armaments would be squeezed out of the latter. The masses would finally be driven forward as cannon-fodder to the field of battle in spite of their own vital interests. Our propaganda has suffered partly because of the mistake that we have made in not noting the second possibility, due to an impermissible simplification of the

question. Versailles had two sides. On the one hand, the inclusion of defeated German imperialism in the system of world imperialism and of anti-Soviet war, and to THAT EXTENT it could not be done away with prior to the proletarian revolution; but at the same time it strengthened a definite correlation of forces between Germany and the other imperialist powers, AND TO THAT EXTENT it required revision to a certain degree at the expense of the toiling masses. These masses should have been shown that THIS way of revising Versailles could only be brought about AT THEIR OWN EXPENSE. It was just this (and not the assertion that this revision was not complete, and that it needed to be questioned) that should have been at the basis of our propaganda.

In recent years the dual character of the imperialist development of Germany in the period of relative stabilisation was of fundamental importance for the development of German chauvinism. AT ONE AND THE SAME TIME, four to five thousand millions of marks of capital were imported, while approximately half that sum was exported. The bourgeoisie in Germany, at one and the same time, fought against the participation of foreign capitalists in the exploitation of Germany, for new colonies, and territory in the East, etc. German nationalism fought against the really existing national oppression of the German people, but at the same time laid claim to the right to the national oppression of other peoples. The crisis meant that the question of the choice between the two possible ways of doing away with Versailles was raised. This struggle developed in the form of a struggle between finance-capital and the proletariat for leadership over the petty-bourgeoisie. We were not in a position to ensure leadership of the petty-bourgeoisie by the proletariat, the organisation of proletarian mass struggles. It was thus that it became possible for finance-capital to direct the wrath of the petty-bourgeoisie with Versailles against the proletariat, and enabled them even to exert their influence over certain sections of the proletariat.

Our programme of national and social liberation, put forward in 1930 was an attempt to divert this stream into another channel. The first precondition for the successful operation of this programme was action by the working class in a broad united front. The next link in the chain, with the aid of which it would have been possible to win over the national-socialist petty bourgeoisie, was consequently, the Social-Democratic workers and the drawing of them into the organisation of mass struggles in the factories.

The C.P.G. did not succeed in doing this for several reasons. We were unsuccessful in including the anti-Versailles agitation into the general

bounds of the liberation struggle of the proletariat. In the years 1930-31 there was a slackening down, a fact to which Comrade Thaelmann referred in his articles in the "Communist International." The Party gradually straightened its line—at no time in the Party was such an energetic campaign for proletarian internationalism carried on as in the year 1932. The influence of this programme over the supporters of Hitler, who were already wavering at the end of 1932, depended on the fighting power of the proletariat. In spite of the good beginning, this latter turned out to be too weak, and the petty bourgeoisie followed Hitler against the proletariat.

At the present time Germany has abolished very fundamental elements of the Versailles system. It does not pay debts and reparations. It is arming itself within the bounds of its own economic possibilities, which are extremely great. It not only seeks a revision of the territorial clauses of the Versailles Treaty, but it wishes to oppress other peoples. It wishes to bring about a new revision of the globe, and drafts robber plans first and foremost against the Soviet Union. German chauvinism is under no circumstances a national movement for independence at the present time. It implies an exceptionally provocative spirit of conquest and militarism, directed particularly against the U.S.S.R.

II. The Basis and Possible Sphere of Influence of German Chauvinism.

What are the objective possibilities at the disposal of fascist finance-capital for influencing the masses in a chauvinistic spirit. Let us look, first and foremost, at the economic basis. A considerable part of the growth of German production, following the lowest point of the crisis period, has been covered by direct and indirect preparations for war. The production of arms alone, and the supply of the two million army with war supplies, as reckoned for in the first period of mobilisation, demands at least 2,000 million marks. It is hardly likely that the building, on the one hand, of barracks, aerodromes (we are aware of 64 such, protected and camouflaged), strategic roads, fortifications, etc., the supply of important substitutes (the new machinery for the production of oil alone costs 300 million marks), and the transfer of military enterprises to the central regions relatively less vulnerable from the air, etc., will require much less expenditure. Mass consumption has grown to a slight degree, while the renewal and extension of the production apparatus is concentrated mainly in open and camouflaged military industrial enterprises. The military economic sector is developing at the expense of the rest of the national economy. It is engulfing an ever-

greater portion of the social product. The thousands of millions of marks invested in armaments (not to speak of the profits of the various capitalists who are doing so well out of them) represent "productive expenditure" from the point of view of finance capital as a whole, only if they provide new possibilities during the war period for the investment of capital, and new sources of profit. On the other hand, expenditure on armaments renders it easier for finance-capital to unite all the forces of the bourgeoisie with a view to letting war loose. Even the breweries, whose market has fallen by the poverty of the masses, find a certain compensation in the shape of the production of boxes for military supplies (we have the necessary information in this regard).

Such is the objective side of the expenditures being made on armaments. Subjectively the worker who has been brought again into the productive process, or the small handicraftsman or shopkeeper whose budget has but slightly improved needs a special degree of class-consciousness to understand that the cause of this improvement is a return of only part of what Hitler and his like have taken away from him. He only sees the primitive fact, that, as Hess declares, "armaments give work and bread." It goes without saying that this creates a definite basis for chauvinistic war slander.

FROM THE ORGANISATIONAL POINT OF VIEW, chauvinist propaganda under fascism receives very strong support through the medium of all kinds of fascist and unified mass organisations, among which the various kinds have to be distinguished. Firstly, there are the direct party, youth and military organisations which serve this propaganda (the difference noted between the National Socialist Party and the Steel Helmets from an inner-political point of view play no part as far as the stirring up of war is concerned), and also organisations after the fashion of the "League of Germans Abroad." Secondly, professional organisations of various kinds, to a very great extent based on compulsion (primarily of course, the "Labour Front"), the forced labour camps, etc. Thirdly, there is a series of unified organisations which jointly cover the overwhelming majority of the population, at least the town population (and among these of special importance as far as influencing the youth is concerned are the Sports Leagues). Fourthly, organisations which clearly serve for the preparation of war. Among these latter, alongside organisations for raising military qualifications, and organisationally preparing conscious fascist elements (the National Socialist motor drivers' union' the National Socialist Air-men's League, technical first aid) we find such an organisation as the Anti-Aircraft Defence League,

a wide organisation though to a very great extent based on compulsion. It is clear that we cannot introduce a clear line of demarcation here between compulsion and ideological pressure. In the schools and other educational institutions many young people belong to the Hitler Youth League only by reason of pressure exerted upon them. This does not exclude the fact that ideological influence is brought to bear on them by rousing chauvinistic sentiments among them. In the same way, the majority of those who pass through the forced labour camps, in spite of the compulsory nature of the work they do, are not guaranteed against being influenced by the militaristic atmosphere prevailing. On the other hand, such an organisation, compulsory though its character, as the "Labour Front" contains the possibility of exerting ideological influence over its members. These possibilities are mainly brought about by the subordinate "Strength through Joy" organisation the privileges of which are utilised by a considerable section of its members as partial compensation for the membership dues they pay. "The unified" organisations, although this unification has left a great number of flaws in many respects (we do not speak of the conscious opposition of the class-conscious proletarians) have, as a result of the chauvinistic direction taken over many years by the petty-bourgeoisie and the labour aristocracy, become centres of infection, whose influence penetrates deeply even among those sections of the people whose outlook is anti-fascist. Finally, even in so far as anti-aircraft defence shows the masses how near and serious is the war danger and has a dampening effect, willy-nilly, on the hurrah patriotism of the street demonstrations, it at the same time creates a definite and fatalistic view on war as of something unavoidable. It creates the feeling that "we must defend ourselves, otherwise we will be wiped out by gas attacks."

FROM THE IDEOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW, in addition to the traditional forms of chauvinistic war mongering, fascism creates new methods of providing a "scientific" foundation for German chauvinism, particularly by its racial theory. The special advantage of this theory for the exploiters is that along with the internal political functions directed against the class struggle ("justifying exploitation on the grounds that the exploiters belong to the highest race, and diverting the wrath of the petty bourgeoisie at finance capital, against "Jewish competition" in its own ranks), it also spreads the story about "the higher value" of "the refined man of the north." It justifies all the conquests in view, and thereby transforms war from a social category (to be prevented by the alteration of social conditions) into a phenomenon

allegedly established by nature itself, i.e., one that cannot be held off by any means, as a "biological" phenomenon.

To what extent are the various classes and sections of the toiling population susceptible to this chauvinist agitation, carried through by means of force? Among the town petty bourgeoisie we must distinguish office employees, civil servants, etc., from the "old" petty bourgeoisie (the small shopkeepers, handicraft workers, etc.). The first of these have doubtless been relatively fascism's most reliable mass basis from the very beginning. Their position as "junior officers" in production or even in the state apparatus of domination renders them the most reliable bearers of the chauvinist poison. The "independent" petty-bourgeois have far stronger anti-fascist sentiments. It must, however, not be forgotten that along with the powerful historical spread of chauvinism among precisely these elements, a section of these, particularly the youth, are seeking compensation in the shape of jobs in the war and police apparatus, as a result of the loss of their old "reliable" economic position.

We can see a similar duality in the position of the peasants. Among the small and middle peasantry anti-fascist discontent is assuming considerable dimensions, but even apart from this we presume (on the simple basis that the majority of these peasants suffer more from the burden of interest, taxes, monopolies, etc., than from the lack of land) that the attempts of the Nazis to divert the attention of the peasants towards the conquest of territory in the East, have no great chances of success. Nonetheless, this problem exists for the younger sons of the kulaks, and the upper section of the middle-peasantry. It is precisely so as to draw this human material, valuable in respect to the carrying on of a reactionary war, into the war apparatus, that the famous law regarding the inheritance of farmsteads was invented (from the point of view of "pacifying the village," highly inadvisable). While the absence of company officers, for instance, makes it necessary to transform the old Reichswehr non-commissioned officers into lieutenants and captains, a section of the town and village petty-bourgeoisie inevitably sees a way out of the declassed fate that threatens them, in military service. About a quarter of a million people, who have found a livelihood in military service represent a great danger in their ideological influence over other sections of petty-bourgeois origin, from under whose feet the ground has been cut.

Hence the slogan "esteem labour and honour the worker" (it is clear that what is in view is not the "lower person") and hence the demand (which is by no means the fruit of the ideas of some fool

for providing secondary school diplomas for the provision of the "best" places as factory apprentices, etc. It is clear that such people cannot exert a powerful influence over the masses, if only because the petty bourgeois always strives to put a social barrier between himself and the "lower" elements, and also because such elements cannot be placed in what are in reality important jobs in the factories.

More important is the OTHER side of the efforts of the fascists to penetrate the ranks of the proletariat. There is no doubt that the minority of those who have passed through the forced labour camps who can be drawn into the productive process (and in the conditions of the crisis of capitalism this can ONLY be a minority) at first feel a certain calm and develop definite hopes. While such sentiments last, these new elements from the forced labour camps will be the bearers of the chauvinist poison spread there. But it is clear that such influence is not long lasting (at least on the PROLETARIAN whose life goes on in the factory). Very soon the surroundings of production in which such a proletarian finds himself, the constant struggle he has to carry on, the exploitation he undergoes, and the feeling of proletarian solidarity which he has, all serve as a counterblast to the temporary influence on the discipline of the barrack. They are not insignificant, in so far as new elements are continually coming from the camps into the factories, but they do not play a decisive rôle. Only the basic masses of the workers who formerly, to a great extent, were members of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade union. These workers are against Hitler, who tramples their rights underfoot, enslaves them and reduces their standard of living. But the labour aristocracy which used to be the bearer of the influence of Social-Democracy among the masses of the workers are also not on the side of Hitler. However, the intensified war preparations (and for certain sections of workers employed in the war enterprises this is connected with high wages) can be a canal for spreading fascist influence and partly also for the passage of the labour aristocracy to support for fascism. The tense struggle now going on among the Social Democratic workers for united working class action is at the same time a struggle as to which policy is to be adopted by the former Social Democratic workers, a chauvinist or an internationalist one.

Certain possibilities exist for a new social-chauvinism coming into being, even though on a limited scale. What distinguishes it from the old social-chauvinism is the impossibility of setting the question of "guns against the rights of the people," since the mere demand of these rights of the people implies the violation of the totality of

the fascist dictatorship, and is in any case a departure from its legal position. The new social fascism is compelled to satisfy itself with "hopes" for future positions in the "labour front," in the confidence councils, etc.

The last question regarding the mass influence of chauvinism among the proletariat is the degree to which the class-conscious elements have succeeded in coping with the complicated problems of our relations with the imperialist army, without slipping away unconsciously from making use of it for revolutionary work. It would be foolish to overlook the existence of certain serious symptoms in this connection. Especially among the working youth with their fighting spirit, the joy connected with the possibility of receiving arms, and of getting military experience (this joy is at times unconsciously shown in a certain satisfaction that an end will be put to the horrors of unemployment by military service), has led to a certain endorsement of military affairs AS SUCH. Such sentiments were bound to weaken the revolutionary outlook which alone could justify joining the army, and in general resistance to militarism. Under certain circumstances such sentiments render certain workers susceptible to chauvinist influence, which can be spread in very fine forms, for instance, by way of hints by the officers that the Reichswehr would not follow Hitlerism, and that they would use a war to have a "clean up," etc. Although such cases of uncertainty by former class-conscious workers occur in only single instances, it must be recognised that such cases sound a warning note of the danger which threatens us if we are insufficiently concrete in the slogans we issue regarding war. If we one-sidedly advance the idea of the inevitability of war to the forefront, and its revolutionary side, and war is even shown as the only way out of fascist slavery, then all this inevitably weakens the resistance to chauvinism. Against this the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. stressed that "only such a Bolshevik struggle before the war for the victory of the revolution provides a guarantee of the victory of the revolution in connection with the war."

III. Our Tasks.

In outlining our tactical tasks we must make our starting point the change in the objective situation.

Now the main object of our attack is not Versailles, but German imperialism and its fascist dictatorship.

What has remained of Versailles is the national oppression of the German outlying regions, against which we have carried and continue to carry on a most decisive struggle. But in this connection also, it would be clearly incorrect to simply deny the possibility of overcoming national

oppression in one or other of these outlying regions by the imperialist path. Such possibilities can be realised by way of imperialist robber plunder (for instance, the German regions in Czecho-Slovakia, the Memel region or Austria). Important for us is to show the toilers of these outlying regions, that such an imperialist way of destroying national oppression is not in their interests. They must expect national liberation not from Hitler's bayonets but from international solidarity with the proletariat of the oppressing nationality. It is possible, and we must recognise this openly, that this path may be more protracted. This way will not lead to fascist slavery and a new imperialist mass blood bath, but to the real social and national liberation of the toilers both of the nationality concerned as well as of other peoples. To-day we are AGAINST linking up Austria, and the German regions in Czecho-Slovakia, etc., to Hitler Germany. Both in Germany itself, of the oppression of which we have now no cause to talk, and in the regions taken away from it and still subjected to national oppression, we have to swim "against the stream." In both sectors of the front, the C.P. of Germany must concentrate its fire against German chauvinism. To direct a concentrated fire against Czechish, French, Lithuanian and other chauvinism is the task of our class brothers who belong to the oppressing nations. We must still more concretely define Liebknecht's slogan to the effect that "the enemy is in our own country," in the sense that the main enemy speaks one's own language.

IN OUR AGITATION AND PROPAGANDA the main thing is not simply to show the essence of fascism as exploiter, as well as its foulness, senselessness and criminality, which we do pretty thoroughly (and which, of course, we must continue in the same spirit) but while not limiting ourselves to this we must deal in detail with the various chauvinistic arguments raised, and refute them.

The fascists declare that "we are breaking Versailles and ensuring the honour and liberty of the nation." But that which they have in fact broken and destroyed up to now, and which they wish to destroy in the future are only the bounds to the exploitation and suppression of the German toilers by the native exploiters. Thyssen can now exploit the Saar miners as well as those in the Ruhr, and can make use of millions of German toilers as cannon fodder. It is quite natural and understandable that he is satisfied with this. But what use is this to his victims? Where is the famous freedom of the German people, bound hand and foot by Hitler's brown bands? Can we imagine a greater shame for a great and cultured nation than the torture dens of the secret police, the bonfires of books, race trials, etc., to say

nothing of the vile deeds, day in and day out. The honour of the German people is now being saved by those tens of thousands of people who are carrying on the heroic struggle underground in most difficult conditions. The path to the liberation of the German people is clearly being hindered now, not by Versailles, but by the fascist hangman's dictatorship which has forced on the German people its "kinsmen" exploiters.

The brown assassins loudly proclaim "the civilising mission of our northern honourable race." Wherein lies their historic bulwark, whom do they consider their age-long enemy? It appears that it is the ability which not only the German landowners but also the French, Slav, Italian and other landowners, have so often demonstrated to exploit the peasants and to compel them to pay feudal dues. It is on their ability to exploit surf labour that the German fascists (and all the other exploiters, who, it is clear, belong as one man to the "honourable race") at the same time base their "right" to exploit the sections of the GERMAN population who belong to the lower races. The exploiters of German origin who lay claim to such an alleged inherent right to domination have for this reason executed or shot down the toilers in France and Russia on more than one occasion. This is pictured in Nazi theory as the "revolt of the lower races." The civilising mission of the German people clearly consists at the present time first and foremost in ridding themselves and other peoples of the worst enemies of all civilisation and culture whatsoever.

The brown barbarians are calling for a holy war "against Bolshevik barbarism." This "barbarism" consists in the fact that the peoples of the U.S.S.R. have shown the people of Germany and other countries how indeed to rid themselves of the barbarous yoke of the exploiters. They have rooted out this oppression by building socialism and have won for themselves an existence worthy of men. It is, therefore, quite logical that the representatives of such barbarous capitalist oppression call for assistance to be rendered to the "hungry Germans of the Volga Region" at the very time when hundreds of thousands of people in Germany are perishing from starvation. The U.S.S.R., from their point of view, is a danger which must be wiped out as soon as possible. They do this so that in case such propaganda leads to the required result, i.e., to war, the German exploiters may be able to doom still more millions of people (including very likely the Germans of the Volga Region) to starvation. It is OUR task to show and to analyse in detail WHERE culture exists, and WHERE barbarism holds sway.

Hitler asserts that he has allegedly established "a free and mighty Germany." We have already

spoken about the "freedom" that exists under Hitler, Thyssen and Schacht. The spread of this "freedom" to other sections of the German people would mean that, badly as they live now, their lot would be not liberation — but still worse enslavement. The Prussian Junkers, whose "best" traditions are being carried on by Hitler, have always and invariably shown in practice that what vitally concerns them is the maximum quantity and the maximum profitability of the objects they exploit, and by no means the nationality to which these objects belong. The German landowners have always been ready to hand over large sections of the German people to be robbed by the Hapsburgs or others. Of course only if this has been advantageous in the robbery of the Polish, Turkish, African and other peasants by the exploiters, and to their policy of conquest. This, it is clear, does not correspond to the language map (which they alter as necessary) but to imperialist needs and possibilities. German imperialism will always be compelled to hand over a section of the German people to the whims of one or other of the imperialist allies it requires for the conduct of its robber wars.

According to the fascists, "territory for our people" must be won through imperialist war. What the German people need is not a certain number of square miles of territory. They need that part of the product of their labour which the exploiters wring out of the workers under the protection of Hitler's brown gangs. If the German peasant needs land, there is no point in his seeking it on the other side of the borders of Germany. He will have enough if he takes it from the Junker agrarian in possession of the land. Hitler's dream of seizing land in the East can be of advantage to thousands of landlords, capitalists and kulaks, and mainly to the war industrialists. As far as the millions of German toilers are concerned, the seizure of land in the East only means blood-letting on a mass scale, and a further intensification of the exploitation and the yoke under the weight of which they are now sinking.

"The advance of Germany will provide a better standard of living for everyone" — for every exploiter, we add, and then the fascist slogan would be correct. The advance of Germany also provides jobs for all kinds of fascist foremen, executioners and other murderers of the working class. But as far as concerns the wide masses of the toiling population, the imperialist advance of Germany means decay. For the masses the path to a real advance lies through the abolition of the domination of the exploiters.

"If we do not defend ourselves, we will be overwhelmed by gas attacks." This thesis is justified to a certain extent, but it must be correctly under-

stood in the following way, namely, if we do not defend ourselves against the Hitler dictatorship, then many of us really will perish as a result of gas attacks. By the "defensive measures" of imperialist armaments, we only render it easier for Hitler to let loose his robber war from the evil effects of which perhaps only a handful of people will be saved, but by no means the toiling masses.

"Armaments provide bread and work, young workers who join the army release places in the factories for the old workers"—this was the thesis which Hess advanced not so long ago as a slogan for the confidence council elections. The bread, however, which one section of the working class receives from the preparation of war, is only a crumb as compared with what the Hitler dictatorship squeezes out of the working class. The temporary privileges and concessions which certain sections of the workers in the war industries receive, will have to be paid for by themselves and their children with their lives. The foul attempt made by Herr Hess to play off the interests of the older generation against those of the younger workers by telling them to be glad at the "good jobs" they have in the war industries, and in the meantime let their children go to face machine-gun fire will only rouse contempt from the majority. But we can use this argument to show the younger generation who swallow Hitler's bait to some extent, the complete foulness of his game with the youth. Every kind of method has been used to drive the young workers out of the production process into the war camps. The older generation have received no benefits from this. Herr Hess' slogan shows that the process of driving the youth out of production is to be extended. The workers' labour does not open the way to the factory at all, but to the field of battle.

Herr Hess introduced a special note into this nauseating address to the workers of the older generation, when he proposed that they should regard that henceforth their children "are being educated as befits German manhood." (He is quite well aware that all parents would prefer their children to receive anything but the Prussian barracks.) There is no doubt that Herr Hess is trying to strike a certain responsive note in the heart of the German petty-bourgeoisie. The Nazis will meet with a certain response when they speak of "our people's army." But every class-conscious worker will doubtless be in favour of his son learning how to shoot. The time will come when the art of shooting will prove to be very important to the liberation of the German people from their enemy, who is in their own country. The class-conscious worker, however, is by no means in favour of his son learning to shoot in an

organisation which orders him about as a helpless slave, and teaches him to "shoot at his own father and mother" in case of necessity. Such workers will never agree to give the title of people's army to an army whose task it is to shoot down the toiling population of Germany or at the real allies of the German people, namely, the Red Army of the U.S.S.R., and to carry through imperialist wars.

First and foremost we must select two fundamental categories from our basic tasks in the struggle against chauvinism. **FIRSTLY**, to obtain the practical experience by means of which to convince the masses that imperialist war and the preparations for it not only do not provide them with bread, but tear the last crust of it out of their mouths. The path towards the achievement of this experience clearly lies through united action by the proletariat in the struggle against all wage-deductions made for the building of armaments, against the high cost of living and the supply of low quality goods (which latter is the result of the fact that the best products and raw materials are being used for war purposes), and for the unemployed being adequately supplied out of the stores accumulated for war purposes. The existence of these supplies creates certain possibilities of material success for our struggle against hunger. And on the contrary, success of this kind implies a straight, direct blow against the preparation of imperialist war. **SECONDLY**, it is important to penetrate the apparatus spreading chauvinistic calumny, to develop revolutionary work in all the fascist mass organisations, and above all in the "Labour Front." Then in the forced labour camps, and in general in the "militarist sector" of labour. We must adapt ourselves to the concrete and occasionally quite complicated conditions that exist within the various organisations. Thus, for instance, if we deal here with only the purely military organisations in anti-aircraft defence, it will be insufficient to simply carry on agitation and propaganda along the above mentioned lines. We must convince the masses in practice that it is impossible to provide really all-round anti-aircraft defence for the rank-and-file in case of imperialist war. For this purpose we must frequently put forward concrete demands in respect to anti-aircraft defence (the provision, for instance, of gas masks for all workers). In the forced labour camps, etc., there is now apparently a danger that material partial demands will be put forward one-sidedly (and, of course, in our agitation and propaganda we must SEIZE HOLD of these, but these demands must not be the MAIN CONTENT of this agitation and propaganda) while the struggle in principle against chauvinistic calumny is shifted into the background.

The weight of our activity in the forced labour camps, and what is more, among the new mass army, must be the work of our Y.C.L. We must define to what extent it is capable of making use of its traditions of anti-military struggle, enriched by the experiences of the Bolsheviks, and of becoming the main bearer of the struggle against the chauvinistic poisoning of the youth of Germany.

When discussing our concrete slogans as regards universal military service we must make the present sentiments existing among the masses our starting point (and among the masses close to us) and select those points which are the decisive links in the chain TO-DAY. Masses of workers now understand the necessity of acquainting themselves with the use of arms. But it is far from being generally understood that it is not sufficient to join the army with a view to learning how to use arms, for to join the army only from this point of view weakens the resistance of the individual worker to the chauvinistic pressure of the military machine. In the period of the preparation of imperialist war, the bourgeoisie have tremendous possibilities and means of exerting chauvinistic pressure on the toiling masses, especially those embraced by the military apparatus at their disposal.

What is important for us is to explain to the workers, how and in what capacities they should join the army. We have to explain that they join not simply to learn the military trade, but as organisers and agitators among the soldiers, consciously undermining the German army, which is the weapon of the exploiters. We must explain to the masses (who have occasionally a very unclear and schematic idea of what is meant by transforming the army as a weapon of the exploiters into a weapon of the revolution) that the decisive question is not that of arms, but of the organisation of the army. The task of the German workers is not to worry about the military training of the masses of the workers in the bourgeois class army. The bourgeoisie, as they advance to their death struggle, take good care of that. The task is to undermine and destroy the organisation and the ideology with the aid of which the capitalists through the medium of the

military barracks, transform the toilers into weapons directed against the toilers, i.e., against their own class. It has to be explained to the workers that the question of their armament is not a question of building up, but one of the destruction of the bourgeois class army.

And in the struggle against Hitler's militarism, with its universal conscription, our basic task is to concretely establish UNITY OF ACTION WITH THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC WORKERS. We must develop this struggle against Hitler's militarism with its universal conscription, and make use of every single fact showing the influence of militarism on the conditions of the toiling masses. It is just in the sphere of the anti-war struggle that there are exceptionally rich traditions of the pre-war period. We can seize these and develop our struggle in sharp contradiction to the Magdeburg war programme. Fundamental differences in the line are primarily disclosed here, as in other spheres, in the question of the concrete development of the revolution, the destruction of the old army, and the building up of the Red Army, etc. It will undoubtedly be of decisive importance to overcome these unclear views of the Social-Democratic workers at a higher stage of the struggle. But they can only be overcome on the basis of the experience of the concrete joint struggle carried on for the questions immediately on the order of the day. We must jointly carry on mass explanatory work among the recruits joining the army, and also among those who have passed through the forced labour camps and are assigned to the army. We must also use all our energy to organise demonstrations of recruits, action in the barracks, demonstrations of members of the soldiers' families, carry on joint work among the workers in the war industries, especially among the qualified workers, and overcome the slogan advanced by Hess, carrying on the struggle against chauvinism, whoever is the bearer of it and spread it among the working class. Such are the tasks which can now be solved regarding which we will be able to come to an agreement with all the Social Democratic workers and organisations who are really inclined against fascism. The solution of these tasks by united working class action will raise our struggle against chauvinism on to a higher plane.

(c) RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE C.P. OF SPAIN AND THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMINTERN

(From *Bandera Roja* No. 8, February, 1935).

THE E.C.C.I. has decided to convene the Seventh Congress in the first half of the present year. The tremendous significance of this Congress of the general staff of the world proletarian revolution, can be seen even from the main questions for discussion—the fight against fascism, against war and for the united front.

The Comintern has instructed all its sections to make preparations for the Congress by carrying on an exhaustive discussion, on the basis of practical results, of all questions of policy, tactics and the fulfilment of the slogans of the Communist Party.

The Political Bureau welcomes the decision of the E.C.C.I. to call the Seventh World Congress, and calls to the attention of all the Party organisations, both district and local, as well as of all the units and of the individual comrades, to the great significance of this discussion. This basic discussion must be carried on from the point of view of consolidating and increasing the influence of the Party among the masses, especially among the working class; it must be carried on from the point of view of giving organisational form to this influence, and of the results achieved in the struggle for the united front and unity of action; it must be carried on from the point of view of raising the political level of the members, of training the Party forces and strengthening the work of the Party in the organisation of the struggles of the toilers and the leadership of them in the conditions of illegality which have now arisen.

To make it easier the Political Bureau raises a series of problems which, however, are by no means the only ones requiring discussion.

Our discussion must be centred around a critical review of the work of the Party throughout the Spanish revolution, particularly the lessons of the October battles, the tasks which arise before the Party in connection with the present situation and the prospects of the Spanish Revolution. In the process of the discussion, these questions must be closely linked up with problems of an international character.

We give a number of cardinal questions to which all comrades must strive to give a Bolshevik reply:

1. The prospects of the development of the revolution in Spain after the October battles.

2. Why is it that, despite the bankruptcy of the policy of the Socialist Party, before the October movement, in spite of its behaviour during and after this movement, our Party has not established closer organic contacts with the broad masses of the Left Socialist workers? By what methods shall we achieve this aim? Why is our Party not growing rapidly enough?

3. Why is it that the Party is so slow in drawing the anarchist workers into its ranks in spite of the counter-revolutionary work of the anarchist leaders during the October battles, in spite of their policy and their struggle against unity of action and trade union unity — which causes such great discontent among the working class members of the reformist Confederation of Labour?

4. What is it that prevents us securing greater practical results in the struggle for the united front and the unity of the trade union movement, and unity of action in Spain, in spite of the enormous urge of the masses towards the united front? How does the Party utilise and organise the growing sympathy of the masses for this slogan?

5. What should be our trade union tactics towards the fascist legislation which is directed against the class trade unions? What tactics should we adhere to in respect to the trade unions of the "National front"? How should we bring about trade union unity in practice? What methods of work should we make use of in the conditions where the unions are illegal, and what tasks face us in the mass organisations?

6. Why is it that the formation of workers' and peasants' alliances is going on with insufficient speed? What should be the rôle of these bodies in the present situation? What should be their programme and methods of work and what should be their organisational structure? How and under what conditions must the alliances be transformed into Soviets?

7. What should be our tactics and organisational forms in the villages in the present situation? How can we prevent the penetration of fascism among the peasants?

8. How to combine the struggle for partial demands with our prospects for a popular armed uprising?

9. What prevents the influence of the Party penetrating into the national movement? What prevents it leading the struggles of the masses of the people, especially in Catalonia and Biscay? What tactics and what slogans should we use on this question, and also in connection with the colonial movement?

10. What forms should our work assume in the struggle against the militarisation of the youth, and in the struggle to win the proletariat in uniform? What is the rôle of the youth in the struggle against war and fascism? How should this struggle be organised?

11. Which parties in Spain are fascist in character? What methods of work do they employ, what are their respective policies, tactics and social basis? How are we to bring about a wide concentration of the anti-fascist forces and what should be the aim of this step?

12. In what respects does the crisis and bankruptcy of the Second International show itself, and how does it

carry out its mission of being the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie?

13. How does the Comintern solve the problems facing the toilers? What are the most characteristic features showing that the Comintern is the only world revolutionary party of the working class and all the oppressed masses?

14. What are the characteristic features of the economic crisis in Spain and the characteristic peculiarities of the "depression of a special kind?" (Stalin.)

15. How is Spain preparing for imperialist war, how is it carrying on robber war in Morocco, and in what way is there to be seen its participation in the organisation of counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R.?

16. How do the great achievements of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. and the victories of the Red Army in Soviet China influence the maturing of the world revolutionary crisis and the revolution in Spain?

17. How should the Party take advantage of all legal forms and carry on the fight for legality, while at the same time increasing its illegal work and organisation?

18. What constitutes the counter-revolutionary rôle

played by the renegade groups (Trotskyites, etc.), in their struggle against our Party, against the U.S.S.R. and against the Comintern, and how are we to expose these renegade groups?

The problems of the Seventh Congress which are brought up for discussion in our Party are the problems facing the working class, the peasants and all the toilers, and in view of this it is necessary, while observing the rules of conspiracy, to get the socialist, anarchist and non-Party workers to participate in our discussions.

The preparations for the Seventh Congress must find expression in an increase of the activity and energy of our Party in its struggles, and must as the result lead to mass recruitment into our organisations.

POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE C.C. OF THE
C.P. OF SPAIN.

IN THE U.S.S.R.

THE VICTORY OF PUBLIC, SOCIALIST, OWNERSHIP AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY

By E. PASHUKANIS.

THE Seventh Congress of Soviets* adopted a resolution to introduce certain amendments into the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These amendments to the Constitution are to give a more precise definition to its social and economic basis, and to reflect the grandiose changes that have taken place in the economics, and in the relation of class forces, inside the country. The transformation of the U.S.S.R. into a socialist country, the victory of the collective farming system, the liquidation in the main of the capitalist elements, the consolidation of public, socialist, ownership in both town and country—all this has to be reflected in the text of the new Soviet Constitution.

For the first time in the history of mankind, changes are being made in the Constitution of a state to correspond with changes in the social structure which have come about not as the result of blind, spontaneous development, but have been achieved consciously and on a planned basis, according to a pre-conceived programme.

Indeed, the abolition of capitalist exploitation, the abolition of classes was declared to be the basic aim of the Soviet state. It was so stated in the first Constitution of 1918. Now, in 1935, this aim

has been accomplished, in the main. Three-quarters of the citizens of the Soviet Union are manual and other workers employed in Socialist enterprises and collective farmers.

In his report to the Congress, Comrade Molotov gave figures to show the grandiose changes that have taken place in the class composition of the population of the Soviet Union, not only as compared with the year 1913, but also with 1928.

Workers and office employees, of whom there were 23 million in 1913 and 26,343,000 in 1928, numbered 47,118,000 in 1934. In 1918 there were no collective farmers at all, and in 1928 they numbered a total of 4,406,000, while in 1934 there were 77,037,000 collective farmers throughout the U.S.S.R.

In 1913 and 1928, individual peasant farmers constituted the main mass of the population, numbering 90,700,000 and 111,131,000 respectively. In 1934, there remained 37,902,000 individual peasant farmers. The bourgeoisie, large and small, including kulaks, who numbered 22,100,000 in 1913 and 6,801,000 in 1928, fell in number to 174,000 in 1934 (0.1 per cent. of the total population).

We get the same picture from the figures for the distribution of funds invested in production. Between 1925 and 1934, the funds invested in the

* The Seventh Congress of Soviets took place in Moscow from January 25 to February 6, 1935.

socialist sector rose from 48 per cent. of the total, to 95.8 per cent. of the total funds invested in production.

The funds invested of the capitalist sector, on the contrary, fell from 6.5 per cent. to 0.09 per cent., and of the small private enterprises—from 44.7 per cent. to 4.1 per cent. of the total funds invested in production.

During these years there has also taken place an enormous increase in the absolute figures of the funds invested in socialist production, viz.: between 1925 and 1934 they have increased from 22,000 million to 90,000 million roubles.

About 96 per cent. of the total funds invested in production are concentrated in the socialist sector. New mighty means of production have been set up on the socialist foundation, of which old Russia could never dream. All that was expropriated from the capitalists and landlords represents but an insignificant part of what has been created by the labour of the working class who have become masters of the state and of production. About 80 per cent. of the peasants in agriculture have been brought into the collective farms. The most difficult task of reorganising the millions of small, dwarfed peasant farms into large collective farms has been solved. Socialism has become the predominant economic form in town and country, and is on the eve of becoming the only order in being in the U.S.S.R.

The might of the land of socialism is clearly reflected in the annual budget, which amounts to 65,000 million roubles, a budget which knows no deficits at a time when all the wealthiest capitalist countries are unable to extricate themselves from serious budget difficulties and colossal deficits.

The growing importance of public, socialist ownership is also to be seen in the fact that the income of the state budget of the U.S.S.R. is being more and more derived from the profits received from socialist enterprises.

Credit and banking business are entirely in the hands of the state. The lion's share of trade turnover is state and co-operative trade; the remainder falls to collective farm trading. The private trader, the intermediary and speculator have been driven out of trade. Developed soviet trade is trade without private intermediaries, is trade from which all motives of gain and profit have been removed.

Public, socialist ownership has become the basis of the soviet system, not only in the town, but also in the village.

The text of the new Constitution has to reflect and consolidate these achievements. The principle of public, socialist ownership must be introduced into the Constitution as its fundamental and all-determining basis, so that this Constitution

becomes an extremely keen weapon in the struggle for the final liquidation of the survivals of capitalism in the economics and the consciousness of the people of the U.S.S.R.

The decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets adopted following the proposals made by the Plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, also provide for changes in the Soviet electoral system, in the direction of its further democratisation by way of the introduction of equal suffrage and direct elections, and the secret ballot.

In this case also we are dealing with decisions which do not constitute anything unexpected, any departure from the prospects of the development of the Soviet state, as dealt with in the works of Lenin and Stalin.

The attempts of certain bourgeois newspapers to declare that the changes in the electoral system are almost "a retreat from the ideological foundations of the Soviet government" can only be put down to complete ignorance or conscious lack of scruples.

Actually, the further democratisation of the Soviet electoral system constitutes the consecutive, straightforward development of the fundamental basis of the Soviet system, which were laid down in October, and which together with the progressive trend of development of socialist construction will be applied ever more extensively and planfully.

The prospects of the gradual abolition of suffrage restrictions have been repeatedly pointed out by LENIN AND STALIN. As far back as 1918, in the theses on Soviet Power presented to the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin foresaw the

"extension of the Soviet Constitution to cover the whole of the population IN PROPORTION AS the resistance of the exploiters is broken."*

In his reply to questions put by students of the "Sverdlov" Communist University, in the year 1925, and when talking about livening up the Soviets, Comrade Stalin emphasised the point that the bounds to the extension of Soviet democracy indicated at that time in the decisions of the 14th Party Conference and the 3rd Congress of Soviets of the U.S.S.R., would not

"remain unchanged for ever. On the contrary. As our national economy develops, as the economic and political power of the proletariat becomes ever more consolidated, as the revolutionary movement in the West and in the East progresses, as the international situation of the Soviet state improves, so proportionally, will our concessions undoubtedly assume wider scope."†

After quoting the words of Lenin above-mentioned, Comrade Stalin continues:

"What is referred to here is the extension of the Consti-

* Lenin, Vol. 22, page 372. Russ. Ed.

† Stalin: *Leninism*, Vol. 1., page 219. English Edition.

tution to the whole of the population, including the bourgeoisie. This was said in March, 1918. From that date till the day of Lenin's death there was an interval of more than five years, but Lenin never once during that period even hinted that it was opportune to apply this postulate. Why? Because the time had not yet come for it. But the time will come when the internal and international position of the Soviet state will have become finally consolidated, of that there can be no doubt."§

Now the position of the Soviet state has been consolidated to such an extent that it can grant the suffrage to a certain section of the kulaks who have ceased their resistance to the collective farms and have taken up a life of honest toil.

The transition to equal suffrage in just the same way is nothing at all unexpected. The Party programme of the C.P.S.U. clearly and precisely refers to the temporary character of the advantages established by the Constitution for the industrial proletariat. The programme links up the institution of these advantages with "the difficulties of the socialist organisation of the village."

It is clear that now that the collective farming system has achieved victory, now that the kulaks have in the main been liquidated, now that there is the collective farmer in the soviet village—and he is a stable bulwark of the Soviet government, there is every reason for the transition to equal suffrage.

The fact that the workers and peasants are now to have equal suffrage is the best proof of the colossal successes achieved in the reconstruction of agriculture on socialist lines. It signifies the further consolidation of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. It goes without saying that leadership by the working class is as hitherto the main condition for the successful struggle for the final liquidation of the survivals of capitalism in the village. But the chief difficulties connected with the reconstruction of the village on socialist lines have already been overcome. There was a time when Trotsky prophesied that the proletariat, when bringing socialism about, would inevitably come into conflict with the basic masses of the peasantry. These Menshevik prophesies have failed ignominiously. The process of development is going in the entirely opposite direction of a closer and closer rapprochement between town and village in the sphere of economics, culture and politics, an ever-increasing growth of proletarian influence over the peasantry, and an increase in the authority of the Communist Party. Some bourgeois newspapers, even, have been compelled to admit this fact, when making efforts to give an objective appraisal of the full meaning of the changes to be made in the Soviet suffrage. Trotsky, the counter-revolutionary slanderer, has nothing left to do but to raise a howl in common with the foulest fascist scribes to

§ Ibid.

the effect that there is actually no Constitution and no suffrage in the U.S.S.R., and that it is a "party bureaucracy" that holds the reins of power in the U.S.S.R. The food for the soul that Mr. Trotsky brings to his few adherents differs in no way from that which they can get from the "unified press" of Hitler Germany.

It is characteristic that in commenting on the amendments to the Soviet Constitution fully, the chief newspaper published in the land where the hangmen of Hungarian proletarian revolution hold the reins of power, agrees with the foul attacks made by Trotsky upon the C.P.S.U. and its leadership, and pays compliment after compliment to the betrayers of the working class, the counter-revolutionaries Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev.

The bankrupt leaders of social democracy are trying to utilise the decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets to rouse bourgeois-democratic illusions among the masses once more. These gentlemen find nothing so tempting as to make it appear that the Soviet system, with its unequal, open and indirect elections, was in some degree behind by the "more perfected" parliamentary democracy, and that now, apparently, the Bolshevik Party has itself admitted this and is hastening to catch up to the "advanced" countries. It is in this spirit that the *Neue Vorwaerts* of February 24, 1935, commented on the amendments in the Soviet Constitution.

This new edition of an old lie must be thoroughly unmasked and ridiculed. The Soviet political system, the Soviet political order is the most advanced, most progressive, and most democratic, and has been so ever since it was first established, since the October Revolution.

"Even during the first period, when the forces of the working class were still small and certain limitations in the election system were inevitable, the Soviet system represented an embodiment of the highest type of democracy signifying the attraction to government administration of the great masses of toilers on an unheard-of scale." (Molotov, Speech at the Seventh Congress of Soviets on the "Revision of the Constitution.")

The Soviet system is an unheard-of extension of democracy for the toilers, and it has become possible because power, the land, capital and political rights were wrested from the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

This is the historic achievement still to be attained by the countries where universal, direct, equal and secret franchise ensure the domination of the capitalists, thanks to the link between the government and the stock exchange, thanks to bribery, and the pressure exerted by capital upon public opinion, and thanks to the fact that the press, the schools, the church, science, and the whole machinery of state, are in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The entire history of the class struggle has proved that

"formal equality cannot be the form of struggle for material equality against actual inequality."*

The changes in the electoral system in the direction of a transition to equal and direct elections with the secret ballot, is taking place on a Soviet basis, i.e., on the basis arrived at by class struggle and civil war against the capitalists; on the basis of the destruction of the yoke of capital, of private ownership; on the basis of the destruction of the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie during the course of the proletarian revolution.

Among Lenin's works there remained the plan of a pamphlet on proletarian dictatorship, which contains an excellent formulation of the difference in principle between bourgeois and proletarian democracy.

"Bourgeois democracy is decision by voting, i.e., by the formal manifestation of will while preserving the capitalist determinants (motivations) of the will. Proletarian democracy is decision by the class struggle and civil war against the exploiters. In its struggle, in its revolutionary struggle, the proletariat DESTROYS capitalist property relations, and therefore the capitalist determinants (motivations) of the will and decision for the waverers."†

The liquidation of the kulaks as a class on the basis of mass collectivisation, and the consolidation of the collective farms, organisationally and economically constituted the final decisive blow at the "capitalist determinants of will," and have created a stable basis for the further democratisation of the Soviet electoral system.

In this same draft, Lenin underlines the fact that the condition for decision by the majority is honest subordination. To presuppose that the capitalists possess this honesty implies to gloss over capitalism and deceive the toilers. This is what the reformists do. They lull the masses with the empty illusion of the honest subordination of the capitalists to the vote of the majority.

The Communists solve the problem otherwise: "First overthrow the yoke of money, the power of capital, and private ownership, and then the prolonged development of 'honesty' on this basis."‡

As Marx and Engels taught us, universal suffrage on the basis of bourgeois parliamentarism only provides an opportunity for calculating forces, for carrying on extensive agitation, for taking hold of the parliamentary tribune and using it to organise the masses.

Universal suffrage under capitalist can give no more. It remains the form of the domination of capital in circumstances where the bourgeoisie stands firmly on its feet, and where it can reduce non-economic compulsion to a minimum.

"The democratisation of the electoral system was an

expression of the confidence of the bourgeoisie in the growth of its power, of its confidence in the ability of the bourgeois power to subdue the masses in accordance, as it were, with their own will." (Molotov: Speech at the Seventh Congress of Soviets on the "Revision of the Soviet Constitution.")

In the imperialist epoch, when monopolist capital comes on the scene, the bourgeoisie resorts first and foremost to means of non-economic compulsion. It turns from parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, it turns to "strong government," to open dictatorship. Now, in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, one bourgeois power after another is turning to terrorist methods of government, laying naked the direct dependence of the apparatus of state compulsion upon the mighty organisations of monopolist capitalism.

Fascism is the regular product of bourgeois democracy at that stage when the threat is levelled at what is fundamental, namely, capitalist private ownership; when there is no other way of saving it but through unrestricted violence and terror directed against the working class.

And, on the contrary, every step to unfold Soviet democracy is the regular result of the destruction of the oppressive bourgeois, state machinery and of the economic power of capital.

The profound democratic character of the Soviet system, which differs in principle from the democracy of the most enlightened capitalist countries, is to be seen at every step in all spheres of state and social life.

It seems to be an absolutely natural thing in the U.S.S.R. that political and social life is free from the influence of the church.

But is it not true that this mighty weapon of the political domination of capital over the exploited, these fetters which bind the will and reason of the toilers, make themselves felt in all the other countries of the world?

And equal rights for women, which have released half the toiling population of the U.S.S.R. from the position of humiliation and semi-slavery in which they formerly existed. Equal rights in the family, in daily life, in industry, in the factory, in the collective farm; is this not a sign of the broadest democracy, which is only possible where the dictatorship of the proletariat has broken down the fetters of private ownership?

And is not the Red Army the most democratic army in the world? Its profound proletarian democratic character is felt both in the comradesly feeling which exists between the Red Army men and their commanders, in the relationship which exists between the army and the population, and in the fact that the Red Army is a school which brings the toilers of different nations closer together, a school of international education and

* *Leninist Miscellany*, Vol. III., p. 495. Russ. Ed.

† *Leninist Miscellany*, Vol. III., p. 496. Russ. Ed.

‡ Lenin: *Miscellany*, III., p. 545. Russ. Ed.

of the struggle against great-Russian chauvinism and local nationalism.

Every Red Army unit to-day is the bearer of the most advanced, most democratic culture, not only as compared with the armies of capitalist countries, but as compared with their universities, where bestial theories of race alienation and race hatred are propounded.

And the conditions of the trade union organisations, their rights, the part they play in industry and in the state, do these not all point to a democracy which is only possible where the proletariat have seized the reins of power, and where production is subordinated to the interests of the toilers, and not the interests of private profit?

In operating its dictatorship, the working class of the Soviet Union aroused the intermediary sections of the toilers, and first and foremost the huge masses of peasants, to political life and political activity, educating them politically and drawing them into the management of the state, into the organisation of production. Mass collectivisation, moreover, which called new strata of men and women peasants to conscious, social activity, produced a colossal increase in the political activity of the rural masses.

After all that has been said, it is clear that the amendments to the Soviet Constitution, as outlined by the 7th Congress, must be evaluated from the viewpoint of the CONSOLIDATION OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, from the viewpoint of the extension of SOVIET democracy, and on no account from the viewpoint of the advantages of some sort of abstract democracy.

As we know, it was in the name of this abstract democracy, in the name of the formal rights of the Constituent Assembly, that international Menshevism declaimed; it was under this banner that the renegade Kautsky fought against the Soviets.

It would seem that there is no longer any need to discuss questions to which history has already given the answers. The Russian Constituent Assembly prepared the ground for Kolchak, while the victory of the Weimar "National Constituent Assembly" in Germany paved the way for Hitler's bloody dictatorship.

And the Soviets have been the bodies around which the masses of the toilers have been concentrated; they have been the bodies guided by the proletariat and its vanguard the Communist Party, which have converted the backward, impoverished land of the Soviets into the citadel of victorious socialism.

The Congresses of Soviets, though elected not by direct and equal elections, expressed the real will of the working class and the advanced peasants,

while the bourgeois parliaments, elected by direct and equal voting reflected the pressure exerted by capital, the power of private ownership, the influence of the church upon the backward strata of the population, and were the result of a whole system of bribery, violence and deception.

Bourgeois and social-democratic critics of the Soviet system have spilled quite an amount of ink in attacking the indirect elections which have existed up to now in the U.S.S.R., depicting it as a cunning device on the part of the Bolsheviks to ensure a Party majority in the various Soviet bodies.

One might have thought that they would be delighted at the news of the introduction of direct elections.

But nothing of the kind. These gentlemen have now become the most arrant defenders of the old system, and are discovering that it contains unparalleled positive features.

Take, for example, the Polish *Illustrovani Kurjer Podzenni* of February 12th, 1935, which vented its spleen about the amendments to the Soviet Constitution in an article full of spiteful rubbish. This paper is not in the least disturbed at offering its readers the absolutely unfounded news to the effect that the Soviet system is allegedly being entirely abolished, to be replaced by a bourgeois-parliamentary system, "according to which elective institutions of all kinds will be elected once in four years."

Further on, the paper makes false hints to the effect that the right to recall deputies will no longer be enforced, and ends up with the following tirade:

"Whereas under the previous system, at least in the lowest links of the chain, in the district soviets, a citizen had some opportunity of expressing his will and carrying it out to a modest degree, now, on the contrary, under the universal ballot on the territorial basis, this opportunity vanishes entirely."

Is it not a farce, when the lackeys of landlord-militarist Poland, which even hesitates to call itself a republic, play the rôle of defenders of Soviet democracy?

However, we were not forced to wait long for the explanation of these unexpected sympathies shown towards the "ideological foundations of the Soviet system." The author of the article considers that the democratic character of the local soviets lies in the fact that

"the rural district soviets were the only elected institutions where the Communists almost never had, nor could have, a majority; what is more, they were institutions into which representatives of the condemned classes, such as rich peasants, or the so-called representatives of the old world, the local clergy, sometimes found access."

These gentlemen do not like indirect elections; in fact, they cannot like anything in the Soviet

Union, because the capitalist elements are being eliminated there, and because all hopes of restoring the capitalist system are being radically destroyed. They do not like direct elections, because they foresee an enormously new increase in the influence of the Communist Party.

Well, you can never please these people. The more abusive they are, the more useful the given measure must be for the workers and peasants.

When speaking of the references made by the bourgeois and social-democratic press to the decisions of the 7th Congress of Soviets, we must not overlook what Otto Bauer has had to say in *Der Kampf*, No. 3. The underlying tone of his article is foul hypocrisy and a desire to cover up traces at all costs. Otto Bauer admits that the proposed amendments to the Constitution signify great progress," and "are of great historical importance." He even declares that this is "the first (!) step towards the gradual and real self-determination of the toiling masses working in socialist industry and collectivised agriculture." The question arises, then, how, in that case, does Mr. Bauer estimate the October Revolution—which he is never tired of greeting in words. If the decisions of the 7th Congress of Soviets constitute the "first" step in the direction of real self-determination by the toiling masses, then what was the October Revolution? Obviously, Mr. Bauer cannot make things fit in. But this is still not all. It appears that the amendments to the Constitution add nothing new, for in the U.S.S.R. there is no real freedom to elect whom you please, since there is no freedom given to all parties to put forward their candidates.

Here Mr. Bauer is singing in chorus with all the others, from the fascists to the social democrats. True, he tries to occupy a "special" position. He "does not defend" the whiteguards, he "admits" that dictatorship of the proletariat should suppress parties which seek to restore capitalism and overthrow the Soviet Government. But he sheds crocodile tears because the same fate awaits even "political and ideological currents which recognise the Soviet Constitution and want to continue the construction of industry and agriculture."

Where does he see these nice "political and ideological currents"? It is clear from what follows that he is referring to the remnants of the Zinoviev opposition, whom he warmly recommends as people devoted to Socialism. Bauer declares that they were only dissatisfied with the abolition of the bread cards and with the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. We do not take it upon ourselves to make a judgment as to what are the sources from which Mr. Bauer obtained such precise information as to the precise cause of the

"dissatisfaction" of the counter-revolutionary double-dealers, and how far this information coincides with the truth; but it is useless for Mr. Bauer to pass by the fact that these people "merely" organised terrorist acts with the assistance of foreign consuls, and dreamed about intervention and the overthrow of the Soviet Government.

Mr. Bauer pretends that he is wholly and solely in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the suppression of the capitalists. He takes it upon himself to teach the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. how they should carry out their dictatorship so as to win the approval of such noble personalities as Otto Bauer, to which we can give the following reply: You, Messrs. Bauer and Co., led the Western-European working class beneath the fascist executioner's axe, if the workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R. had followed your advice, capitalist reaction would long ago have washed its hands in their blood. You come forward as the defenders of the foul assassins of Comrade Kirov, at the same time assuming the hypocritical mask of people delighted with the building of socialism. The Soviet proletariat does not need either your advice or your hypocritical sympathy.

The malicious attacks of Mr. Dan, published in the Belgian *Peuple* of February 9th, are just as revolting, and leave just the same farcical impression.

Dan is not satisfied with the decisions passed by the 7th Congress of Soviets. This is quite understandable. He wants the kind of democracy where the Mensheviks will be free to carry on their undermining work in favour of the capitalist interventionists. Dan is hurt at the treatment of Zinoviev and his followers. Birds of a feather flock together. Dan would like the Nikolaevs* to be given freedom to plot terrorist acts on Soviet territory with the help of foreign consuls. He cannot imagine democracy in any other light. And, finally, and best of all, Dan refuses to believe in the democratic character of the Soviet system, since the Congress of Soviets unanimously and without offering any objections, accepted the proposal of the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Dan does not like the kind of democracy where the Communist Party is the ruling party, and where it enjoys unparalleled and undivided influence and authority among the toilers. The sort of democracy that brings greater joy to Dan is that where the Communists sit behind prison bars. We know this full well. But nothing can be done about it. Neither the hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, Mr. Dan,

* Nikolaev—the assassin of Com. Kirov.—Ed.

who has found himself a place in their backyards, nor the bourgeoisie throughout the whole world, have the power to change historic facts.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party trained by Lenin and by the great Stalin, who continues his work, has led the working class and peasantry of the Soviet Union through all difficulties and dangers, and over all hidden rocks

in their path, to the promised goal, the victory of Socialism. It is just this that has created for the Communist Party the enormous authority that it enjoys among the toilers. And side by side with the growth and development of Soviet democracy, the influence of the Party over the masses, and the confidence of the masses in the Party leadership will continue to grow ever greater.

DOCUMENTS

ABOUT THE LETTER CIRCULATED BY THE INITIATORY GROUP OF KOREAN COMMUNISTS CONCERNING THE TASKS CONNECTED WITH THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FACTIONAL GROUPINGS

THE letter circulated by the initiatory group of Korean Communists to Communist groups in the factory and village, and calling on them to conduct a struggle against factional groupings, is of exceptionally great importance in the struggle for the creation of a real Bolshevik Communist Party in Korea.

Under the present conditions existing in Korea, when all the factional groups without exception, have "played and continue to play the rôle of marionettes in the hands of the Japanese police," the creation of a powerful, disciplined, militant and mass illegal Communist Party, one capable of leading the struggle of the toilers in Korea against Japanese imperialism, cannot but be accompanied by a merciless struggle against all factional groups and their leaders.

The initiatory group of Korean Communists which has proposed a platform of action for the C.P. of Korea was perfectly correct and timely in issuing its circular letter dealing with the urgency of the struggle against factional groups and factionalists. This letter, which gives an absolutely correct Bolshevik estimation of all the factional groups in Korea, and which points out the road to the creation of a real Communist Party in Korea, is supplementary to the platform of action issued by the Korean Communist Party. These two most important documents must serve as the ideological and political basis on which to gather together the best Communist elements from among the advanced workers and peasants with a view to re-establishing the C.P. of Korea.

Thanks to the irreconcilable struggle of the Comintern against the factionalists in Korea, the factional groups and their leaders have already

been to a great extent exposed to the masses as enemies and disorganisers of the struggle of the toilers of Korea. However, remnants of the factional groups still remain, and they are trying to penetrate among the workers and peasants in order to continue their base factional activity. The factionalists are trying to pass off their unprincipled factional struggle as one of principle. The story they are spreading is that their groups have been Bolshevik groups from the very outset, while all the other groups are opportunist, etc. There is no doubt that such "theories" are anti-Party, and are being made use of so as to justify their base factional activity.

This circular letter must aid in securing that a truly Communist Party takes shape and comes into being in Korea, for it is inconceivable that the Korean workers and peasants can achieve any more or less serious victories in their struggle against Japanese imperialism and the Korean landlords and bourgeoisie without such a Party.

TO ALL FACTORY AND VILLAGE COMMUNIST GROUPS IN KOREA.

Regarding the factional struggles and the tasks facing the Korean Communists in the struggle against factional groups.

Dear Comrades:

Our country is one of the few in the world where there is no acknowledged Communist Party yet in being. This is due exclusively to the fierce factional struggle going on among the Communists, a struggle which has assumed absolutely unheard-of and monstrous forms in precisely our country.

The factional struggle has ruled out every possi-

bility of educating our Party members in the spirit of a policy guided by principles, has dulled Party feeling, destroyed Party discipline, broken up the unity in our Party ranks, undermined the authority of the Party among the workers and peasants, and diverted the Party from positive work. The Korean Communists, involved in their factional quarrels, did not engage in the organisation and leadership of the struggles of the workers and peasants for their economic and political interests, did not carry on the struggle against national reformism, and did not further the development of the national-liberation movement of the toiling masses. As a result of this factional decay, the heroic work of certain honest comrades who are truly devoted to Communism, has been reduced to almost nothing. The more this factional struggle developed, the more distorted became the forms it assumed, becoming directly linked with the provocative work of the Japanese gendarmes and police.

The Japanese imperialists corrupted the Communists ranks by skilfully utilising the factional antagonisms of the various groups. In the heat of the factional fight a situation was created whereby provocateurs and spies could quite freely penetrate into the Communist ranks. These latter occupied leading positions in a number of groups (e.g., the cases of Kim-Tchai, Che-ir, De-Gi-sen, etc.), and betrayed the most devoted revolutionaries, and fanned the fires of the factional struggle in order to weaken and break up the ranks of the Communists and to discredit them in the eyes of the toiling masses.

All this testifies to the fact that all the factional groups, without exception, irrespective of what they called themselves and of the dates on which they were formed, played and continue to play the rôle of marionettes in the hands of the Japanese police.

Taking all this into consideration, the Comintern was forced to take a special decision in December, 1928, dissolving the Communist Party of Korea. This decision demanded the abolition of all factions and at the same time pointed the way to the creation of a new, truly Communist Party, as the vanguard of the proletariat in Korea.

The establishment of a centralised, disciplined, ideologically monolithic, mass, underground Communist Party is the main and basic task facing the revolutionary movement of the toilers in Korea. The basic elements from which the Communist Party must be established, a Party with an iron discipline and Bolshevik principles of conspiracy, are the advanced workers and peasants who have displayed their quality in strikes, demonstrations, peasant conflicts, and in the other forms of struggle of the masses against their class enemies.

Unfortunately, we have no such party as yet, although all the prerequisites for its creation exist. The Korean working class, whose Party the C.P. of Korea must become, has already inscribed a number of brilliant pages in the history of the class struggle in Korea. It is enough to recall the general strike in Henzan and a number of other strikes which took place in the past few years, in order to be convinced of the presence among the workers of our country of the will and determination to struggle against their class enemies.

The absence of a real Communist Party is retarding the development of the struggle of the toilers in Korea, especially the struggle of the Korean workers against Japanese imperialism and its allies. The absence of such a party is especially felt now when a new wave of revolutionary activity on the part of the masses of the people is rising in the country.

The characteristic feature of the present situation in Korea is that the entire policy pursued by Japanese imperialism amounts to that of adapting our country to the needs of an imperialist predatory war. In their efforts to find a way out of the crisis at the expense of the toiling masses, the Japanese imperialists are more and more intensifying the oppression and exploitation of the masses of the people. On the other hand, they are feverishly preparing for war against the Soviet Union—the stronghold of the world revolutionary movement. As a result of this, the impoverished condition of the Korean toilers, bad as it was, is growing still worse. Unemployment is growing, and the mass ruin of the peasantry, especially of the poor peasantry, is to be observed, while an army of millions of hungry peasants is being formed. And to all this there is to be added the fact that Japan's predatory war in China, has already ruined millions of toilers. The Korean bourgeoisie are also carrying on a struggle against the masses of the people, and are more and more taking the line of capitulation to Japanese imperialism. Under these conditions, only a Communist Party in Korea can ensure the successful development of the struggle of the Korean workers and peasants against the existing order, for the complete independence of Korea, the destruction of the existing system of land ownership, for the eight-hour working day, for a radical improvement in the conditions of the workers and for the establishment of a workers' and peasants' Soviet Power. There is no other way out. Only a C.P. in Korea can give correct leadership to the struggle of the working class, and ensure that the latter takes the lead in the national-liberation struggle, directed against Japanese imperialism.

We, the initiatory group of Korean Communists, fully conscious of the importance and

responsibility of the present historical moment, set ourselves the task of establishing a united Communist Party which shall organise and lead the struggle of the toilers of Korea against Japanese imperialism. We call on the Communist workers in the factories, etc., and on the Communists in the villages to whom the interests of the Korean revolution are dear, to respond to our letter. On the basis of the platform of action of the C.P. of Korea we call on all Communist workers and Communists in the villages to fight for the demands which are embodied in this platform, and to organise themselves into Communist groups in the factories and in the villages, so as to undertake active struggle.

Thanks to the determined and undeviating line taken by the Comintern against the factional groupings, a great many of them have been exposed to the toilers. But remnants of factional groups still exist which in connection with the growth of the workers' and peasants' movement, are trying to penetrate among the workers so as to continue their base factional struggle there. Therefore, the process of establishing Communist groups in the plants, factories, mines, docks, villages, on ships, railroads and other places of work, must be accompanied by a fierce struggle directed against all factional groups and individual factionalists. The factionalists must be exposed and driven out of our ranks. The wrath of the masses must be directed against them. In the present situation, when factional groups and each individual factionalist are objectively tools in the hands of Japanese imperialism to break up the revolutionary ranks, the political integrity of these people must be rightfully called in question.

(Continued from page 395.)

Party members employed, as well as the organisation of a number of factory cells, are to a great extent the result of the good work of the Party press.

The Party carried through a great amount of work in rallying funds for our papers. By systematic and stubborn work, and by rallying all its members, the Party during the course of one year collected in shillings and pence £128 6s. 7d. for *The Workers' Weekly* alone. This is no small figure! The Party has recruited a number of worker-correspondents for its papers and has done a great deal of organisational work in connection with the distribution of the papers. The Party has become more active, and the Party members individually and the Party as a whole have developed in this work.

The Party must raise this work to a still greater height. It must work without loss of energy to still further rally the masses in support of the

We must show exceptional vigilance towards this variety of provocateurs. We can only allow one or other former factionalist to enter into the newly-organised Communist groups in the enterprises and villages, when he proves his devotedness to the cause of the revolution, not in words, but in deeds, in the course of revolutionary struggle.

Only in this way, by organising and gathering together the advanced workers and peasants in Communist groups in the enterprises and in the villages, and by isolating the factionalists at the same time, will we be able to organise a Communist Party which will really and worthily bear the name of a Section of the Comintern.

We, the initiatory group, boldly declare that in spite of all the devices of the factionalists, the creatures of Japanese imperialism in the ranks of the working class, in spite of their attempts once again to undermine the establishment of a Communist vanguard among the Korean proletariat, we shall overcome all difficulties, and reach our goal with the aid of the newly-organised Communist groups in the enterprises and villages. We shall succeed in completely doing away with the factional groups and in drawing together the best Communist elements from among the ranks of the workers and peasants.

Long Live the C.P. of Korea!

Down with the factional struggle, the weapon used by the Japanese imperialists in the effort to undermine the ranks of the revolutionary movement of the toilers of Korea!

Long live the Communist International — the general staff of the world revolution!

The Initiatory Group of Korean Communists.

paper, and thus strengthen its financial basis. Especial attention must be paid to work with the worker-correspondents. The number of worker-correspondents must be extended; and this must be done not only for *The Workers' Weekly*, but it is still more important for the women's paper as well. The Party must carry on careful work with the worker-correspondents, and organise and lead them in such a way that they systematically and planfully participate in all the campaigns and in all the work of the Party. The circulation of the papers and the extension of the circle of those who read them, first and foremost among the decisive sections of the working class—these are the organisational tasks to which the Party must pay great attention. If the Party works unceasingly to strengthen the ideological contents of the papers and to increase their circulation, it will succeed in achieving still greater successes and will increase its influence among wider sections of the toilers, and become transformed into a mass Party.

REVIEW OF THE CENTRAL ORGAN OF THE C.P. OF NEW ZEALAND

By L. ANDREWS.

THE C.P. of New Zealand can note a series of rather important successes over the last year in its periodical press. The most important of these was the issue (beginning from November 7th, 1933) of the weekly Party paper, *The Workers' Weekly*.

The former Party paper, *The Red Worker*, was a monthly paper, although it came out very irregularly, as a result of which correspondence and materials printed were frequently out of date. This paper could not reflect as it should the intensification of the daily struggle of the toilers of New Zealand, nor organise and lead this struggle. Nevertheless, *The Red Worker* fulfilled a highly important task, and on more than one occasion played a serious political rôle in the country. Witness of this was the increased terror of the government directed against this newspaper and the heavy sentences passed on Comrades Alick Galbraith, Dick Griffin and "Snowy" Robinson, for their direct participation in the issue of the paper. The issue of a weekly newspaper has played a tremendous rôle in overcoming the sectarian relics in the ranks of the Party, and in drawing the Party closer to the masses of the workers, and to their day-to-day needs.

The line of the paper is the line of the Party, and the strong and weak points of the paper reflect the strong and weak points of the Party.

The first issue of *The Workers' Weekly* was printed in 2,000 copies, and the July (1934) issue reached 5,000 copies.

In May, 1934, the Party increased the size of the paper, and the circulation which, when the paper was first issued, fluctuated very much, became more settled.

The political and economic importance of the weekly paper is shown best of all by the leading rôle which it played during the struggles of the unemployed, during the Hunger March in Gisborne and the unemployed demonstrations in Palmerston North, in the campaign for free speech, and also during the establishment of the united front in Auckland against fascism and war. This influence was very noticeably felt by the Labour Party, which is very much afraid that the Party will take the lead of the united front of the workers.

An expression of this fear was the lying articles,

full of venom against the Communist Party, printed in the official organ of the New Zealand Labour Party, *The New Zealand Worker*. There are many examples to show how great is the fear with which our press fills the trade union leaders as well. For instance, "Big Jim" Roberts, of the Workers' Alliance, wrote in the columns of *The New Zealand Worker* and *The Transport Worker* calling for unity, while the "Black Prince" of the Seamen's Union, Tui Walsh, demands the expulsion of the Communists from the trade unions so that the Communists should not be in a position to prevent the trade union leaders from handing the seamen over to the whims of their fascist masters. The Executive Council of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, the Railwaymen's Union, on the demand of McIlbride, General Secretary and the former Labour Member of Parliament from Napier, adopted a resolution to refuse to accept Communists as members of their union. The struggle of the Communist Party and of its paper, *The Workers' Weekly*, against these splitting acts of the trade union leaders not only raised the authority of our Party, but also to a very great degree assisted in the distribution of the paper among the employed workers.

Proof of the great rôle that *The Workers' Weekly* plays among the farmers is provided by the open display of dissatisfaction by the small farmer at the traditional methods of extracting rents, interest and debts, especially in those regions where the newspaper has its biggest circulation, for instance, in North Auckland.

The Party membership has doubled since *The Workers' Weekly* began to appear, and it should be noted half of the new members are employed.

The political line of the paper is correct. The paper carries through the main decisions of the Party; it pays great attention to the demands of the employed workers, and prints materials on rationalisation, the speed-up system, working conditions, wages, etc., and makes use of all the day-to-day demands with a view to rallying the workers for revolutionary struggle. The paper carried through a big campaign against the expulsion of revolutionary workers and Communists from the reformist trade unions. *The Workers' Weekly* also did great work in connection with the anti-war congress. The paper gives much space to the

unemployed movement, but sometimes there are tendencies to ignore the interests of the employed workers. Proof of this, for instance, is to be seen in the campaign for the Workers' Charter (a Charter of the day-to-day needs of the workers put forward by the Communist Party in June 1934.—Ed.).

The campaign developed by the central organ of the C.P. of New Zealand in connection with the Charter was calculated not so much on covering the wide masses of toilers as on securing a hold over the unemployed. Too many unemployed demands were put forward, and so the campaign was transformed into a struggle mainly for the interests of the unemployed.

The paper has begun to pay much attention to questions which trouble the toiling farmers, by explaining the essence of the measures being operated by the government. The paper has given quite a good popularisation of the central slogan of the Comintern, "For Soviet Power," by publishing a whole series of articles headed "Soviet New Zealand."

A big defect, however, in the paper is a certain tendency for the articles to be of a theoretical character, articles about dialectical materialism, about opportunism in general, etc. Such articles should be dealt with first and foremost in the Party's monthly journal, *The Communist Review*. The task of the weekly paper is first and foremost to rally the workers to the struggle for their immediate demands in the factory, on board ship, and in the mines, to popularise the slogans of the Party, and organise the workers for revolutionary struggle.

The Communist Party approached the Labour Party and the trade unions with a proposal to establish a united front. The approach made by our Party, however, was made in too general a tone, and this made it easier for the reformists to refuse to establish the united front. The Party committed a mistake in not giving the widest publicity to the refusal of the Labour Party to establish the united front, and by publishing information of this fact only three months later.

More recently the paper has printed a series of interesting and important articles dealing with the Maoris. These articles, unfortunately, have been limited to material of a purely historical character (the appropriation of the land of the natives by the whites a hundred years ago), and very little material has been printed about the present conditions of the Maoris and of their needs and demands.

On occasion, when explaining our slogans, the paper incorrectly popularises the Comintern slogan, "For Soviet Power." In an article, "Soviet New Zealand and the Peasantry," in the issue

dated October 27th, 1934, the paper explains what the proletarian revolution would give the toiling farmers. The bad feature is that the paper passed over the main question which troubles the farmer to-day, namely, as to how the revolution will solve the land question. In an article written in the form of a conversation between a Communist and a non-Party worker, the latter says,

"The poor farmer will support the proletarian revolution if it frees his farm from debts. But if Soviet Power takes his land from him and socialises it, the farmer will be against the Soviets."

In reply to this, it should have been shown that Soviet Power will not only not take the land from the poor and toiling farmers in general, but, on the contrary, it will give every single farmer land, and nobody will have the right to drive the farmer off his farm, whereas capitalism, which drives the farmers on to the labour market, takes their land from them. The paper did not do this. Many mistakes of this character are to be found.

Occasionally the paper is insufficiently skilful in collecting and utilising its materials. For instance, on the occasion of the Lenin Anniversary, the newspaper printed one of Lenin's articles about religion. This is very good in its way, but the bad point is that the Editorial Board did not succeed in selecting a more topical article from the store of Leninism.

These defects do not reduce the great importance of our Party paper, they only show that in the future what is needed is much persistent work to improve the paper, and to bring it closer to the mass of readers among the workers and farmers.

Of no less importance is *The Working Woman*, the paper for working women, issued by the Party at the beginning of March, 1934. The paper met with a very deep response among the toiling masses of the country. It was published out of the hard-earned pennies collected from the toiling women. While the first number issued in March was printed in 1,100 copies, the circulation of the July issue was 2,264 copies, which is evidence of the popularity it was able to win in such a short space of time. *The Working Woman* played a big part in the struggle of the Party to increase its influence among the employed women and housewives, by giving in its columns numerous concrete examples of how women must organise for the struggle against the employers' offensive. The journal also played an important rôle in establishing women's committees throughout the whole of New Zealand.

The Party papers must establish still closer contact with the trade unions and the small and middle farmers, by giving wide publicity to all facts which can assist in rallying the masses of

(Continued on page 385.)