

THE

WORKERS OF THE WORLD-UNITE!



Communist

U.S.S.R. - - - - DEFECTS IN PARTY WORK: STALIN

BRITAIN - - BRITISH ARMS—AGAINST WHOM?: ARNOT

U.S.S.R. - - - - THE 1917 REVOLUTION: KUCHKIN

CHINA - - - - THE KEY TO SALVATION: WAN MIN

and

SPAIN - FOR THE ORGANISATION OF THE

STRUGGLE AND VICTORY: DIAZ

International

4

VOLUME XIV

SIXPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published monthly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English

Contents :

No. 4

	Page
1. J. Stalin: Defects in Party Work and Measures for Liquidating Trotskyist and Other Double-Dealers. (Report at the Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., March 3rd, 1937)	965
2. J. Stalin: Reply to Debate at the Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., March 3rd, 1937	974
3. The Historic Plenum of the C.C. of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Soviet Union	980
4. R. Page Arnot: British Arms—Against Whom?	985
5. Wan Min: The Key to the Salvation of the Chinese People	990
<u>THE HEROIC STRUGGLE OF THE SPANISH PEOPLE</u>	
6. J. Diaz: For the Organisation of the Struggle and Victory	1000
7. R. Guyot: In Memory of Three Comrades	1010
<u>POLITICAL NOTES</u>	
8. P. Wieden: The Hitler Putsch in Hungary	1012
<u>IN THE LAND OF SOCIALISM</u>	
9. A. Kuchkin: The Revolution of February, 1917, in Russia, and Lenin's "April Theses"	1014
<u>IN THE SECTIONS OF THE COMINTERN</u>	
10. G. Dimitrov: The 10th Anniversary of the "Stato Operario"	1023
11. K. Horwat: The Struggle for the People's Front in Jugoslavia	1025
<u>BOOK REVIEW:</u>	
12. A. Krajewski: "Die Internationale"—Theoretical Organ of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany	1029

DEFECTS IN PARTY WORK AND MEASURES FOR LIQUIDATING TROTSKYIST AND OTHER DOUBLE-DEALERS

(Report at the Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., March 3, 1937)

By J. STALIN

COMRADES, from the reports and the debates on these reports heard at this Plenum it is evident that we are dealing with the following three main facts.

First, the wrecking, diversionist and espionage work of the agents of foreign countries, among whom a rather active role was played by the Trotskyists, affected more or less all, or nearly all, our organisations—economic, administrative and Party.

Second, the agents of foreign countries, among them the Trotskyists, not only penetrated into our lower organisations, but also into a number of responsible positions.

Third, some of our leading comrades, at the centre and in the districts, not only failed to discern the real face of these wreckers, diversionists, spies and assassins, but proved to be so careless, complacent and naïve that not infrequently they themselves helped to promote agents of foreign powers to responsible positions.

Such are the three incontrovertible facts which naturally emerge from the reports and the debates on these reports.

I. POLITICAL CARELESSNESS

How are we to explain the fact that our leading comrades, who have rich experience in the fight against all sorts of anti-Party and anti-Soviet trends, proved in this case to be so naïve and blind that they were unable to see the real face of the enemies of the people, were unable to discern the wolves in sheep's clothing, unable to tear off their masks?

Can it be said that the wrecking, diversionist and espionage work of the agents of foreign powers operating in the territory of the U.S.S.R. can be anything unexpected and unprecedented for us? No, that cannot be said. This is shown by the wrecking activities in various branches of national economy during the past ten years, beginning with the Shakhti period, activities which are registered in official documents.

Can it be said that in this past period there were no warning signals and warning signs about the wrecking, espionage or terrorist activities of the Trotskyist-

Zinovievist agents of Fascism? No, that cannot be said. We had such signals, and Bolsheviks have no right to forget about them.

The foul murder of Comrade Kirov was the first serious warning which showed that the enemies of the people would resort to duplicity, and resorting to duplicity would disguise themselves as Bolsheviks, as Party members, in order to worm their way into our confidence and gain access to our organisations.

The trial of the "Leningrad Centre" as well as the "Zinoviev-Kamenev" trial gave fresh grounds for the lessons which followed from the foul murder of Comrade Kirov.

The trial of the "Zinovievist-Trotskyist bloc" broadened the lessons of the preceding trials and strikingly demonstrated that the Zinovievists and Trotskyists had united around themselves all the hostile bourgeois elements, that they had become transformed into an espionage, diversionist and terrorist agency of the German secret police, that duplicity and camouflage are the only means by which the Zinovievists and Trotskyists can penetrate into our organisations, that vigilance and political insight are the surest means of preventing such penetration, of liquidating the Zinovievist-Trotskyist gang.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. in its confidential letter of January 18, 1935, on the foul murder of Comrade Kirov emphatically warned the Party organisations against political complacency and philistine heedlessness. In the confidential letter it was stated:

"We must put a stop to opportunist complacency which comes from the mistaken assumption that as we grow in strength our enemies become tamer and more innocuous. Such an assumption is radically wrong. It is an echo of the Right deviation which assured all and sundry that the enemy would quietly creep into Socialism, that in the end they would become real Socialists. Bolsheviks cannot rest on their laurels and become heedless. We do not want complacency, but vigilance, real Bolshevik, revolutionary vigilance. We must remember that the more hopeless the position of the enemies becomes the more eagerly will they clutch at extreme methods as the only methods of the doomed in their struggle against the Soviet Power. We must remember this and be vigilant."

In its confidential letter of July 29, 1936, on the

espionage-terrorist activities of the Trotskyist-Zinoviev *bloc* the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. once again called upon the Party organisations to display the utmost vigilance, to acquire the ability to discern the enemies of the people no matter how well disguised they may be. In that confidential letter it was stated:

"Now that it has been proved that the Trotskyist-Zinovievist monsters are uniting in their struggle against the Soviet Power all the most enraged and sworn enemies of the toilers of our country—spies, provocateurs, diversionists, whiteguards, kulaks etc.—when between these elements and the Trotskyists and Zinovievists all lines of demarcation have been obliterated, all our Party organisations, all members of the Party, must understand that the vigilance of Communists is needed on every sector and under all circumstances. An inalienable quality of every Bolshevik under present conditions must be the ability to discern the enemy of the Party no matter how well he may disguise himself."

And so there were signals and warnings.

What did these signals and warnings call for?

They called for the elimination of the weakness of Party organisational work and for the transformation of the Party into an impregnable fortress into which not a single double-dealer could penetrate.

They called upon us to put a stop to the underestimation of Party political work and to make an emphatic turn in the direction of intensifying this work to the utmost, of intensifying political vigilance.

But what happened? The facts show that our comrades reacted to these signals and warnings very slowly.

This is eloquently shown by all the known facts that have emerged from the campaign of verifying and exchanging Party documents.

How are we to explain the fact that these warnings and signals did not have the required effect?

How are we to explain the fact that our Party comrades, notwithstanding their experience in the struggle against anti-Soviet elements, notwithstanding the numerous warning signals and warning signs, proved to be politically short-sighted in face of the wrecking, espionage and diversionist work of the enemies of the people?

Perhaps our Party comrades have deteriorated, have become less class-conscious and less disciplined? No, of course not!

Perhaps they have begun to degenerate? Again, of course not! There are no grounds whatever for such an assumption.

What is the matter then? Whence this heedlessness, carelessness, complacency, blindness?

The matter is that our comrades, carried away by economic campaigns and by colossal successes on the front of economic construction, simply forgot about certain very important facts which Bolsheviks have no right to forget. They forgot about the

main fact in the international position of the U.S.S.R. and failed to notice two very important facts which have direct relation to the present-day wreckers, spies, diversionists and assassins who are concealing themselves behind Party membership cards and disguising themselves as Bolsheviks.

II. THE CAPITALIST ENCIRCLEMENT

What are the facts which our Party comrades forgot about, or simply failed to notice?

They forgot that the Soviet Power is victorious only on one-sixth of the globe, that five-sixths of the globe are in the possession of capitalist states. They forgot that the Soviet Union is encircled by capitalist states. It is an accepted thing among us to chatter about capitalist encirclement, but people refuse to ponder over what sort of thing this capitalist encirclement is. Capitalist encirclement is not an empty phrase, it is a very real and unpleasant thing. Capitalist encirclement means that there is a country, the Soviet Union, which has established the Socialist system, and that there are, besides, many other countries, bourgeois countries, which continue to lead the capitalist mode of life and which surround the Soviet Union, awaiting for an opportunity to attack her, to crush her, or, at all events, to undermine her might and weaken her.

It is this main fact that our comrades forgot. But it is precisely this fact that determines the basis of the relations between the capitalist encirclement and the Soviet Union.

Take the bourgeois states, for example. Naïve people might think that exceptionally good relations exist between them, as between states of the same type. But only naïve people can think like that. As a matter of fact relations far from neighbourly exist between them. It has been proved as definitely as twice two are four that the bourgeois states send to each other spies, wreckers, diversionists, and sometimes also assassins, instruct them to penetrate into the institutions and enterprises of these states, set up their agencies and "in case of necessity" disrupt their rear, in order to weaken them and to undermine their strength. Such is the case at the present time. Such, also, was the case in the past. For example, take the states in Europe at the time of Napoleon the First. At that time France was swarming with spies and diversionists from the side of the Russians, Germans, Austrians and English. On the other hand, England, the German states, Austria and Russia, had in their rear a no smaller number of spies and diversionists from the French side. English agents twice made an attempt on the life of Napoleon, and several times they roused the peasants of the Vendée in France against the Napoleon Government. And what was this Napoleon Government? A bourgeois government, which strangled the French Revolution and preserved only those results of the revolution which were of

advantage to the big bourgeoisie. Needless to say the Napoleon Government did not remain in debt to its neighbours and also undertook diversionist measures. Such was the case in the past, 130 years ago. That is the case now, 130 years after Napoleon the First. To-day France and England are swarming with German spies and diversionists, and, on the other hand, Anglo-French spies and diversionists are busy in Germany; America is swarming with Japanese spies and diversionists, and Japan is swarming with American spies and diversionists.

Such is the law of the relations between bourgeois states.

The question arises, why should the bourgeois states treat the Soviet Socialist state more gently and in a more neighbourly manner than they treat bourgeois states of their own type? Why should they send to the Soviet Union fewer spies, wreckers, diversionists and assassins than they send to their kindred bourgeois states? Why should you think so? Would it not be more correct from the point of view of Marxism to assume that the bourgeois states would send twice and three times as many wreckers, spies, diversionists and assassins to the Soviet Union as they send to any bourgeois state?

Is it not clear that as long as the capitalist encirclement exists we shall have wreckers, spies, diversionists and assassins sent to us by agents of foreign states?

Our Party comrades forgot about all this, and having forgotten about it, they were caught unawares.

That is why the espionage and diversionist work of the Trotskyist agents of the Japano-German secret police proved to be quite unexpected for some of our comrades.

III. PRESENT-DAY TROTSKYISM

Further, while fighting the Trotskyist agents, our Party comrades failed to notice, overlooked the fact that present-day Trotskyism is not what it was, say, seven or eight years ago, that during this period Trotskyism and the Trotskyists had undergone an important evolution which radically changed the face of Trotskyism, that in view of this, the struggle against Trotskyism, the methods of fighting it, have to be radically changed. Our Party comrades failed to notice that Trotskyism had ceased to be a political trend in the working class, that from the political trend in the working class that it was seven or eight years ago Trotskyism had become transformed into a wild and unprincipled gang of wreckers, diversionists, spies and assassins acting on the instructions of the intelligence services of foreign states.

What is a political trend in the working class? A political trend in the working class is a group, or party, which has a definite political face, a platform, a programme, which does not and cannot hide its views from the working class, but on the contrary, advo-

cates its views openly and honestly before the working class, which is not afraid of showing its political face to the working class, which is not afraid of demonstrating its real aims and objects to the working class, but on the contrary, goes to the working class with open visor in order to convince it of the correctness of its views. In the past, seven or eight years ago, Trotskyism was such a political trend in the working class, and anti-Leninist and, therefore, a profoundly mistaken trend, it is true, but a political trend, nevertheless.

Can it be said that present-day Trotskyism, Trotskyism, say, of 1936, is a political trend in the working class? No, this cannot be said. Why? Because the present-day Trotskyists are afraid to show their real face to the working class, are afraid to reveal to it their real aims and objects, carefully hide their political face from the working class, fearing that if the working class learns about their real intentions it will curse them as people alien to it and drive them away. This, in fact, explains why the principal methods of Trotskyist work now are not the open and honest advocacy of its views in the working class, but the disguising of its views, the obsequious, fawning eulogy of the views of its opponents, the pharisaical and hypocritical trampling of its own views in the mud.

At the trial in 1936, if you remember, Kamenev and Zinoviev emphatically denied that they had any political platform. They had every opportunity of unfolding their political platform at the trial. But they did not do this, declaring that they had no political platform. There can be no doubt that both of them were lying when they denied that they had a political platform. Now even the blind can see that they had a political platform. But why did they deny that they had a political platform? Because they were afraid to reveal their real political face, they were afraid to demonstrate their real platform of restoring capitalism in the U.S.S.R., they were afraid, because such a platform would cause revulsion in the ranks of the working class.

At the trial in 1937, Piatakov, Radek and Sokolnikov took a different line. They did not deny that the Trotskyists and Zinovievists had a political platform. They admitted that they had a definite political platform, admitted it and unfolded it in their evidence. But they unfolded it not in order to call upon the working class, to call upon the people, to support the Trotskyist platform, but in order to curse and brand it as an anti-people and anti-proletarian platform. The restoration of capitalism, the liquidation of the collective farms and state farms, the restoration of the system of exploitation, alliance with the Fascist forces of Germany and Japan to bring nearer war against the Soviet Union, the fight for war and against the policy of peace, the territorial

dismemberment of the Soviet Union in which the Ukraine was to be surrendered to the Germans and the Maritime Region to the Japanese, preparation for the military defeat of the Soviet Union in the event of an attack on her by hostile states and, as a means of achieving these aims, wrecking, diversion, individual acts of terrorism against the leaders of the Soviet Government, espionage on behalf of the Japano-German Fascist forces—such was the political platform of present-day Trotskyism unfolded by Piatakov, Radek and Sokolnikov. Naturally the Trotskyists could not but hide such a platform from the people, from the working class. And they hid it not only from the working class, but also from the rank-and-file Trotskyists, and not only from the rank-and-file Trotskyists, but even from the leading Trotskyist group consisting of a small clique of thirty or forty people. When Radek and Piatakov demanded from Trotsky permission to convene a small conference of thirty or forty Trotskyists for the purpose of informing them about the character of this platform, Trotsky forbade them on the ground that it was inexpedient to tell even a small clique of Trotskyists about the real character of this platform, for such an "operation" might cause a split.

"Political figures," hiding their views and their platform not only from the working class, but also from the Trotskyist rank-and-file, and not only from the Trotskyist rank-and-file, but from the leading group of the Trotskyists—such is the face of present-day Trotskyism.

But it follows from this that present-day Trotskyism can no longer be called a political trend in the working class.

Present-day Trotskyism is not a political trend in the working class, but a gang without principles and without ideals, a gang of wreckers, diversionists, intelligence service agents, spies, assassins, a gang of sworn enemies of the working class, working in the pay of the intelligence services of foreign states.

Such is the incontrovertible result of the evolution of Trotskyism in the last seven or eight years.

Such is the difference between Trotskyism in the past and Trotskyism at the present time.

The mistake our Party comrades made is that they failed to notice this profound difference between Trotskyism in the past and Trotskyism at the present time. They failed to notice that the Trotskyists have long ceased to be people devoted to an ideal, that the Trotskyists long ago became highway robbers, capable of any foulness, capable of all that is disgusting, to the point of espionage and the downright betrayal of their country, if only they can harm the Soviet Government and Soviet Power. They failed to notice this and therefore were unable to adapt themselves in time to fight the Trotskyists in a new way, more determinedly.

That is why the abominable work of the Trotskyists during the last few years was quite unexpected for some of our Party comrades.

To proceed. Finally, our Party comrades failed to notice that there is an important difference between the present-day wreckers and diversionists, among whom the Trotskyist agents of Fascism play rather an active part, and the wreckers and diversionists of the time of the Shakhti case.

Firstly, the Shakhti and Industrial Party wreckers were people openly alien to us. They were for the most part former factory owners, former managers for the old employers, former share holders in joint stock companies, or simply old bourgeois specialists who were openly hostile to us politically. None of our people had any doubt about the real political face of these gentlemen. And the Shakhti wreckers themselves did not conceal their dislike for the Soviet system. The same cannot be said about the present-day wreckers and diversionists, the Trotskyists. The present-day wreckers and diversionists, the Trotskyists, are for the most part Party people with a Party card in their pocket, consequently, people who, formally, were not alien to us. The old wreckers opposed our people, but the new wreckers fawn upon our people, praise them, toady to them in order to worm their way into their confidence. As you see, the difference is an important one.

Secondly, the strength of the Shakhti and Industrial Party wreckers was that they, more or less, possessed the necessary technical knowledge, whereas our people, not possessing such knowledge, were compelled to learn from them. This circumstance put the wreckers of the Shakhti period in an advantageous position, it enabled them to carry on their wrecking work freely and unhindered, enabled them to deceive our people *technically*. This is not the case with the present-day wreckers, with the Trotskyists. The present-day wreckers are not superior to our people in technical knowledge. On the contrary, our people are technically better trained than the present-day wreckers, than the Trotskyists. During the period from the Shakhti case to the present-day tens of thousands of genuine, technically well-equipped Bolshevik cadres have grown up among us. One could mention thousands and tens of thousands of technically educated Bolshevik leaders, compared with whom people like Piatakov and Livshitz, Shestov and Boguslavsky, Muralov and Drobnis are empty windbags and mere tyros from the standpoint of technical training. That being the case, wherein lies the strength of the present-day wreckers, the Trotskyists? Their strength lies in the Party card, in the possession of a Party card. Their strength lies in the fact that the Party card enables them to be politically trusted and gives them access to all our institutions and organisations. Their advantage lies in that, holding

a Party card and pretending to be friends of the Soviet Power, they deceived our people *politically*, abused their confidence, did their wrecking work furtively and disclosed our state secrets to the enemies of the Soviet Union. The political and moral value of this "advantage" is a doubtful one, but still, it is an "advantage." This "advantage" explains why the Trotskyist wreckers, having a Party card, having access to all places in our institutions and organisations, were a real windfall for the intelligence services of foreign states.

The mistake some of our Party comrades made is that they failed to notice, did not understand this difference between the old and the new wreckers, between the Shakhti wreckers and the Trotskyists, and, not noticing this, they were unable to adapt themselves in time to fight the new wreckers in a new way.

IV. THE BAD SIDES OF ECONOMIC SUCCESSES

Such are the main facts of our international and internal situation which many of our Party comrades forgot, or which they failed to notice.

That is why our people were taken unawares by the events of the last few years as regards wrecking and diversion.

It may be asked : But why did our people fail to notice all this, why did they forget about all this ?

Where did all this forgetfulness, blindness, carelessness, complacency, come from ?

Is it an organic defect in the work of our people ?

No, it is not an organic defect. It is a temporary phenomenon which can be rapidly removed if our people make some effort.

What is the matter then ?

The matter is that during the last few years our Party comrades have been totally absorbed in economic work, have been carried away to the extreme by economic successes, and being absorbed in all this, they forgot about everything else, neglected everything else.

The matter is that, being carried away by economic successes, they began to regard this as the beginning and end of all things, and simply ceased to pay attention to such things as the international position of the Soviet Union, the capitalist encirclement, increasing the political work of the Party, the struggle against wrecking, etc., assuming that all these were second-rate or even third-rate matters.

Successes and achievements are a great thing, of course. Our successes in the sphere of Socialist construction are truly enormous. But successes, like everything else in the world, have their bad side. Among people who are not very skilled in politics, big successes and big achievements not infrequently give rise to carelessness, complacency, self-satisfaction, excessive self-confidence, swelled-headedness

and boastfulness. You cannot deny that lately braggarts have multiplied among us enormously. It is not surprising that in this atmosphere of great and important successes in the sphere of Socialist construction boastfulness should arise, that showy demonstrations of our successes, under-estimation of the strength of our enemies, over-estimation of our own strength, and, as a result of all this, political blindness, should arise.

Here I must say a few words about the dangers connected with successes, about the dangers connected with achievements.

We know by experience about the dangers connected with difficulties. We have been fighting against such dangers for a number of years and, I may say, not without success. Among people who are not staunch, dangers connected with difficulties not infrequently give rise to despondency, lack of confidence in their own strength, feelings of pessimism. When, however, it is a matter of combating dangers which arise from difficulties, people are hardened in this struggle and emerge from the struggle really granite Bolsheviks. Such is the nature of the dangers connected with difficulties. Such are the results of overcoming difficulties.

But there is another kind of danger, the danger connected with successes, the danger connected with achievements. Yes, yes, comrades, dangers connected with successes, with achievements. These dangers are that among people not very skilled in politics and not having seen much, the atmosphere of successes—success after success, achievement after achievement, overfulfilment of plans after overfulfilment of plans—gives rise to carelessness and self-satisfaction, creates an atmosphere of showy triumphs and mutual congratulations, which kills the sense of proportion and dulls political intuition, takes the spring out of people and causes them to rest on their laurels.

It is not surprising that in this intoxicating atmosphere of swelled-headedness and self-satisfaction, in this atmosphere of showy demonstrations and loud self-praise, people forget certain essential facts of first-rate importance for the fate of our country ; people begin not to notice such unpleasant facts as the capitalist encirclement, the new forms of wrecking, the dangers connected with our successes, and so forth. Capitalist encirclement ? Oh, that's nothing ! What does capitalist encirclement matter if we are fulfilling and over-fulfilling our economic plans ? The new forms of wrecking, the struggle against Trotskyism ? Mere trifles ! What do these trifles matter if we are fulfilling and over-fulfilling our economic plans ? The Party rules, electing Party bodies, Party leaders reporting to the Party members ? Is there really any need for all this ? Is it worth while bothering about all these trifles if our economy is

growing and the material conditions of the workers and peasants are becoming better and better? Mere trifles! The plans are being over-fulfilled, our Party is not a bad one, the Central Committee of the Party is also not a bad one—what else do we need? They are some funny people sitting there in Moscow, in the Central Committee of the Party, inventing all sorts of problems, talk about wrecking, don't sleep themselves and don't let other people sleep. . . .

This is a striking example of how easily and "simply" some of our inexperienced comrades are infected with political blindness as a result of dizzying rapture over economic successes.

Such are the dangers connected with successes, with achievements.

Such are the reasons why our Party comrades, having been carried away by economic successes, forgot about facts of an international and internal character which are of vital importance for the Soviet Union, and failed to notice a number of dangers surrounding our country.

Such are the roots of our carelessness, forgetfulness, complacency, political blindness.

Such are the roots of the defects in our economic and Party work.

V. OUR TASKS

How can these defects in our work be removed? What must be done to achieve this?

The following measures must be carried out:

(1) First of all the attention of our Party comrades who have become submerged in "current questions" in some department or other must be turned towards the big political, international and internal problems.

(2) The political work of our Party must be raised to the proper level, making the cornerstone the task of politically educating and giving Bolshevik hardness to the Party, Soviet and economic cadres.

(3) It must be explained to our Party comrades that the economic successes, the significance of which is undoubtedly very great and which we shall go on striving to achieve, day after day, year after year, are nevertheless not the whole of our work of Socialist construction.

It must be explained that the bad sides connected with economic successes which are expressed in self-satisfaction, carelessness, the dulling of political intuition, can be removed only if economic successes are combined with successes in Party construction and extensive political work of our Party.

It must be explained that economic successes, their stability and duration wholly and entirely depend on the successes of Party organisational and Party political work, that without this economic successes may prove to have been built on sand.

(4) We must remember and never forget that the

capitalist encirclement is the main fact which determines the international position of the Soviet Union.

We must remember and never forget that as long as the capitalist encirclement exists there will be wreckers, diversionists, spies, terrorists, sent to the Soviet Union by the intelligence services of foreign states; this must be borne in mind and a struggle must be waged against those comrades who under-estimate the significance of the capitalist encirclement, who under-estimate the strength and significance of wrecking.

It must be explained to our Party comrades that no economic successes, no matter how great, can annul the capitalist encirclement and the consequences arising from it.

The necessary measures must be taken to enable our comrades, both Party and non-Party Bolsheviks, to become familiar with the aims and objects, with the practice and technique of the wrecking, diversionist and espionage work of the foreign intelligence services.

(5) It must be explained to our Party comrades that the Trotskyists, who are the active elements in the diversionist, wrecking and espionage work of the foreign intelligence services, have long ceased to be a political trend in the working class, that they have long ceased to serve any ideal compatible with the interests of the working class, that they have become a gang of wreckers, diversionists, spies, assassins, without principles and ideals, working in the pay of foreign intelligence services.

It must be explained that in the struggle against present-day Trotskyism, not the old methods, the methods of discussion, must be used, but new methods, uprooting and smashing methods.

(6) We must explain to our Party comrades the difference between the present-day wreckers and the wreckers of the Shakhti period; we must explain that whereas the wreckers of the Shakhti period deceived our people in the sphere of technique, taking advantage of their technical backwardness, the present-day wreckers, with Party cards in their possession, deceive our people by taking advantage of the political confidence shown towards them as Party members, by taking advantage of the political carelessness of our people.

The old slogan of the mastery of technique which corresponded to the Shakhti period must be supplemented by the new slogan of political training of cadres, the mastery of Bolshevism and abandonment of our political trustfulness, a slogan which fully corresponds to the period we are now passing through.

It may be asked: Was it not possible ten years ago, during the Shakhti period, to advance both slogans simultaneously, the first slogan on the mastery of technique, and the second slogan on the political training of cadres? No, it was not possible. Things

are not done that way in the Bolshevik Party. At the turning points of the revolutionary movement some basic slogan is always advanced as the key slogan which we grasp in order to pull the whole chain. That is what Lenin taught us : find the main link in the chain of our work, grasp it, pull it and thus pull the whole chain and march forward. The history of the revolutionary movement shows that this is the only correct tactic. In the Shakhti period the weakness of our people lay in their technical backwardness. Technical questions and not political ones were our weak spot at that time. Our political attitude towards the wreckers of that time was perfectly clear, it was the attitude of Bolsheviks towards politically alien people. We eliminated our technical weakness by advancing the slogan on the mastery of technique and by educating during this period tens and hundreds of thousands of technically equipped Bolshevik cadres. It is a different matter now when we have technically equipped Bolshevik cadres and when the part of wreckers is being played by people who are not openly alien to us and who moreover are not technically superior to us, but who possess Party cards and enjoy all the rights of Party members. The weakness from which our people suffer now is not technical backwardness but political carelessness, blind faith in people who have accidentally obtained Party cards, the failure to judge people not by their political declarations, but by the results of their work. The key question now facing us is not the elimination of the technical backwardness of our cadres for, in the main, this has already been done, but the elimination of the political carelessness and political trustfulness in wreckers who have accidentally obtained Party cards.

Such is the radical difference between the key question in the struggle for cadres in the Shakhti period and the key question at the present time.

That is why we could and should not have issued both slogans ten years ago : the one on the mastery of technique and the one on the political training of cadres.

That is why the old slogan on the mastery of technique must now be supplemented by the new slogan on the mastery of Bolshevism, the political training of cadres and the abandonment of our political carelessness.

(7) We must smash and cast aside the rotten theory that with every advance we make the class struggle here must subside, the more successes we achieve the tamer will the class enemy become.

This is not only a rotten theory but a dangerous one, for it lulls our people, leads them into a trap, and enables the class enemy to recuperate for the struggle against the Soviet Government.

On the contrary, the further forward we advance, the greater the successes we achieve, the greater will

be the fury of the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes, the more ready will they be to resort to sharper forms of struggle, the more will they seek to harm the Soviet state, and the more will they clutch at the most desperate means of struggle as the last resort of the doomed.

It must be borne in mind that the remnants of the defeated classes in the U.S.S.R. do not stand alone. They have the direct support of our enemies beyond the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. It would be a mistake to think that the sphere of the class struggle is limited to the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. One end of the class struggle operates within the frontiers of the U.S.S.R., but its other end stretches across the frontiers of the bourgeois states surrounding us. The remnants of the defeated classes cannot but be aware of this. And precisely because they are aware of it, they will continue their desperate sorties.

This is what history teaches us. This is what Leninism teaches us.

We must remember all this and be on the alert.

(8) We must smash and cast aside another rotten theory to the effect that a person who is not always engaged in wrecking and who even occasionally shows successes in his work cannot be a wrecker.

This strange theory exposes the naïveté of its authors. No wrecker will engage in wrecking all the time if he wants to avoid being exposed in the shortest possible time. On the contrary, the real wrecker must from time to time show successes in his work, for this is his only means of preservation as a wrecker, of winning the confidence of people and of continuing his wrecking work.

I think that this question is clear and requires no further explanation.

(9) We must smash and cast aside the third rotten theory to the effect that the systematic fulfilment of economic plans nullifies wrecking and its consequences.

Such a theory can only have one purpose, namely to tickle the self-esteem of our departmental officials, to lull them and to weaken their struggle against wrecking.

What does "the systematic fulfilment of our economic plans" mean?

Firstly, it has been proved that all our economic plans are too low, for they do not take into account the enormous reserves and possibilities lying hidden in our national economy.

Secondly, the total fulfilment of economic plans by the respective People's Commissariats does not mean that there are not some very important branches which fail to fulfil their plans. On the contrary, the facts go to show that quite a number of People's Commissariats which have fulfilled or even more than fulfilled the annual economic plans, systematically

fail to fulfil the plans in several very important branches of national economy.

Thirdly, there can be no doubt that had the wreckers not been exposed and ejected, the position in respect to the fulfilment of economic plans would have been far worse. This is something which the short-sighted authors of the theory under review ought to remember.

Fourthly, the wreckers usually time the main part of their wrecking work not for peace time, but for the eve of war, or for war itself. Suppose we lulled ourselves with this rotten "systematic fulfilment of economic plans" theory and did not touch the wreckers. Do the authors of this rotten theory appreciate what an enormous amount of harm the wreckers would do to our country in case of war if we allowed them to remain within the body of our national economy, sheltered by the rotten "systematic fulfilment of economic plans" theory?

Is it not clear that this "systematic fulfilment of economic plans" theory is a theory which is advantageous to the wreckers?

(10) We must smash and cast aside the fourth rotten theory to the effect that the Stakhanov movement is the principal means for the liquidation of wrecking.

This theory has been invented in order, amidst the noisy chatter about Stakhanovites and the Stakhanov movement, to parry the blow against the wreckers.

In his report Comrade Molotov quoted a number of facts which show how the Trotskyist and non-Trotskyist wreckers in the Kuznetsk and Donetz Basins abused the confidence of our politically careless comrades, systematically led the Stakhanovites by the nose, but spokes in their wheel, so to speak, deliberately created numerous obstacles to prevent them from working successfully and finally succeeded in disorganising their work. What can the Stakhanovites do alone if capital construction as carried on by the wreckers, let us say, in the Donetz Basin, caused the preparatory work of coal mining to lag behind all other branches of the work?

Is it not clear that the Stakhanov movement itself is in need of our real assistance against the various machinations of the wreckers so as to advance the movement and enable it to fulfil its great mission? Is it not clear that the struggle against wrecking, the fight to liquidate it, to curb this wrecking is a necessary condition to enable the Stakhanov movement to expand to the full?

I think that this question is also clear and needs no further comment.

(11) We must smash and cast aside the fifth rotten theory to the effect that the Trotskyist wreckers have no more reserves, that they are mustering their last cadres.

This is not true, comrades. Only naïve people

could invent such a theory. The Trotskyist wreckers have their reserves. These consist first of all of the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes in the U.S.S.R. They consist of a whole number of groups and organisations beyond the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. which are hostile to the Soviet Union.

Take, for example, the Trotskyist counter-revolutionary Fourth International, two-thirds of which is made up of spies and diversionist agents. Is not this a reserve? Is it not clear that this international of spies will provide forces of the spying and wrecking work of the Trotskyists?

Or take, for example, the group of that rascal, Schefflo, in Norway who provided a haven for the arch-spy Trotsky and helped him to harm the Soviet Union. Is not this group a reserve? Who can deny that this counter-revolutionary group will continue to render services to the Trotskyist spies and wreckers?

Or take, for example, the group of another rascal like Schefflo, the Souvarine group in France. Is not this a reserve? Can it be denied that this group of rascals will also help the Trotskyists in their espionage and wrecking work against the Soviet Union?

Those ladies and gentlemen from Germany, the Ruth Fischers, Maslovs, and Urbahns who have sold themselves body and soul to the Fascists—are they not reserves for the espionage and wrecking work of the Trotskyists?

Or take, for example, the well-known gang of writers in America headed by the well-known crook Eastman, all these pen pirates who live by slandering the working class of the Soviet Union—are they not reserves for Trotskyism?

No, the rotten theory that the Trotskyists are mustering their last forces must be cast aside.

(12) Finally we must smash and cast aside still another rotten theory to the effect that since we Bolsheviks are many, while the wreckers are few, since we Bolsheviks have the support of tens of millions of people, while the Trotskyist wreckers can be numbered in tens and units, then we Bolsheviks can afford to ignore this handful of wreckers.

This is wrong, comrades. This more than strange theory has been invented for the consolation of certain of our leading comrades who have failed in their work because of their inability to combat wrecking. It has been invented to lull their vigilance, to enable them to sleep peacefully.

Of course it is true that the Trotskyist wreckers have the support of individuals, while the Bolsheviks have the support of tens of millions of people. But it by no means follows from this that the wreckers are not able to inflict very serious damage on us. It does not need a large number of people to do harm and to cause damage. To build a Dnieper Dam tens

of thousands of workers have to be set to work. But to blow it up, only a score or so would be required. To win a battle in a war several Red Army corps may be required. But to nullify this gain at the front only a few spies are needed at Army Headquarters, or even at Divisional Headquarters, to steal the plan of operations and pass it on to the enemy. To build a big railway bridge thousands of people are required. But to blow it up a few are sufficient. Scores and hundreds of similar examples could be quoted.

Consequently, we must not comfort ourselves with the fact that we are many, while they, the Trotskyist wreckers, are few.

We must see to it that not a single Trotskyist wrecker is left in our ranks.

This is how the matter stands with the question of how to remove the defects in our work, which are common to all our organisations—economic, Soviet, administrative and Party.

Such are the measures that are necessary to remove these defects.

As regards the Party organisations in particular, and the defects in their work, the measures necessary to remove these defects are indicated in sufficient detail in the Draft Resolution submitted for your consideration. I think, therefore, that there is no need to enlarge on this aspect of the question here.

I would like to say just a few words on the question of political training and of improving our Party cadres.

I think that if we were able, if we succeeded in giving our Party cadres, from top to bottom, ideological training and in hardening them politically so that they could easily find their bearings in the internal and international situation, if we succeeded in making of them fully mature Leninists, Marxists, capable of solving the problems of leading the country without serious error, we would thereby solve nine-tenths of our problems.

What is the situation in regard to the leading forces of our Party?

In our Party, if we have in mind its leading strata, there are 3,000 to 4,000 first rank leaders. These are what I would call the generals of our Party.

Then there are 30,000 to 40,000 middle rank leaders, who are our Party's commissioned officers.

Then there are about 100,000 to 150,000 lower Party leaders who are, so to speak, our Party's non-commissioned officers.

The task is to raise the ideological level of these commanding cadres, to harden them politically, to infuse them with new forces which are awaiting promotion, and thus enlarge the ranks of these leading cadres.

What is needed for this?

First of all we must instruct each of our Party leaders, from secretaries of Party cells to secretaries

of Regional and Republic Party organisations, to select within a certain time two persons, two Party workers, who are capable of acting as his effective deputies. It might be asked: where are we to get these two deputies for each secretary, we have no such people, no workers who answer these requirements. This is wrong, comrades. We have tens of thousands of capable and talented people. All we have to do is to get to know them and promote them in time so as not to keep them in one place too long, until they begin to rot. Seek and ye shall find.

Further. For the Party instruction and re-training of secretaries of Party cells, four months' "*Party courses*" should be established in every Regional centre. The secretaries of all primary Party organisations (cells) should be sent to these courses, and when they finish and return home, their deputies and the most capable members of the primary Party organisations should be sent to these courses.

Further. For the political re-training of first secretaries of District organisations, eight months' "*Lenin courses*" should be established in, say, ten of the most important centres in the U.S.S.R. The first secretaries of District and Regional Party organisations should be sent to these courses, and when they finish and return home, their deputies and the most capable members of the District and Regional organisations should be sent.

Further. For the ideological re-training and political improvement of secretaries of city organisations, six months' "*Courses for the study of Party history and policy*" under the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. should be established. The first or second secretaries of city Party organisations should be sent to these courses, and when they finish and return home, the most capable members of the city Party organisations should be sent.

Finally, a six months' "*Conference on questions of internal and international policy*" under the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. should be established. The first secretaries of Regional and Territorial organisations and of Central Committees of national Communist Parties should be sent here. These comrades should provide not one but several relays, capable of replacing the leaders of the Central Committee of our Party. This should and must be done.

I now conclude, comrades.

We have thus indicated the main defects in our work, those which are common to all our organisations—economic, administrative and Party, and also those which are peculiar only to the Party organisations, defects which the enemies of the working class have taken advantage of in their diversionist and wrecking, espionage and terrorist work.

We have also indicated the principal measures that have to be adopted to remove these defects and to

render harmless the diversionist, wrecking, espionage and terrorist sorties of the Trotskyist-Fascist agents of the foreign intelligence services.

The question arises: can we carry out all these measures, have we all the necessary means for this?

Undoubtedly we can. We can because we have all the means necessary to carry out these measures.

What do we lack?

We lack only one thing, the readiness to rid ourselves of our carelessness, our complacency, our political short-sightedness.

There's the rub.

Cannot we, who have overthrown capitalism, who,

in the main, have built Socialism and have raised aloft the great banner of world Communism, get rid of this ridiculous and idiotic disease?

We have no reason to doubt that we shall certainly get rid of it, if, of course, we want to do so. We will not just get rid of it, but get rid of it in the Bolshevik way, in real earnest.

And when we get rid of this idiotic disease we shall be able to say with complete confidence that we fear no enemies from within or without, we do not fear their sorties, for we shall smash them in the future as we are smashing them now and as we have smashed them in the past. (*Applause.*)

REPLY TO DEBATE AT THE PLENUM OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P.S.U., MARCH 3, 1937

By J. STALIN

COMRADES, in my report I dealt with the main problems of the subject we are discussing. The debate has shown that there is now complete clarity among us, that we understand the tasks and that we are ready to remove the defects in our work. But the debate has also shown that there are several definite questions of our organisational and political practice on which there is not yet complete and clear understanding. I have counted seven such questions.

Permit me to say a few words about these questions.

(1) We must assume that everybody now understands and realises that excessive absorption in economic campaigns and allowing ourselves to be carried away by economic successes while Party political problems are under-estimated and forgotten, lead into a *cul de sac*. Consequently, the attention of Party workers must be turned in the direction of Party political problems so that economic successes may be combined and march side by side with successes in Party political work.

How, practically, can the task of reinforcing Party political work, the task of freeing Party organisations from minor economic details, be carried out? As is evident from the debate, some comrades are inclined to draw from this the wrong conclusion that economic work must now be abandoned entirely. At all events, there were voices which said in effect: Well, now, thank God, we shall be free from economic affairs, now we shall be able to devote our attention to Party political work. Is this conclusion correct? No, it is not correct. When our Party comrades who were carried away by

economic successes abandoned politics, it meant going to the extreme, for which we had to pay dearly. If, now, some comrades, in setting to work to reinforce Party political work, think of abandoning economic work, this will be going to the other extreme, for which we shall pay no less dearly. You must not rush from one extreme to the other. Politics cannot be separated from economics. We can no more abandon economics than we can abandon politics. For convenience of study people usually, methodologically separate problems of economy from problems of politics. But this is only done methodologically, artificially, only for convenience of study. In real life, however, in practice, politics are inseparable from economics. They exist together and operate together. And whoever thinks of separating economics from politics in our practical work, of reinforcing economic work at the expense of political work, or, on the contrary, of reinforcing political work at the expense of economic work, will inevitably find himself in a *cul de sac*.

The meaning of the point in the Draft Resolution on freeing Party organisations from minor economic details and increasing Party political work is not that we must abandon economic work and economic leadership, but merely that we must no longer permit our Party organisations to supersede the business organisations, particularly the land departments, and deprive them of personal responsibility. Consequently, we must learn the Bolshevik method of leading business organisations, which is, systematically to help these organisations, systematically to strengthen them and to guide economy, not over the heads of

these organisations, but through the medium of them. We must give the business organisations, and primarily the land departments, the best people, we must fill the staffs of these organisations with fresh workers of the best type who are capable of carrying out the duties entrusted to them. Only after this has been done can we count on the Party organisations being quite free from minor economic details. Of course, this is a serious matter and requires a certain amount of time. But until it is done the Party organisations will have to continue for a short period to deal very closely with agricultural affairs, with all the details of ploughing, sowing, harvesting, etc.

(2) Two words about wreckers, diversionists, spies, etc. I think it is clear to everybody now that the present-day wreckers and diversionists, no matter what disguise they may adopt, either Trotskyist or Bukharinist, have long ceased to be a political trend in the Labour Movement, that they have become transformed into a gang of professional wreckers, diversionists, spies and assassins, without principles and without ideals. Of course, these gentlemen must be ruthlessly smashed and uprooted as the enemies of the working class, as betrayers of our country. This is clear and requires no further explanation.

But the question arises: how is this task of smashing and uprooting the Japano-German Trotskyist agents to be carried out in practice? Does that mean that we must strike at and uproot, not only real Trotskyists, but also those who at some time or other wavered in the direction of Trotskyism and then, long ago, abandoned Trotskyism; not only those who are really Trotskyist wrecking agents, but also those who, at some time or other, had occasion to walk down a street through which some Trotskyist had passed? At all events, such voices were heard at this Plenum. Can such an interpretation of the Resolution be regarded as correct? No, it cannot be regarded as correct. In this matter, as in all others, an individual, discriminate approach is required. You cannot measure everybody with the same yardstick. Such a wholesale approach can only hinder the fight against the real Trotskyist wreckers and spies.

Among our responsible comrades there are a number of former Trotskyists who abandoned Trotskyism long ago and are fighting Trotskyism not less and perhaps more effectively than some of our respected comrades who have never wavered in the direction of Trotskyism. It would be foolish to cast a slur upon such comrades now.

Among our comrades there are some who ideologically were always opposed to Trotskyism, but who, notwithstanding this, maintained personal connections with individual Trotskyists which they did not hesitate to dissolve as soon as the practical features of Trotskyism became clear to them. Of

course, it would have been better had they broken off their personal friendly connections with individual Trotskyists at once, and not only after some delay. But it would be foolish to lump such comrades with the Trotskyists.

(3) What does choosing the right people and putting them in the right place mean?

It means, firstly, choosing workers according to political principle, *i.e.*, whether they are worthy of political confidence, and secondly, according to business principle, *i.e.*, whether they are fit for such and such a definite job.

This means that the business approach must not be transformed into a narrow business approach, when people interest themselves in the business qualifications of a worker but do not interest themselves in his political face.

It means that the political approach must not be transformed into the sole and exclusive approach, when people interest themselves in the political face of the worker but do not interest themselves in his business qualifications.

Can it be said that this Bolshevik rule is adhered to by our Party comrades? Unfortunately, this cannot be said. Reference was made to this at this Plenum. But not everything was said about it. The point is that this tried and tested rule is frequently violated in our practical work, and violated in the most flagrant manner. Most often, workers are chosen not for objective reasons, but for casual, subjective, philistine, petty-bourgeois reasons. Most often, so-called acquaintances, friends, fellow-townsmen, personally devoted people, masters in the art of praising their chiefs, are chosen without regard for their political and business fitness.

Naturally, instead of a leading group of responsible workers we get a little family of intimate people, an artel, the members of which try to live in peace, try not to offend each other, not to wash dirty linen in public, to praise each other, and from time to time send vapid and sickening reports to the centre about successes.

It is not difficult to understand that in such a family atmosphere there can be no place for criticism of defects in the work, or for self-criticism by leaders of the work.

Of course, such a family atmosphere creates a favourable medium for the cultivation of toadies, of people who lack a sense of self-respect, and therefore have nothing in common with Bolshevism.

Take for example Comrades Mirzoyan and Vainov. The first is the secretary of the Kazakhstan Territorial Party Organisation, and the second is the secretary of the Yaroslavl Regional Party Organisation. These people are not the worst in our midst. But how do they choose workers? The first dragged with him to Kazakhstan from Azerbaidjan and the Urals,

where he had worked formerly, thirty to forty of his "own" people and placed them in responsible positions in Kazakhstan. The second dragged with him to Yaroslavl from the Donetz Basin, where he had worked formerly, over a dozen of his "own" people and also placed them in responsible positions. And so Comrade Mirzoyan has his own artel. And Comrade Vainov also has his own artel. Guided by the Bolshevik method of choosing and placing people, could they not choose workers from among the local people? Of course they could. Why, then, did they not do so? Because the Bolshevik method of choosing workers precludes the possibility of a philistine petty-bourgeois approach, precludes the possibility of choosing workers on the family and artel principle. Moreover, in choosing as workers people who were personally devoted to them, these comrades evidently wanted to make themselves, to some extent, independent of the local people and independent of the Central Committee of the Party. Let us assume that Comrades Mirzoyan and Vainov, owing to some circumstance or other, are transferred from their present place of work to some other place. What, in such a case, will they do with their "tails"? Will they drag them again to the new places where they are going to work?

This is the absurd position to which the violation of the Bolshevik rule of properly choosing and placing people leads.

(4) What does testing workers, verifying the fulfilment of tasks, mean?

Testing workers means testing them, not by their promises and declarations, but by the results of their work.

Verifying the fulfilment of tasks means verifying and testing, not only in offices and only by means of formal reports, but primarily at the place of work, according to actual results.

Is such testing and verification required at all? Undoubtedly it is required. It is required, firstly, because only such testing and verification enables us to get to know the worker, to determine his real qualifications. It is required, secondly, because only such testing and verification enables us to determine the virtues and defects of the executive apparatus. It is required, thirdly, because only such testing and verification enables us to determine the virtues and defects of the tasks that are set.

Some comrades think that people can be tested only from above, when leaders test those who are led by the results of their work. That is not true. Of course, testing from above is needed as one of the effective measures for testing people and verifying the fulfilment of tasks. But testing from above far from exhausts the whole business of testing. There is another kind of test, the test from below, when the masses, when those who are led, test the leaders, draw

attention to their mistakes and indicate the way in which these mistakes may be rectified. This sort of testing is one of the most effective methods of testing people.

The Party membership tests its leaders at meetings of Party *actives*, at conferences and at congresses by hearing their reports, by criticising defects and, finally, by electing or not electing this or that leading comrade to leading bodies. The strict adherence to democratic centralism in the Party, as the rules of our Party demand, the obligatory election of Party bodies, the right to nominate and to object to candidates, secret ballot, freedom of criticism and self-criticism—all these and similar measures must be carried out in order, among other things, to facilitate the testing and control of Party leaders by the Party membership.

The non-Party masses test their business, trade union and other leaders at meetings of non-Party *actives*, at mass conferences of all kinds, at which they hear the reports of their leaders, criticise defects and indicate the way in which these defects may be removed.

Finally, the people test the leaders of the country during elections of the government bodies of the Soviet Union by means of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage.

The task is to combine testing from above with testing from below.

(5) What does educating cadres on their own mistakes mean?

Lenin taught that conscientiously exposing the mistakes of the Party, studying the causes which gave rise to these mistakes and indicating the way in which these mistakes may be rectified are one of the surest means of properly training and educating Party cadres, of properly training and educating the working class and the toiling masses. Lenin says:

"The attitude of a political party toward its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest criteria of the seriousness of the party and of how it fulfils in practice its obligations toward its class and toward the toiling masses. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyse the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it—these are the signs of a serious party; this means the performance of its duties, this means educating and training the class, and then the masses."

This means that it is the duty of Bolsheviks, not to gloss over their mistakes, not to wriggle out of admitting their mistakes, as often happens among us, but honestly and openly to admit their mistakes, honestly and openly to indicate the way in which these mistakes may be rectified, honestly and openly to rectify their mistakes.

I would not say that many of our comrades would cheerfully agree to do this. But Bolsheviks, if they really want to be Bolsheviks, must have the courage

openly to admit their mistakes, to reveal their causes, indicate the way in which they may be rectified, and in that way help the Party to give the cadres a proper training and proper political education. For only in this way, only in an atmosphere of open and honest self-criticism, is it possible to educate real Bolshevik cadres, is it possible to educate real Bolshevik leaders.

Two examples to demonstrate the correctness of Lenin's thesis.

Take, for example, our mistakes in collective farm construction. You, no doubt, remember 1930, when our Party comrades thought they could solve the very complicated problem of transferring the peasantry to collective farm construction in a matter of three or four months, and when the Central Committee of the Party found itself obliged to curb these over-zealous comrades. This was one of the most dangerous periods in the life of our Party. The mistake was that our Party comrades forgot about the voluntary nature of collective farm construction, forgot that the peasants could not be transferred to the collective farm path by administrative pressure, they forgot that collective farm construction required, not several months, but several years of careful and thoughtful work. They forgot about this and did not want to admit their mistakes. You, no doubt, remember that the Central Committee's reference to comrades being dizzy with success and its warning to our comrades in the districts not to run too far ahead and ignore the real situation were met with hostility. But this did not restrain the Central Committee from going against the stream and turning our Party comrades to the right path. Well? It is now clear to everybody that the Party achieved its aim by turning our Party comrades to the right path. Now we have tens of thousands of excellent peasant cadres for collective farm construction and for collective farm leadership. These cadres were educated and trained on the mistakes of 1930. But we would not have had these cadres to-day had not the Party realised its mistakes then, and had it not rectified them in time.

The other example is taken from the sphere of industrial construction. I have in mind our mistakes in the period of the Shakhti wrecking. Our mistakes were that we did not fully appreciate the danger of the technical backwardness of our cadres in industry, we were reconciled to this backwardness and thought that we could develop extensive Socialist industrial construction with the aid of specialists who were hostile to us, dooming our own business cadres to the role of bad commissars attached to bourgeois specialists. You, no doubt, remember how unwillingly our business cadres admitted their mistakes at that time, how unwillingly they admitted their technical backwardness, and how slowly they assimilated the slogan "master technique." Well? The facts show that the slogan "master technique" had

good effects and produced good results. Now we have tens and hundreds of thousands of excellent Bolshevik business cadres who have already mastered technique and are advancing our industry. But we would not have had these cadres now had the Party yielded to the stubbornness of the business leaders who would not admit their technical backwardness, had not the Party realised its mistakes then, and had it not rectified them in time.

Some comrades say that it is inexpedient to talk openly about our mistakes, as the open admission of our mistakes may be construed by our enemies as our weakness and may be utilised by them. That is nonsense, comrades, sheer nonsense. On the contrary, the open admission of our mistakes and their honest rectification can only strengthen our Party, raise the prestige of our Party in the eyes of the workers, peasants and working intelligentsia, increase the strength and might of our state. And that is the main thing. If only the workers, peasants and working intelligentsia are with us, all the rest will come.

Other comrades say that the open admission of our mistakes may lead, not to the training and strengthening of our cadres, but to their becoming weaker and disturbed, that we must spare and take care of our cadres, that we must spare their self-esteem and peace of mind. And so they propose that we gloss over the mistakes of our comrades, relax criticism and, still better, ignore these mistakes. Such a line is not only radically wrong but extremely dangerous, dangerous first of all for the cadres whom they want to "spare" and "take care of." To spare and take care of cadres by glossing over their mistakes means killing these very cadres for certain. We would certainly have killed our collective farm Bolshevik cadres had we not exposed the mistakes of 1930, and had we not educated them on these mistakes. We would certainly have killed our industrial Bolshevik cadres had we not exposed the mistakes of our comrades in the period of the Shakhti wrecking, and had we not educated our industrial cadres on these mistakes. Whoever thinks of sparing the self-esteem of our cadres by glossing over their mistakes is killing the cadres and the self-esteem of cadres, for by glossing over their mistakes he helps them to make fresh and perhaps even more serious mistakes, which, we may assume, will lead to the complete breakdown of the cadres, to the detriment of their "self-esteem" and "peace of mind."

(6) Lenin taught us not only to teach the masses, but also to learn from the masses.

What does that mean?

It means that we, the leaders, must not get swelled heads, must not think that because we are members of the Central Committee, or People's Commissars, we possess *all the knowledge necessary* to lead

properly. Rank alone does not give knowledge and experience. Still less does title.

It means that our experience alone, the experience of the leaders, is not sufficient to enable us to lead properly, that, consequently, we must supplement our experience, the experience of the leaders, with the experience of the masses, the experience of the Party membership, the experience of the working class, the experience of the people.

It means that we must not for a moment relax, let alone sever our ties with the masses.

And finally, it means that we must listen attentively to the voice of the masses, to the voice of the rank-and-file members of the Party, to the voice of the so-called "little people," to the voice of the people.

What does leading properly mean?

It does not in the least mean sitting in offices and writing instructions.

Leading properly means:

Firstly, finding the proper solution to a problem; but it is impossible to find the proper solution to a problem without taking into account the experience of the masses who feel the results of our leadership on their own backs;

Secondly, organising the application of the correct solution, which, however, cannot be done without the direct assistance of the masses;

Thirdly, organising the verification of the fulfilment of this solution, which again cannot be done without the direct assistance of the masses.

We, the leaders, see things, events and people only from one side, I would say, from above; consequently, our field of vision is more or less limited. The masses, on the other hand, see things, events and people from the other side, I would say, from below; consequently, their field of vision is also to some extent limited. In order to find the proper solution to a problem these two experiences must be combined. Only then will the leadership be correct.

This is what not only teaching the masses but also learning from the masses means.

Two examples to demonstrate the correctness of Lenin's thesis.

This happened several years ago. We, the members of the Central Committee, were discussing the question of improving the situation in the Donetz Basin. The measures proposed by the People's Commissariat of Heavy Industry were obviously unsatisfactory. Three times we sent the proposals back to the People's Commissariat of Heavy Industry. And three times we got different proposals from the People's Commissariat of Heavy Industry. But even then we could not regard them as satisfactory. Finally we decided to call several workers and lower business and trade union officials from the Donetz Basin. For three days we discussed matters with these comrades. And all of us members of the

Central Committee had to admit that only these ordinary workers, these "little people," were able to suggest the proper solution to us. You no doubt remember the decision of the Central Committee and of the Council of People's Commissars on measures for increasing coal output in the Donetz Basin. Well, this decision of the Central Committee and the Council of People's Commissars, which all our comrades admitted was a correct and even a remarkable one, was suggested to us by simple people from the ranks.

The other example. I have in mind the case of Comrade Nikolayenko. Who is Nikolayenko? Nikolayenko is a rank-and-file member of the Party. She is an ordinary "little person." For a whole year she had been giving signals that all was not well in the Party organisation in Kiev; she exposed the family spirit, the philistine petty-bourgeois approach to workers, the suppression of self-criticism, the prevalence of Trotskyist wreckers. But she was constantly brushed aside as if she were a pestiferous fly. Finally, in order to get rid of her they expelled her from the Party. Neither the Kiev organisation nor the Central Committee of the C.P. of the Ukraine helped her to bring the truth to light. The intervention of the Central Committee of the Party alone helped to unravel the knot. And what transpired after the case was investigated? It transpired that Nikolayenko was right and the Kiev organisation was wrong. Neither more nor less. And yet, who is Nikolayenko? Of course, she is not a member of the Central Committee, she is not a People's Commissar, she is not the secretary of the Kiev Regional Organisation, she is not even the secretary of a Party cell, she is only a simple rank-and-file member of the Party.

As you see, simple people sometimes prove to be much nearer to the truth than some high institutions.

I could quote scores and hundreds of similar examples. Thus you see that our experience alone, the experience of the leaders, is far from enough for the leadership of our cause. In order to lead properly the experience of the leaders must be supplemented by the experience of the Party membership, the experience of the working class, the experience of the toilers, the experience of the so-called "little people."

But when is it possible to do that?

It is possible to do that only when the leaders are most closely connected with the masses, when they are connected with the Party membership, with the working class, with the peasantry, with the working intelligentsia.

Connection with the masses, strengthening this connection, readiness to heed the voice of the masses—herein lies the strength and invincibility of Bolshevik leadership.

We may take it as the rule that as long as the

Bolsheviks maintain connection with the broad masses of the people they will be invincible. And, on the contrary, as soon as the Bolsheviks become severed from the masses and lose their connection with them, as soon as they become covered with bureaucratic rust, they will lose all their strength and become a mere squib.

In the mythology of the ancient Greeks there is the celebrated hero Antæus who, so the legend goes, was the son of Poseidon, god of the seas, and Gæa, goddess of the earth. Antæus was particularly attached to his mother who gave birth to him, suckled him and reared him. There was not a hero whom this Antæus did not vanquish. He was regarded as an invincible hero. Wherein lay his strength? It lay in the fact that every time he was hard pressed in the fight against his adversary he touched the earth, his mother, who gave birth to him and suckled him, and that gave him new strength. But he had a vulnerable spot—the danger of being detached from the earth in some way or other. His enemies took this into account and watched for it. One day an enemy appeared who took advantage of this vulnerable spot and vanquished Antæus. This was Hercules. How did Hercules vanquish Antæus? He lifted him off the ground, kept him suspended, prevented him from touching the ground and throttled him.

I think that the Bolsheviks remind us of the hero of Greek mythology, Antæus. They, like Antæus, are strong because they maintain connection with their mother, the masses, who gave birth to them, suckled them and reared them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible.

This is the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership.

(7) Lastly, one more question. I have in mind the question of the formal and heartlessly bureaucratic attitude of some of our Party comrades towards the fate of individual members of the Party, to the question of expelling members from the Party, or the question of reinstating expelled members of the Party. The point is that some of our Party leaders suffer from a lack of concern for people, for members of the Party, for workers. More than that, they do not study members of the Party, do not know what interests they have, how they are developing; generally, they do not know the workers. That is why they have no individual approach to Party members and Party workers. And because they have no individual approach in appraising Party members and Party workers they usually act in a haphazard way: either they praise them wholesale, without measure, or roundly abuse them, also wholesale and without measure, and expel thousands and tens of thousands of members from the Party. Such leaders

generally try to think in tens of thousands, not caring about "units," about individual members of the Party, about their fate. They regard the expulsion of thousands and tens of thousands of people from the Party as a mere trifle and console themselves with the thought that our Party has two million members and that the expulsion of tens of thousands cannot in any way affect the Party's position. But only those who are in fact profoundly anti-Party can have such an approach to members of the Party.

As a result of this heartless attitude towards people, towards members of the Party and Party workers, discontent and bitterness is artificially created among a section of the Party, and the Trotskyist double-dealers cunningly hook on to such embittered comrades and skilfully drag them into the bog of Trotskyist wrecking.

Taken by themselves, the Trotskyists never represented a big force in our Party. Recall the last discussion in our Party in 1927. That was a real Party referendum. Of a total of 854,000 members of the Party, 730,000 took part in the voting. Of these, 724,000 members of the Party voted for the Bolsheviks, for the Central Committee of the Party and against the Trotskyists, while 4,000 members of the Party, *i.e.*, about one-half per cent., voted for the Trotskyists, and 2,600 members of the Party abstained from voting. One hundred and twenty-three thousand members of the Party did not take part in the voting. They did not take part in the voting either because they were away, or because they were working on night shift. If to the 4,000 who voted for the Trotskyists we add all those who abstained from voting, on the assumption that they, too, sympathised with the Trotskyists, and if to this number we add, not half per cent. of those who did not take part in the voting, as we should do by right, but five per cent., *i.e.*, about 6,000 Party members, we will get about 12,000 Party members who, in one way or another, sympathised with Trotskyism. This is the whole strength of Messieurs the Trotskyists. Add to this the fact that many of them became disillusioned with Trotskyism and left it, and you will get an idea of the insignificance of the Trotskyist forces. And in spite of this the Trotskyist wreckers have some reserves around our Party it is because the wrong policy of some of our comrades on the question of expelling and reinstating members of the Party, the heartless attitude of some of our comrades towards the fate of individual members of the Party and individual workers, artificially creates a number of discontented and embittered people, and thus creates these reserves for the Trotskyists.

For the most part people are expelled for so-called passivity. What is passivity? It transpires that if a member of the Party has not *thoroughly mastered* the Party programme he is regarded as passive and sub-

ject to expulsion. But that is wrong, comrades. You cannot interpret the rules of our Party in such a pedantic fashion. In order to thoroughly master the Party programme one must be a real Marxist, a tried and theoretically trained Marxist. I do not know whether we have many members of the Party who have thoroughly mastered our programme, who have become real Marxists, theoretically trained and tried. If we continued further along this path we would have to leave only intellectuals and learned people generally in our Party. Who wants such a Party? We have Lenin's thoroughly tried and tested formula defining a member of the Party. According to this formula a member of the Party is one who *accepts* the programme of the Party, pays membership dues and works in one of its organisations. Please note: Lenin's formula does not speak about *thoroughly mastering* the programme, but about *accepting* the programme. These are two very different things. It is not necessary to prove that Lenin is right here and not our Party comrades who chatter idly about thoroughly mastering the programme. That should be clear. If the Party had proceeded from the assumption that only those comrades who have thoroughly mastered the programme and have become theoretically trained Marxists could be members of the Party it would not have created thousands of Party circles, hundreds of Party schools where the members of the Party are taught Marxism, and where they are assisted to master our programme. It is quite clear that if our Party organises such schools and circles for members of the Party it is because it knows that the members of the Party have

not thoroughly mastered the Party programme, have not yet become theoretically trained Marxists.

Consequently, in order to rectify our policy on the question of Party membership and on expulsion from the Party we must put a stop to the present block-head interpretation of the question of passivity.

But there is another error in this sphere. It is that our comrades recognise no mean between two extremes. It is enough for a worker, a member of the Party, to commit a slight offence, to come late to a Party meeting once or twice, or to fail to pay membership dues for some reason or other, to be kicked out of the Party in a trice. No interest is taken in the degree to which he is to blame, the reason why he failed to attend a meeting, the reason why he did not pay membership dues. The bureaucratic approach displayed on these questions is positively unprecedented. It is not difficult to understand that it is precisely the result of this heartless policy that excellent, skilled workers, excellent Stakhanovites, found themselves expelled from the Party. Was it not possible to caution them before expelling them from the Party, or if that had no effect, to reprove or reprimand them, and if that had no effect, to put them on probation for a certain period, or, as an extreme measure, to reduce them to the position of candidates, but not expel them from the Party at one stroke? Of course it was. But this calls for concern for people, for the members of the Party, for the fate of members of the Party. And this is exactly what some of our comrades lack.

It is time, comrades, high time, to put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs. (*Applause.*)

THE HISTORIC PLENUM OF THE C.C. OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIK) OF THE SOVIET UNION

THE last Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. was one of the most important historical stages on the victorious path of the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, of the guide, teacher and leader of the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

With the introduction of the Stalin Constitution there opens up a new period in the development of the dictatorship of the working class of the U.S.S.R. The operation of this new Constitution, which has given shape to, and laid on record, all the gains of the toilers of the U.S.S.R., signifies at the same time a *turning point in the political life of the country.*

This turning point consists, first and foremost, in the further democratisation of the electoral system.

In all the Soviets of deputies of the working people, up to and including the Supreme Council of the U.S.S.R., there has been established universal, direct, equal suffrage by secret ballot. All citizens who have arrived at the age of 18 years will take part in the elections. A consequence of the democratisation of the electoral system will be a further tremendous increase in the political activity of the masses. New sections of the working people are being drawn into the management of the state. *Hundreds of thousands of deputies* will be elected to the different grades of Soviets on the basis of universal suffrage. In addition, the Constitution introduces the referendum.

In the light of this flourish of democracy, one

hitherto unheard of in the history of mankind, the anti-Soviet slanderers of all countries, especially those who for so many years have howled in the ranks of the working-class movement about the incompatibility of the dictatorship of the proletariat and true democracy, have completely disgraced themselves. To-day everybody can see that democracy and liberty can flourish properly only on the basis of the dictatorship of the working class. And the enemies of the Soviet Union are making a profound mistake when they hope that the dictatorship of the working class in the U.S.S.R. will now become less stable. The exact opposite is true; the basis of the dictatorship of the working class becomes still more stable, for its foundation is broadened. As the Plenum of the Central Committee noted, the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes a more flexible and, consequently, a more powerful system of the state guidance of society by the working class.

It is clear that all this presupposes a tremendous expansion of the activity of the *Communist Party* of the Soviet Union. And in fact the Party is confronted with the task of taking the lead in this turn in the political life of the country, of developing its contacts on a wide scale throughout the country with millions of working people; of being able, in accordance with the changed conditions brought about by the new electoral system, to carry out in a new fashion its great role of guide, teacher and leader of the people.

It was to the tasks connected with this preparation of the Party organisations that the Plenum of the C.C. devoted particular attention. It was to these tasks that there were devoted the decisions of the Plenum on the report of Comrade *Zhdanov*. It was with these tasks that there were inwardly connected the exceptionally valuable speeches of Comrade *Stalin* made at the Plenum, namely, his report and concluding speech on the defects in Party work and measures for liquidating Trotskyist and other double-dealers.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Bolshevik Party, on the basis of the guiding lines of Comrade *Stalin* and of the decisions adopted at the Plenum, will cope fully with all its great tasks. And its new victories in the development of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. will thus strengthen the struggle for Socialism throughout the whole world. But apart from this most important result, the decisions of the Plenum will contain a real wealth of guiding lines enabling the brother parties in the capitalist countries directly to master the very valuable experience of the C.P.S.U., the leading Party of the international proletariat.

* * * *

Wherein lies the tremendous strength of the Party of Lenin and Stalin?

In its correct relations with the working class and the broad masses of the working people.

The entire history of this Party proves that the Party has always trusted the masses and always valued the confidence of the masses. It stood at the head of the masses in the 1905 revolution; during the years of reaction, driven underground again, it worked unceasingly to strengthen its connections with the masses. In 1917, by its correct slogans and stubborn work among the masses, it won the confidence of the majority of the working people and led them to the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and landowners. During the course of the almost 20 years of existence of the dictatorship of the working class, during the period of the civil war, during the years of the restoration of the national economy which had been destroyed by the war, during the years of Stalin's Five-Year Plans, during all this period the C.P.S.U. has always been able to lead the struggle of the masses against all, not only the overt, but covert enemies of Socialism, and completely to isolate and crush them, while drawing ever wider masses into the conscious struggle for the building of Socialism.

On the basis of their own experience, the masses have become convinced that the Communist Party is the true and faithful guardian of the interests of the working class and of all working people. The masses have become convinced of the correctness of its policy and leadership, and therefore trust it.

To all enemies of the Soviet Union this confidence of the masses in the Communist Party is the most striking, most unpleasant fact of the whole of Soviet life. It is not for nothing that they always try to dispute and cover up the fact that the Party of Lenin and Stalin enjoys the confidence of the masses in its leadership of the country.

Lenin always taught the Party the need for building its work on the basis of "*mutual confidence* between the vanguard of the working class and the working masses."

Comrade *Stalin* developed and firmly operated this Leninist principle of mutual confidence between the Party and the masses. In 1926, Comrade *Stalin* said that mutual confidence between the Party and the masses:

"First of all, means that the Party must closely heed the voice of the masses, must pay close attention to their revolutionary instinct, must study the practice of the struggle of the masses, and on this basis test the correctness of its own policy—and must therefore, not only teach the masses, but also learn from them.

"It means, in the second place, that the Party must from day to day win the confidence of the proletarian masses; that by its policy and its work it must secure the support of the masses; that it must not command but above all convince the masses and help them to realise by their own experience the correctness of the policy of the Party; that it must therefore be the guide, the leader,

the teacher of its own class." (Stalin: "Leninism," Part 1, p. 283.)

This is what Comrade Stalin said 11 years ago, when, in the struggle against the Trotskyist and Zinovievist enemies of the Party, he defended with all his might the Leninist position regarding the correct relations between the Party and the masses.

And now at the last Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. he again teaches the Party to build up all its activities on this principle. "Connection with the masses," says he, "strengthens this connection, readiness to heed the voice of the masses—herein lies the strength and invincibility of Bolshevik leadership."

Giving concrete examples of how rank and file workers, "the little people," were able to prompt the leadership of the Party and the State in the taking of correct decisions and to utter warnings as to the presence of Trotskyist enemies in the Party organisation, Comrade Stalin explained:

"We, the leaders, see things, events and people only from one side, I would say, from above; consequently our field of vision is more or less limited. The masses, on the other hand, see things, events and people from the other side, I would say, from below; consequently their field of vision is also to some extent limited. In order to find the proper solution of the question, these two experiences must be combined. Only then will the leadership be correct. This is what not only teaching the masses but also learning from the masses means."

Comrade Stalin stressed the point that:

"... as long as the Bolsheviks maintain connection with the broad masses of the people they will be invincible. And on the contrary, as soon as the Bolsheviks become severed from the masses and lose their connection with them, as soon as they become covered with bureaucratic rust, they will lose all their strength and become a mere quib."

Comrade Stalin expressed his thought particularly forcefully, drawing a comparison between the Bolsheviks and Antæus, the hero of Greek mythology. "They," he declared, "like Antæus, are strong because they maintain connection with their mother, the masses who gave birth to them, suckled them and reared them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible."

This is the first point that all Communists need thoroughly to master from the speech of Comrade Stalin at the C.C. Plenum. And it is no less important and essential for the Communist Parties of the capitalist world, than for the C.P.S.U.

* * * *

Everybody is aware of the tremendous successes achieved by the Soviet economic and other organisations under the guidance of the Communists, in connection with the fulfilment of the two Five-Year Plans. These great achievements astounded the whole world. But many Party comrades, engrossed in economic work, carried away by successes, forgot

all about the machinations of the class enemy. Therein were to be seen the bad sides of our successes, the dangers connected with our achievements, as explained by Comrade Stalin at the Plenum of the Central Committee:

"These dangers are that among people not being skilled in politics and not having seen much, the atmosphere of successes—success after success, achievement after achievement, overfulfilment of plans after overfulfilment of plans—gives rise to carelessness and self satisfaction, creates an atmosphere of showy triumphs and mutual congratulations, which kills the sense of proportion and dulls political intuition takes the spring out of people and causes them to rest on their laurels."

The disease of carelessness expressed itself first and foremost in the fact that Party comrades did not see through the wrecking, diversionist and spying activities of the Trotskyist agents of Fascism and other double-dealers. During a number of years these enemies of the people, with their Party cards as a screen, made use of the confidence of honest Party leaders and were able to engage in wrecking, spying and the organisation of foul attempts on the lives of workers, Red army men and leaders of the Party. Party comrades failed to notice that Trotskyism had long *ceased to be a political trend in the working-class movement* and had become converted into a gang of assassins and spies, preparing hand in glove with German and Japanese secret service agents the conditions for a military defeat of the Soviet Union and the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. Party comrades also failed to see through the anti-Party activities of the group of the Rights, Bukharin and Rykov, who descended to the position of desiring the restoration of capitalism and who have now been expelled from the ranks of the Party by the Plenum.

That political vigilance was blunted in a number of Party organisations and among their leaders was also connected with the fact that they had forgotten that the U.S.S.R. is encircled by hostile *capitalist countries*. Aware that the Trotskyists could not reckon upon any mass support in the country and that only the remnants of the crushed capitalist classes—and such still exist—could support them, the comrades, suffering from the disease of carelessness, paid no attention to the repeated warnings of Comrade Stalin and the Central Committee of the Party to the effect that the class war is not on the wane, and that the class enemy will not become more tame as Socialist construction advances. "On the contrary," said Comrade Stalin, "the further forward we advance the greater the successes we achieve, the greater will be the fury of the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes, the more ready will they be to resort to sharper forms of struggle, the more will they seek to harm the Soviet state, and the more will they clutch at the most desperate means of struggle as the last resort of the doomed."

Further, Comrade *Stalin* says:

"It must be borne in mind that the remnants of the defeated classes in the U.S.S.R. do not stand alone. They have the direct support of our enemies beyond the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. It would be a mistake to think that the sphere of the class struggle is limited to the borders of the U.S.S.R. One end of the class struggle operates within the frontiers of the U.S.S.R., but its other end stretches across the frontiers of the bourgeois states surrounding us. The remnants of the defeated classes cannot but be aware of this. And precisely because they are aware of it, they will continue their desperate sorties."

It is just this that many Party comrades missed. The idea that the Trotskyist spies and diversionists have no more reserves is also a harmful illusion. Besides the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes in the U.S.S.R., they have reserves beyond the frontiers of the Soviet Union in the shape of various organisations acting under the label of the "Fourth International," in the shape of "circles provocateurs," grouped around all kinds of "left" and right renegades in Germany, France, Scandinavia, the United States, and so on.

Obviously, the Trotskyist wreckers, when engaged in their wrecking work, had at the same time to fulfil the industrial plans in part, in order to cover themselves. Thus it was easier for them to deceive our Party comrades.

The chief shortcoming in many Party organisations and among their leaders was that they forgot Party political work. In some Party organisations this went so far as complete neglect of this work (the Azov-Black Sea Area Committee, the Kiev Regional Committee, the C.C. of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and others). In places this led to Party organs taking over the functions of the Soviet and economic organisations. Many secretaries of Party committees began more to resemble engineers, agronomists and bookkeepers, than political leaders. Such Party organisations, of course, were not in a position to fulfil the special role of the Party, which consists in *uniting* the work of all mass organisations of the working people and *directing* their activities towards the basic goal of the working class.

In his article, on "Problems of Leninism," when speaking of the leading role of the Party, Comrade *Stalin* taught us that:

"Of course this does not mean that the Party can or should become a substitute for the trade unions, the Soviets and the other mass organisations. The Party realises the dictatorship of the proletariat. It does so, however, not directly, but with the help of the trade unions, and through the Soviets and their ramifications. Without these (belts) anything like a firm dictatorship would be impossible." (*Stalin*: "Leninism." Part 1, p. 278.)

The Plenum of the Central Committee made it obligatory upon all Party organisations to reorganise and raise the *Party-political work* to its proper level. This, of course, does not mean that they should wash

their hands of economic work and economic leadership. No, by using the correct method of leadership and combining Party-political with economic work, the Party organs will in future as well afford systematic assistance to the economic organisations and guide economy, not, however, apart from these organs, but through them; and this will undoubtedly encourage an all-round improvement in their work and an even more rapid improvement in industry, transport and agriculture.

However, a tremendous increase in their *political* activity is moreover required of all Party organisations. In addition to the former slogan of "mastering technique," Comrade *Stalin* has now advanced the slogan of "mastering Bolshevism," thereby showing the Party the true path of advance. Under this slogan the whole of the Party will reconstruct its work and prepare itself for the oncoming new tasks and, in particular, for the general elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

Of course, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the hidden agents of the class enemy will at the forthcoming elections endeavour in some parts to try their strength in order to use Soviet democracy for their own counter-revolutionary tends. But it can be said in advance that nothing will come of their attempts. The Party of Lenin and *Stalin* will meet the elections fully prepared. The decisions of the Plenum have mobilised the whole of the Party around the task of completely abolishing all carelessness, complacency and short-sightedness from their ranks.

In this struggle to do away with carelessness and complacency in the ranks of the Party, the C.P.S.U. affords an example to the Communist Parties of all countries.

* * * *

In demanding the reorganisation of Party work, the Plenum laid stress upon the realisation of *inner-Party democracy*, upon the complete practical fulfilment of the Leninist principles of the building of the Party, namely, *democratic centralism*.

The Plenum made it incumbent upon all Party organisations to abolish the practice of co-opting members to Party committees and to restore the principle of election to leading committees of Party organisations. In electing the Party organs, voting is to take place on each candidate separately and not on panels, all Party members moreover to have unlimited rights to demand the withdrawal of candidates or to criticise them; in electing Party organs, closed (secret) balloting of candidates to be established. The new elections will have been conducted in all Party organisations by not later than May 20.

Why did the Plenum of the C.C. bring the question of measures of inner-Party democracy to the forefront? The Bolshevik Party never made a fetish of

democracy. It does not require democracy as an end in itself, but as a means of raising the activity of the Party membership. To the degree that the main attention of leaders of Party organisations began to be one-sidedly transferred from Party-educational work to economic work, there began to be observed in a number of organisations the practice of violating the Party statute and of inner-Party democracy. Such violation of inner-Party democracy hindered the growth of the activity of Party members.

But this is far from the whole story. The practice of democratic centralism is also essential in the Party from the viewpoint of the correct relations between the leaders and the Party membership. It is particularly important and edifying to examine how the Plenum regarded this question from the viewpoint of the Party's cadre policy.

Cadres decide everything, as Comrade Stalin so often emphasised. And it is precisely Stalin himself who has always set the Party a supreme example in the education, promotion and verification of cadres. It was so at this Plenum as well. Special attention should be paid to that part of his concluding speech where he spoke of the verification of cadres and of the need for "combining verification from above with verification from below."

"Some comrades" he said, "think that people can be tested only from above, when leaders test those who are led by the results of their work. This is not true. Of course, testing from above is needed as one of the effective measures for testing people and verifying the fulfilment of tasks. But testing from above far from exhausts the whole business of testing. There is another kind of test, the test from below, when the masses, when those who are led, test the leaders, draw attention to their mistakes, and indicate the way in which these mistakes may be rectified. This sort of testing is one of the most effective methods of testing people."

Then Comrade Stalin explained his idea in detail:

"The Party membership tests its leaders at meetings of Party 'activities,' at conferences and at congresses by hearing their reports, by criticising defects, and finally, by electing or not electing this or that leading comrade to leading bodies. The strict adherence to democratic centralism in the Party, as the rules of our Party demand, the obligatory election of Party bodies, the right to nominate and to object to candidates, secret ballot, freedom of criticism and self-criticism—all these and similar measures must be carried out in order, among other things, to facilitate the testing and control of Party leaders by the Party membership."

Here is an example of Stalin's approach to the question! In the light of this it is clear to us why the Plenum of the Central Committee considered it necessary to bring to the forefront measures of inner-Party democracy. The C.C. decided to rally all the two million members of the Communist Party to active participation in the Party's cadre policy, to the verification of cadres and to constant control over them, to the work of educating them, to the constant promotion of the most reliable, most devoted and

most capable active Party workers to leading work in the Party organisations.

The Communist Parties of all countries should draw lessons from this for themselves as well, and should learn from the Party of Lenin and Stalin in Bolshevik fashion to apply the methods of inner-Party democracy both in order to raise the general political activity of the Party organisations and in particular to draw the Party membership into active participation in the operation of the Party's cadre policy.

In the decisions of the Plenum, the application of methods of inner-Party democracy is combined with a number of new measures for educating and training cadres. A net-work of Party educational courses is to be organised for the leaders of all Party organisations and for their assistants. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. is straining every effort to equip its cadres ideologically, to extend their political outlook, to make them real Marxist-Leninists, capable of finding their bearings independently in home and foreign policy.

Party educational work is an extremely important aspect of the task of rendering it easier for Party members to master *Bolshevism*. But study is only one side of the case. Communists can attain the thorough steeling of Bolsheviks and thoroughly master the Bolshevik art of leading the masses only in the course of fulfilling Party work and engaging in political struggle, and then only if the Party organisations adopt the practice of making their leading cadres report back and engage in *self-criticism*.

The Plenum rallied all Party organisations to apply Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism on an extensive scale. Comrade Stalin explained how important it is to educate cadres on the basis of their own mistakes; how important it is for every Party member openly to admit his mistakes and honestly to indicate the way of correcting them; how harmful it is to try to spare and take care of cadres by glossing over their mistakes. "Whoever thinks of sparing the self-esteem of our cadres," said Stalin, "by glossing over their mistakes is killing the cadres and the self-esteem of cadres, for by glossing over their mistakes he helps them to make fresh and perhaps even more serious mistakes which, we may assume, will lead to the complete breakdown of the cadres, to the detriment of their "self-esteem" and "peace of mind."

It is clear that criticism and constant control by the Party membership will be most effective in increasing the feeling of responsibility among the Party's cadres and will thereby raise the entire level of their work.

The practice of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in the inner life of the Party not only does not exclude, but pre-supposes, a tactful attitude towards cadres and towards each individual Party member. What is needed is an approach which is not standard-

ised, but individual, not formal, but businesslike ; not a heartlessly bureaucratic attitude, but one of care and attention for every honest comrade ; in a word, all that Comrade Stalin has always demanded was particularly emphasised by the Plenum of the Central Committee.

All this constitutes an extremely valuable example to the entire international working-class movement. All the Communist Parties must devote the most serious study to the *lessons* of the last Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., and master them.

However different may be the conditions and immediate aims of the struggle of the different Communist Parties, it is of the highest importance for all of them to make use of the experience of the C.P.S.U. recorded in the decisions of the February Plenum, for the solution of a number of the most important and urgent questions of their own. For all Parties, the question of developing inner-Party democracy, of developing the activity and initiative of all the members, of criticism, and self-criticism, of the elective principle of reporting back and of controlling Party organs, is of vital importance. In the struggle against the survivals of sectarianism in all the Communist Parties it is essential to imbue all Party members with the consciousness that the Party as a whole and all

its members can only win the confidence of the masses and lead the mass movement on condition that they succeed not only in teaching the masses, but also in learning from them, in lending a ready ear to them, and in explaining to them patiently and skillfully the aims and methods of the struggle. In all the Communist Parties the question on the order of the day is that of increasing Party political education, of attaining an all-round mastery of Bolshevism as the only true guide to action. In all the Communist Parties the very important question of Party cadres is the order of the day. All that Comrade *Dimitrov* said at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International about the tasks connected with our cadre policy is based upon Bolshevik experience. But it is far from adequately being carried into life. The decisions of the last Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. should call forth a turn in the work of all the Communist Parties in the direction of increasing the promotion and verification of cadres, of increasing Bolshevik vigilance towards cadres.

May the lessons of the last Plenum of the C.C. of the great Party of the Soviet working class, the leading Party of the world proletariat, provide a new stimulus to the Bolshevik development of the international Communist movement.

BRITISH ARMS—AGAINST WHOM ?

By R. PAGE ARNOT

IT is not without surprise that the world has beheld the government of British imperialism giving ground before the Fascist Powers, has seen the once-proud Mistress of the Seas allowing its two-century-old control of the Mediterranean to be put in jeopardy by the Italian aggression at the eastern end, and the German-Italian Fascist aggression at the western end. In the last eighteen months, the naval fortresses of Gibraltar and Malta have been declassified; the Balearic Isles have become a potential base for Fascist Italy, and Spanish Morocco, for Fascist Germany; the Mediterranean route to India has been endangered. And Britain has allowed this, even facilitated it.

Both in Britain and abroad, it has been repeatedly and painstakingly pointed out to the British Government that the advance of Fascism endangers its own British Empire interests; but, all these well-aimed shafts of advice and warning did not disturb the apparent calm of the rulers of Britain. In 1914 "up to the very moment of the outbreak of war, the Government of the City forebore to raise its mysterious visor," said the first Manifesto of the Communist International 18 years ago. Once again,

the visor of mystery has been lowered over the face of British diplomacy as the lists are set for a second imperialist world war. Therefore, it is vain to look to the utterances of British statesmen for any enunciation of the aims and inner policy of British imperialism, for their speeches and diplomatic documents, their *démarches* and *détentes* are merely the tissue of this mysterious visor. The direction of British policy recently, and from now on, is to be gauged not by words, but by their deeds and by an appreciation of their fundamental interests.

The most startling of the deeds of the British Government is the rearmament on a scale far beyond anything expected. The arms programme initiated is on a gigantic scale, the first expenditure being made by an arms loan of £400,000,000 sterling. In the next five years they will spend £1,500,000,000 sterling, and "even this figure cannot be regarded as final or certain," said Mr. Neville Chamberlain himself, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the British House of Commons. On the Air Force alone, in 1937, over £88,000,000 sterling will be spent, more than double the amount in the swollen estimates

(39,000,000) of last year. This means an increase of over 2,000 machines alone, of new types "designed to increase striking power" and also "the provision of war reserves of aircraft and equipment on a far larger scale than had been contemplated."

The Navy, always regarded as British imperialism's chief armament, is to have 148 new warships under construction this year, including 5 new battleships, which brings the number of British battleships—these monsters of the deep—to a total of 20, 4 aircraft-carriers, and 20 new cruisers. The British Army, which, before and after the war of 1914-18, has always been a force of mercenaries, relatively small in respect of the total Empire area and population, is to be highly mechanised so as to serve either as the nucleus of a conscript army, if need be in the future or in the present decline of the territorial formation, or as an expeditionary force.

At the same time, the war organisation of British industry, provision of "shadow" factories for munitions, preparation in advance of the civilian population—in a word, all the measures comprised in "The War Book" of the Imperial General Staff of the Admiralty, etc., are proceeding apace.

Altogether, it is such a sudden expansion of British armaments as has never been known before—with resultant disrupting economic effects, already showing itself in high prices, speculation, boom in shares, all of which forces the maturing of a cyclical crisis.

AGAINST WHOM?

Against whom is this rearmament directed? This is the question which everyone is asking in every capital of the world. It has been asked in Britain. In the House of Commons, the leader of the Liberal Party, Sir Archibald Sinclair, asked it in the following terms:

"Faced with the dangers which we know to expect, with the possibility let us say, for example, of a triple attack upon the British Empire, in the Far East, in the Mediterranean and a knock-out blow aimed at the heart of the Empire here, is your policy collective security, or is it military alliance; if so, with whom, or is it isolation?"

Against whom? The reply given by Neville Chamberlain was obvious dust thrown in the eyes of Parliament. He said:

"We have not to single out a particular Power as the enemy, nor are we, as a matter of fact, in alliance with other Powers on whose aid we count in a particular case. What we have had to do is to consider a whole series of hypothetical emergencies in which we may be opposed to this or that Power, or this or that group of Powers, and in which we might find ourselves fighting alongside other Powers or groups of Powers."

Against whom? A milliard and a half pounds sterling expended against "a series of hypothetical emergencies"!

It won't wash. The question remains unanswered. To find the answer, we must examine what are the

class interests of the British bourgeoisie. And these must be considered, so to say, both externally and internally. The "external" interests are the maintenance of their rule over an Empire which comprises a 500 million population (of whom over 355 million are in India).

Apart from the British Dominions, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, the vast majority are subject people to whom arms for national defence are by no means freely granted—a deprivation which throws the main burden of Empire defence upon the safeguarding of sea communications, but through the British navy.

The main sea route to most of these British possessions in the Old World lies through the Straits of Gibraltar at the western end of the Mediterranean, and the Suez Canal at the eastern end. There, indeed, the possessions begin, and there, they fork southwards and eastwards. South, they run through Egypt (strategically within the British Empire), and through the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan up to the Valley of the Nile, to its head waters in Uganda and Kenya; thence, across the Equator to the former German colony of Tanganyika; then, Northern and South Rhodesia, right to the Union of South Africa. Eastward, they run through Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq (strategically within the British Empire), flanked by the huge, and mainly British-dominated, Peninsular of Arabia, right to the East Indies. There again, the possessions fork south-westwards by Borneo and New Guinea to Australia, New Zealand and the Islands of the South Seas, and north-eastward to Hongkong and the British concessions and interests in the river valleys of China.

It is clear that these sprawled-out territories invite, as it were, a clash of interests with many imperialist rivals. The areas of greatest friction are obviously in the Far East and the Pacific, where there is a whole complex of rivalries; in the Near East and Mediterranean; and in Europe. Strategically vulnerable points are, first of all, the English Channel, which air-power has now declassified as a defensive moat; second, the Suez Canal, and third, the Straits of Malacca, where sits Singapore, "the Gate of the East."

FOREIGN POLICY

How is such an expanse of territory, with its subject populations and areas of friction, to be held?

Clearly, from the standpoint of the British bourgeois interests in the Empire, a war was to be avoided. Therefore, it might seem that once the impact of the world economic crisis of 1929 had begun to undermine the system of the Versailles Treaties, that the policy of disarmament and of collective security (even in its undeveloped form) would have been the best for British imperialism. But

the actual foreign policy pursued hitherto was a formal adherence to the League of Nations, which had begun, in this last period, to offer possibilities of functioning as an instrument of peace; and in practice, a support if not direct, at least indirect, of the powers which were undermining these possibilities.

This took the form of diplomatic support to the Japan militarists in their Manchurian adventure in 1931, twice the British Government at that time refused the proposal of the U.S.A. for a joint protest to Japan; the British imperialists hoping to "ease" their own position in the Far East by "transferring" the area of friction to North China and the borders of the U.S.S.R. It took the form of support to Hitler-Germany with the hope of continuing the building of a counter-weight to French influence in Europe so that eventually a West European bloc could be formed, which could be used against the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R., and within which Britain would have the balance of power as between France and Germany. The lesser Powers of Europe would accommodate themselves to this triangle of forces, with Britain as the apex angle; or, if needs be, to a quadrilateral of forces, France, Germany, Italy and Britain, with Britain as the decisive factor.

Such was the aspect of British foreign policy, especially from 1931 onwards.

But in the last year and a half, there is a transformation. Now the triangle or the quadrilateral is becoming a mere aspiration, an imaginary quantity. New geometrical figures, like the "Berlin-Rome Axis," have made their abrupt appearance. The advance of the war-mongering Fascist Powers is the menacing reality in Europe and throughout the world. Not only are the Fascist Powers armed and arming, but they have begun to use their armaments. They have been carrying on wars of aggression, Japan in North China, Italy in North Africa, Germany and Italy in the Spanish peninsula. And each advance in armament, and each advance in actual war, has brought danger to the British Empire. The arms which Hitler obtained with British help can be turned against Britain. The position held by Japan in North China is being used against British interests in the Far East. Mussolini's conquest of Abyssinia and invasion of Spain are part of a serious threat to British interests in the Mediterranean and the Near East.

The realisation of the danger to the British imperialists was shown by the comment of the *London Times* upon the "anti-Comintern" German-Japanese treaty announced last November. The *Times*, which never neglects an opportunity of attacking the Communist International, on this occasion considered the treaty as "regrettable and unnecessary," and significantly adds:

"The chief effects to be apprehended from the alliance are a greater liberty of manœuvre (and probably accession of ebullience) for Hitler in Europe and for the Japanese fighting services in the Far East. It is the latter which principally affects our interests. There are rumours, probably not without substance, that the agreement provides for the establishment of German and Japanese spheres of economic—ultimately political—influence in the Dutch East Indies; a development which would certainly react on our position in Hongkong and Singapore."

Thus, British foreign policy has actually endangered the interests of the peoples of the Empire, as well as endangering the interests of peace. It might seem, therefore, that the obvious policy for British imperialism was definitely to seek peace one and indivisible through a support of collective security, of the Franco-Soviet pact and of a strengthened League of Nations.

But, as the world has witnessed with considerable surprise, the British Government up till now has not taken this path. The explanation of this and of the recent behaviour of the British Government to Spain has to be looked for in the "internal interests" of the British bourgeoisie.

That they are friendly to Fascism is shown by their deeds in the last four years. It is precisely Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, who has concerted with Schacht the credits and other financial measures for bolstering up the Nazi dictatorship and supplying it with the sinews of war. It is the huge Imperial Chemical Industries monopoly which has supplied Canadian nickel for the German arms. In the "Anglo-German Fellowship" this friendship to Hitler takes visible form: and it was significant at one of the banquets last summer how many of the millionaire chiefs of the very biggest monopolies were there present.

The *Daily Mail*, organ of the millionaire Lord Rothermere, which shrieked in horror over any interference with Japan, whence the City draws £8,000,000 of interest yearly, now for several months has been demanding an alliance with Hitler Germany. Example after example could be given to demonstrate the existence of this pro-Nazi attitude of the City.

The attitude is not universal. There is a minority, through whose vocal protests it is that the pro-Hitler attitude of the City has been revealed. The *Banker* of February fiercely attacks the policy of granting credits to Germany as injurious to British interests and leading to war.

"The notion," says the *Banker*, "that English money would stem the tide of Communism from flowing into Germany is inherently ridiculous. . . . From the standpoint of the investor, Germany is a bottomless pit."

And here, in this sentence, we have the clue to the attitude of the overwhelming majority of the City—the *fear of Communism*.

THE FEAR OF COMMUNISM

What form does this fear take? First, as the U.S.S.R. waxes mightily in strength from year to year, inspiring by its example of Socialist construction not only the workers of every country, but other sections of the whole population, so all the more the millionaires of the City clutch fearfully at their money-bags.

Second, in the working class of Britain, they see an enemy whom they have hated for generations, and whom they learned to fear in the General Strike of 1926.

Thirdly, the City fears the national liberation movement of the masses of India and other colonial lands.

Once more the opening words of the Manifesto of the Communist Party apply to the anxious eyes of the London speculators and finance oligarchs:

"A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism."

Haunted by this, they see Communism in every strike of workers, in every party of the Left, in every broad popular movement.

There is a panic fear amongst the money-bags roused by their own press (*Daily Mail*). The Frente Popolar in Spain—that is "Communism." The Popular Front in France? "Communism." The colonial peoples? Again, "Communism." In each broad democratic movement, in whatever country of the world, they detect danger of Communism.

Perhaps Roosevelt is a secret Communist? Of one thing alone they are sure, that Hitler is not a Communist, that the Nazi Government and its associates are not tainted with Communism. Here, then, must be their salvation—and incidentally, the salvation of their profuse interests in Germany. And so, the slogan of the City becomes "Friendship with Hitler, financial support of Nazi Germany."

Between the "internal" interests of the City, of this most reactionary, most chauvinist section of finance-capital, and the "external" interests of the British imperialist bourgeoisie there has come a certain contradiction.

Here, then, is the immediate cause of the apparent confusion, wavering, and dilly-dallying of British foreign policy.

To trace the way in which this clash of interests within the bourgeoisie is represented politically, in the sections of the Tory Party and within the Government, requires separate treatment. But the broad results are clear. Up till now the policy of support for Hitler has been dominant. The British Government has been responsible for the arming of Nazi Germany, for the gigantic strides of Fascism to world war, for the Fascist intervention in Spain and the agony of the Spanish people. But "the whirligig of time brings its revenges," and the British Government

is confronted by the dangers it has itself helped to create: and of these dangers, most disturbing is the blackmail of Hitler, demanding the return of the former German colonies or other colonies. It is true that Von Ribbentrop, Hitler's envoy to London, met with a refusal, due largely to a protest resolution (October 4, 1936) of the Tory Party Conference. But the blackmail continues and Goering openly threatens, saying, "If we had a small portion of Britain's one-third of the world we would not complain," and goes on to speak of "breaking the strangling fingers of that (Britain's) hand one by one."

Of course, the British imperialists have no intention of throwing a colony into the maw of Hitler-Fascism: but, as they hear the baying of the wolf-pack, it occurs to them that, *to gain time*, some other country's territory might well be thrown to the Fascist wolves.

To gain time—this is the essence of the British Government's policy—time to *rearm*. To delay and to betray; to manœuvre and to retreat; to give arms to Hitler against Socialism and democracy in such a way that these arms will not immediately be turned against the British Empire; to let Fascism turn its arms against any other country not closely bound with Britain—but meantime to REARM at feverish speed and on a scale enormously greater than would be required by a policy of collective security.

Thus, on examination, the apparent confusion in foreign policy resolves itself into something resembling the traditional policy of the English ruling classes in times of difficulty. That was the policy of the Tudor Queen Elizabeth against the Catholic Powers of Europe. That was the policy of the Liberal Government against the Central Empires of Wilhelm and Franz-Joseph. Always—*to gain time in order to rearm*.

"HYPOTHETICAL EMERGENCIES" IN SERIES

The British bourgeoisie are playing for time—paying lip-service to collective security, temporarily aiding Hitler, stalling off any final decision of policy until they be armed to the teeth.

But these armaments that they are building must have a purpose. Arms and politics go together. If there is a People's Army in Spain, it is there to fight for democracy and against the Fascist rebels and the interventionist troops. If there is a Red Army in the U.S.S.R., it is there to defend the land of Socialism against the Fascist aggressors of Germany and Japan, with their spies and their Trotskyist hirelings: it is there to help keep the peace of the world against the war-mongers. If there is a Red Army in China, everyone knows it to be a People's Army against the invasion of China by the Fascist-militarists of Japan. Everyone knows that French armaments, so

long as the programme of the Front Populaire remains, are determined by Front Populaire politics, *i.e.*, to maintain collective security, thereto joining in a pact of peace with the U.S.S.R. inside the framework of the League of Nations.

British ruling-class policy which determine British armaments are not known to everyone: and have to be deduced from their deeds and from their interests.

Now that we have seen that their policy is to reject responsibility for collective security, *for fear of Communism*; to take on responsibility for the arming of the Nazis, again *for fear of Communism*; and to be armed to the teeth, ostensibly *for fear of Hitler-Fascism*; and, above all, to gain time—we are back again to the question, “Against whom?” and can now perhaps decipher some of the hieroglyphics (“against a series of hypothetical emergencies”), in which Mr. Neville Chamberlain set forth his answer.

“Hypotheses non fingo” (I construct no hypotheses), said Isaac Newton: but Neville Chamberlain and his merry men are constructing them in series. Early in the series comes a hypothesis which could be deciphered and expressed in Liberal phraseology by Eleanor Rathbone, an Independent member of Parliament:

“The motives behind this policy are clear. Those who advocate it are inspired by two fears, that is, the fear of Germany’s armaments, and there is the fear of Russia’s economic ideas which are all the more dreaded because they are beginning to succeed; and the happy thought has occurred to those who are advocating this policy: ‘*Why not make these two fears neutralise each other, by encouraging Germany to attack Russia?*’” (House of Commons, November 5, 1936.)

The calculations of the Chamberlains on this hypothesis are obvious; to play for time and to keep playing withal for time up to the point where they can create a ringed fence (Low Countries and France) in the West, and let Hitler glut his maw in the East, so that the British bourgeoisie will be safe for the time being.

But now, let us go on in the Chamberlain series to the next hypothesis—if the U.S.S.R. wins? Then, the British Navy in the Baltic and North Sea, and the British Army and Air Force in Europe (“Our frontier is on the Rhine,” said Baldwin in 1934) are equipped and ready, to prevent by arms the spread of social revolution in Western Europe.

So here, once more, the question, “Against whom?” is answered.

Immediately follows yet another hypothesis—that, if one has to prevent the spread of revolution, it would be better still to prevent the U.S.S.R. from winning, by bringing timely aid (“on our own terms”) to a hard-pressed Hitler. This “hypothetical emergency” was neatly expressed by the *Aero-plane* a year ago:

“One of the best proofs that Germany has no fear of a war with us is the massing of German aerodromes in north-west Germany. . . . The obvious explanation of these aerodromes is that Germany is very sensibly putting her aerodromes as far west as possible to get them as nearly as may be out of reach of Russian bombers. . . . Germany has no fear of war against us. On the other hand, if and when we join Germany in throwing the Russians from civilised Europe, those West German aerodromes will be quite nice as first landing places for our aerial reinforcements.”

NOT FALSE FATALISM BUT ACTIVE STRUGGLE

No need to pursue further the “series of hypothetical emergencies.” It is clear enough that a falsely fatalistic attitude to approaching war covers the British Government’s reckonings. It is no inexorable cosmic forces but quite simply and plainly the Nazis, the Blackshirts, the Japanese militarists who create these emergencies, who are setting alight the flames of war. The British bourgeoisie which asserts it is constructing a fire-brigade for its house could even now extinguish the flames of war in Spain, could aid others to restrain the incendiaries. This would give a definite meaning to Britain’s armaments.

The British Government does not do it: and pursues instead the policy which drives to war.

Who then can do it? Who can preserve peace and prevent Fascism? The answer has already been given, written into the European history of the last year. It is the People’s Front, the gathering together for effective action of the working class along with all those, democrats, radicals, intellectuals of the middle classes, who want democracy against Fascism, peace against war.

A People’s Front in Britain—what does it mean? Here and now is not the moment to predict its eventual shape and formal structure, based on specifically British conditions. The British People’s Front means in essence a strengthening and extension of what has been happening in the nine months in the action taken on behalf of Spanish democracy. It means that the vast majority of the British people, hating war, hating Fascism, should make their feelings into a potent reality, should through every organisation and every democratic instrument that they possess bring such pressure to bear on the Government as will compel it to change its policy towards Spain. Already hundreds of the best; Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Welshmen; Liberals, Labour Party members, Communists; proletarians and non-proletarians went to Spain with the English Battalion of the International Brigade, and in the struggle for Democracy and Peace formed there a People’s Front which they sealed and signed with their lives. These hundreds saved the honour of millions. It should now be a point of honour for

those millions in Britain to build that People's Front activity to the height where the British Government could not but take account of it. The weight of those who would defend democracy and peace against Fascism and war is enormous: They have but to cast their weight. This, here and now, is the meaning

of the People's Front activity—to save Spain, to save democracy, to save peace. It means to overcome all obstacles and to take such action as will transform the situation not only in Spain but in Britain, not only in Britain but throughout Europe and the whole world.

THE KEY TO THE SALVATION OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE

By WAN MIN

THE Chinese people and their friends throughout the whole world are becoming more and more convinced that *the root cause of the aggression pursued by the Japanese marauders in China lies not so much in the actual strength of Japan as in the weakness of China itself.* This weakness is expressed, first and foremost, in the division among the various national forces of the Chinese people and in the internecine struggle going on between them. Hence it is clear that *the key to the salvation of the Chinese people from foreign aggression lies in uniting all their forces in a united anti-Japanese national front* and, first and foremost, in *collaboration* between the two decisive, organised, political forces of the country, *i.e., the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, on the basis of a common platform of resistance to Japan and of salvation of the fatherland.*

Only a united China will be strong, and only a united, strong China will be able to carry on a successful struggle to drive out the Japanese aggressors from its territory and to obtain national independence. This is an indisputable truth—one that every honest Chinese must feel and admit.

The great service rendered by the Communist Party lies precisely in the fact that it was ahead of all others in China not only in revealing this truth, but, on the basis of this idea—the only correct one—it boldly reviewed the whole of its former policy and decided on its own new policy—which is directed towards the establishment of a united anti-Japanese national front, such as will rally all the forces of the Chinese people on the basis of collaboration between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang.

It is however, with regret that we have to record the fact that in consequence of the opposition of the pro-Japanese elements and under their pressure, the Kuomintang as a whole has not yet decided to adopt this only correct road of securing the salvation of China.

The clearest illustration of this is to be found in the decision of the Third Plenary Session of the

C.E.C. of the Kuomintang in reply to the appeal addressed to it by the C.C. of the Communist Party of China.

The Third Plenary Session of the Kuomintang which took place in Nanking between February 15 and 22 was convened for the express purpose of solving the question of organising a united national anti-Japanese front, the question raised before the Kuomintang by the will of the whole of the Chinese people and, in particular, by the Siani events.

In regard to both the Siani events and the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang, the Communist Party of China adopted a position which was entirely determined by a sincere desire for unity among the Chinese people for the struggle against Japanese aggression on the basis of collaboration with the Kuomintang and other organisations. This position called forth the enthusiasm and approval of wide masses of the people and of numerous Kuomintang supporters.

As we know, the Siani events were to a considerable extent the result of an attempt on the part of the Nanking Government to begin a fresh drive against the Red Army, and the unwillingness of the North-East and Seventeenth Armies to continue fighting against the anti-Japanese People's Red Army, and the desire of both these armies to fight against the Japanese aggressors. Despite this, however, the Communist Party of China made no effort to utilise this situation in its own partial and temporary interests. On the contrary, as a true revolutionary proletarian party which places the interests of the people and the nation above all else, the Communist Party of China came forward as a resolute opponent of all forms whatsoever of internecine warfare in the country, and as a sincere fighter for the unification of all the forces of the Chinese people against the Japanese aggressor.

The C.P. of China also did its utmost to help the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang to arrive at a solution, in accordance with the

will of the entire people, of the problem of the struggle for national independence and—what is indissolubly connected with it—of the problem of domestic peace and unity among all the anti-Japanese forces.

The appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of China to the Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang constituted a concrete platform for the establishment of collaboration between the two parties. According to a report in the *North China Daily News*, of February 17, 1937, the C.C. of the C.P. of China put forward the following five points as concrete measures of national policy:

- (1) The cessation of all civil war, and the concentration of the entire power of the nation to resist foreign aggression;
- (2) freedom of press, assembly and association, and a general amnesty for all political prisoners;
- (3) the convening of a National Congress with representatives from all parties, groups, sections of society and armies, and the rallying together of all forces capable of working for the national salvation of China;
- (4) the rapid and complete fulfilment of all preparatory work necessary for an armed struggle against Japan;
- (5) improvement of the conditions of the people.

In this appeal, the C.C. of the Communist Party declared:

“If the 3rd Plenary Session of your Party accepts this national policy our Party, as proof of the sincerity of its strivings for joint resistance to aggression, will voluntarily give the 3rd Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang the following assurances:

- (1) To cease the armed struggle to overthrow the Kuomintang Government.
- (2) To rename the Soviet Government as the Chinese Republic Special Area Government, and the Chinese Red Armies as the National Revolutionary Army which will be under the direct control of the Central Nanking Government and the Government's Military Affairs Commission.
- (3) To introduce the democratic system of government in the territory under the Special Area Government.
- (4) To discontinue the confiscation of landowners' lands.
- (5) Strictly to fulfil the common programme of a united anti-Japanese national front.”

Thus the C.P. of China not only proposed to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang the sole correct programme of struggle to unite the country around resistance to foreign aggression, but also voluntarily made a number of tremendously important political concessions.

While making these concessions for the sake of the great cause of building a united national front against the foreign aggressor, the C.P. of China at the same time smashed the theory advanced by the pro-Japanese elements led by Van Tsin Vei of the “impossibility of establishing a united national front between the C.P. of China and the Kuomintang in China because of the existence of two differing governments and armies.”

In concluding its appeal, the C.C. of the C.P. of China declared:

“No time must be lost in face of the present national crisis. We vow that our Party is true to the nation. Since you are all honestly striving for the well-being of China, we do not doubt that you will agree with our proposal to establish a united national front to resist aggression, and for the national salvation of the country. We are all children of the great Chinese nation. In face of the national crisis it is categorically imperative for all of us to cast aside preconceived ideas, to work together and to muster forces for the one aim of struggle for the great cause of finally liberating the Chinese people.”

The appeal of the C.C. of the Communist Party of China to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang met with a wide response not only throughout China but also far beyond its boundaries. Honest supporters of the struggle for the independence of China, including the members and even a number of influential leaders of the Kuomintang itself, gave their ardent support to this appeal.

The whole of China and the surrounding world followed the work of the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang with rapt attention. The Chinese people and all their friends expected a decisive change in the policy of the Kuomintang in the direction of uniting all the anti-Japanese forces inside the country to bring about its salvation.

What, however, was the decision taken by the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang?

The manifesto of the Plenary Session published in the Chinese press—adopted, apparently, after an acute struggle between the pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese currents—consists in the main of two parts: the first deals with the foreign policy of the Kuomintang; the second with its home policy.

The first part consists of four points, of which the first states that since the last Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang (July 1926) “the Government has pursued a policy of resistance to and intolerance of acts of aggression, and has concluded no agreements harmful to the sovereignty of China.”

How was the “policy of resistance and intolerance” expressed towards Japanese aggression? Have our four North-Eastern provinces (*i.e.*, Manchuria and Jehol) during this period ceased to be what is known as “Manchukuo”? Has the so-called “Hopei-Chahar Political Council” ceased to exist in Chahar and Hopei and the so-called “Eastern-Hopei anti-Communist Autonomous Government of In Ju-gin” in Eastern Hopei? Have the Japanese, during this period, given up their machinations aiming at the creation of “Monggo-Kuo”? Have they given up their intense economic contraband and their interference in the internal affairs of China? If the answer is in the negative, then the question arises: how was the “resistance” of the Nanking Government and its intolerance of acts of aggression expressed?

As regards the point of concluding no “agreements harmful to the sovereignty of China.” it must be said

that in view of the activities of the pro-Japanese clique, the Nanking Government and the Kuomintang have also, unfortunately, nothing to be proud of.

Assuming even that the Nanking Government had concluded no formal agreement harmful to China since July 1936, of what importance is this if the whole world knows that one-fifth of the territory of China has in fact been occupied for over five years by the Japanese aggressor—even though the Nanking Government has not, up till now, recognised the fact in an official agreement.

It is time the Kuomintang understood the elementary truth that in the face of the unprecedented national crisis, the Chinese people cannot be satisfied with verbal promises not to conclude agreements which openly recognise and “juridically” ratify the conquests of the Japanese aggressors in China.

In the second point of the section of the manifesto dealing with foreign policy, the Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang declares that:

“It does not consider it necessary to re-examine the foreign policy of China. The Government should exert all its efforts to operate the established policy.”

What actually was the essence of the foreign policy of the Kuomintang upon which the pro-Japanese elements had such a serious influence? It was a policy of “non-resistance to Japanese aggression” *i.e.*, at bottom a policy of tolerating Japanese aggression. The harm it has caused the Chinese people is common knowledge. Nevertheless the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang, under the pressure of Van Tsin Vei, Chang Chung and other pro-Japanese elements, declared to the whole of China and the whole world that there was no point in re-examining this ruinous foreign policy!

The Japanophile influence can be particularly felt in the third point, dealing with the relations between China and Japan, *viz*:

“China will continue to aim at a preliminary improvement in Sino-Japanese relations on the basis of equality and mutual respect of territorial integrity, if there still remains any hope of peace.”

This is the declaration made by the supreme body of the Kuomintang under the pressure of the pro-Japanese elements, at a time when the Japanese militarists, having already seized one-fifth of our territory are making furious preparations for the complete colonial enslavement of China.

This being the situation, it is difficult to estimate the point concerning the “preliminary improvement in Sino-Japanese relations on the basis of equality and mutual respect of territorial integrity” as being other than self-deception and deception of the Chinese people by the Japanophile elements, or else as recognition of the fact that all the territory already occupied by the Japanese is non-Chinese territory.

Point four, dealing with relations with other powers, reads:

“China will follow the course of universal peace and strengthening international friendship.”

We Chinese Communists are ardent supporters not only of the idea of universal peace, but also of international friendship with all countries friendly disposed towards our people. The Chinese people in their historic and difficult national-liberation struggle against the well-armed robber enemy, are in dire need of and value the sympathy and support of other states and peoples. And it is precisely for this reason that we are always ready to unmask the hypocrisy of the Japanophile elements. Many of them flaunt their “Left,” flowery phrases about “saving China solely and only by means of the force of the Chinese people themselves,” about “the Chinese people in their anti-Japanese struggle requiring no aid or support from other Powers and peoples.” In actual practice they pursue the policy of their Japanese masters, a policy of the monopolistic seizure by Japan of China, and of its isolation from all other states and peoples.

Of course, the cause of the liberation of the Chinese people must be conducted and accomplished by the united, organised forces of the Chinese people themselves. But the chief instigators of world war in the East (Japanese imperialism) and in the West (German and Italian Fascism) seek aid and support from outside for their criminal, aggressive acts, and have even concluded a military alliance among themselves. Why, then, should not the Chinese people in their struggle against the chief enemy, namely the Japanese aggressors, seek allies and supporters for themselves among those states and peoples who, in the given instance, have common interests with China and wish in one degree or another to take part in the common struggle against the common enemy?

Hence it is clear that the slogan of the pro-Japanese elements, of the isolation of China from other countries, is put forward on the direct instructions of the so-called Japanese organs for dealing with special affairs, *i.e.*, the Japanese secret service.

At the same time, in the sphere of China's relations with other states, it is essential to refer to two further points: (1) the Kuomintang must clearly realise that Japanese aggression and the policy of the Nanking Government of non-resistance to it, are actually *incompatible* with the policy of “universal peace and the consolidation of international friendship” between China and other states, even if the Nanking Government really wanted to operate this point in its foreign policy; (2) the friendship and sympathy of other peoples and countries will only become a powerful force if the Chinese people themselves and the Chinese Government really begin a serious struggle in defence of their country against the foreign aggress-

sor and the instigator of war in the East and throughout the world.

The second part of the manifesto of the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang is devoted to domestic policy. This section, apart from the question of convening a national meeting on November 12 of this year, and wholesale attacks against the so-called theory of class struggle (we shall have to deal with this point separately . . . V. M.) deals mainly with problems of domestic peace and unity and, in particular, with the question of relations between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party and Red Army of China.

Although the manifesto says that

“The attainment of internal unity by peaceful means continues to remain the guiding principle,”

nevertheless as one reads on, all the contradictory nature and far-fetched artificiality of the remaining points, adopted apparently at the insistence of the pro-Japanese elements, become clear. Not restricting itself to emphasising

“the difference between attaining unity by peaceful means and the cessation of civil war,”

the Third Plenary Session adds that,

“as regards the Communist elements in China . . . the cardinal policy of the central authorities should be to root them out by every means at their disposal.”

What does this mean? Can it really be that the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang enjoins its party and the Nanking Government to be guided by the notorious slogan “first internal pacification,” and continue the civil war against the Chinese anti-Japanese People’s Red Army, whose fighting strength, discipline and loyalty to the cause of the people are recognised not only by the Chinese people themselves, but also by the official press of foreign powers?

Can it be that the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang enjoins its party and the Nanking Government to continue the annihilation of the party whose members are fighting with such self-sacrifice and loyalty for the liberation of the Chinese people; the party whose fighters are referred to by even a section of the most influential leaders of the Kuomintang itself as “the flower of the Chinese youth,” the party which is so zealously persecuted by the sworn, deadly enemy of the Chinese people, namely the Japanese aggressor?

Why, this policy of the Kuomintang has already been rejected by the history and living reality of China, and condemned by all honest patriots in China and by the best people throughout the world. Did not the Siani uprising of army units 100,000 strong prove in itself that the attempts of the pro-Japanese elements in Nanking to continue civil war against the Communist Party and the Red Army are worthless and fatal? Who is still unaware that to fan the

flames of civil war between the Kuomintang troops and the Red Army is fundamentally to conduct the policy of the Japanese aggressor, the policy “of conquering the Chinese at the hands of the Chinese themselves,” of “victory without battles”?

The essence of this criminal and robber policy of the Japanese aggressor is now clear to all. This policy is by no means directed merely against the C.P. of China and the Red Army of China, as the Japanese imperialists and pro-Japanese elements would have us believe, but against the entire Chinese people and, first and foremost, against all its organised political forces, the biggest of which to-day is, undoubtedly, the Kuomintang.

Concretely, this policy of the Japanese robbers amounts to the following:

1. In every way to inflame internecine warfare between the Kuomintang troops and the Red Army of China, and thereby, not only to use the Kuomintang and its troops as a weapon wherewith to annihilate the foremost party and the most effective army in China, namely the Communist Party and the Red Army, but at the same time to exhaust and weaken the power of the Kuomintang itself and of its armies.

2. To stimulate all kinds of conflicts, and, if possible, military collisions between the various groups and cliques within the Kuomintang and also between the Kuomintang and other non-Kuomintang groups.

3. To use bribery and threats to win over a section of the political and military leaders and troops of the Kuomintang, and to convert them into obedient tools of pro-Japanese policy inside the Kuomintang; thus, by pursuing this policy under the label of the Kuomintang, not only to facilitate Japanese aggression in China, but also to discredit the Kuomintang in the eyes of the Chinese people.

4. To introduce their own hirelings from among the old pro-Japanese groups (first and foremost from the Anhwei group and the so-called political science group) first of all into important organs of the state, army and party organisations of the Kuomintang, and then gradually to squeeze out genuine Kuomintang officials, and finally to get them replaced by the most zealous pro-Japanese elements.

Can it be that the members of the Kuomintang will allow the pro-Japanese elements to draw the Kuomintang to the policy of the Japanese aggressors, a policy fatal for the whole of the Chinese people and for the Kuomintang!

Apart from the pro-Japanese elements, the overwhelming majority of members and leaders of the Kuomintang, will hardly agree to a continuation of civil war and the division of the national forces of the Chinese people to suit Japanese imperialism.

However, evidence of the tremendous influence exerted by the pro-Japanese elements upon the work of the Third Plenary Session of the Kuomintang and the documents drawn up by it, is to be found in the

special resolution adopted by the Third Plenary Session in reply to the appeal of the C.C. of the Communist Party of China.

Instead of replying to the proposal of the C.P. of China to set up a united anti-Japanese national front, the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang drew up a resolution headed "Decision to eradicate the Red Danger." Instead of agreeing to collaborate with the C.P. of China on the basis of a joint struggle against Japan, and for the salvation of the fatherland, the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang wrote about "the capitulation of the Communist Party." Instead of calling to mind the glorious traditions of the collaboration between the C.P. of China and the Kuomintang during the revolutionary years of 1925-1927, instead of expressing self-criticism and regret concerning its policy of splitting the united national front in the past which has brought the country to the present extreme crisis, the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang not only distorted all the well-known historical facts of the 1925-27 revolution, but also did its best to vilify the heroic fighters of the Chinese Communist Party.

Instead of honestly recognising that its foreign and home policy during the last ten years has been a wrong one, and admitting the harmfulness of its policy of "first internal pacification, and then resistance to the foreign enemy," the resolution of the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang repeated all the foulest attacks of such a well-known pro-Japanese politician as Van Tsin Vei against the Communist Party and the Red Army of China.

At a moment so fraught with responsibility and so critical for our people, the Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang might have followed the glorious example set by the C.P. of China, and by its positive attitude to the establishment of a united national front, have shown the readiness of the Chinese people for peace at home and unity to resist foreign aggression. Instead of doing so the Kuomintang has once more demonstrated in its resolution that a section of its leaders, in the interests of the Japanese aggressors, still opposes the unification of the forces of the Chinese people.

A comparison of these two documents, namely the appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of China to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang, and the reply of the latter, immediately reveals the tremendous difference between them. The one document—the appeal of the C.P. of China—gives a correct estimation of the critical position inside the country; it is imbued with a high spirit of principle, ardent love of the Chinese people and the fatherland, a feeling of deep responsibility towards them, a proper respect and confidence in the Kuomintang as an ally in the great cause, a sincere desire to create a united national front of all the forces of the Chinese people against the Japanese aggressors. The other docu-

ment—the resolution of the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang concerning the proposal of the C.P. of China—is a politically shortsighted document, which places the economic interests of the big landowners and capitalists before all else, and for their sake sacrifices the vital interests of the Chinese people. There is no feeling of responsibility in this document concerning the fate of the country and the people; it is full of blind hatred for the great idea of Communism, of the desire to prevent China successfully and peacefully uniting in defence of the nation.

It can, however, be said with full confidence that neither the Chinese people nor their friends, nor history itself are on the side of those who habitually bend the knee to the foreign conquerors and at the same time neglect the vital interests of their own people. General sympathy will be on the side of those who, despite all existing political differences, are ready to place the interests of the nation before all else, and magnanimously reconcile themselves with political opponents within their own nation for the sake of uniting the forces of the entire people for the struggle against the foreign enemy.

It is with regret that one has to record that the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang, under the pressure of the pro-Japanese elements, adopted decisions which not only continue to call forth disillusionment among the Chinese people, who had staked so much on this Plenary Session, but which also create the most unfavourable impression upon international public opinion, whose aid is so essential in the national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people.

These decisions are causing a great deal of confusion even in the ranks of the Kuomintang itself and surprise among the majority of the people of Japan, who are opposed to the aggressive, adventurist policy of the Japanese militarists, and are sympathetic towards the national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people.

It is said that this character of the decisions of the Third Plenary Session was dictated exclusively "by diplomatic considerations as regards a certain power." True, the present most complicated situation in China requires that a flexible policy be pursued towards a most malicious opponent. But the fundamental line of state policy must not be subordinated to considerations of a temporary diplomatic character, the more so if it is a question of the mortal enemy of our people. That is the first point.

Secondly, one correct and serious step in the direction of unity at home will be a thousand times more effective even in the sense of its positive influence upon China's diplomatic relations with other countries than making concessions and bending the knee to the aggressor.

It is very characteristic that in view of the growing

desire in China for national unity against foreign aggressors on the basis of collaboration between the C.P., the Kuomintang and other organisations, even Sato, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, was compelled to speak about "the need for reviewing the foreign policy of Hirota towards China and the recognition of the just demands of China concerning equality for the parties to the Sino-Japanese negotiations."

But in spite of all this, the last Plenary Session of the Kuomintang still stood out to advantage, to some extent, from all preceding Plenary Sessions and Congresses which have taken place since the breakdown of collaboration between the Kuomintang and the C.P. of China. There was a positive side to its work, expressed not only in the fact that despite the threats and intrigues of the pro-Japanese elements, proposals reached the Plenary Session from public organisations in Shanghai, Peiping, Manchuria and other parts concerning the need for the Kuomintang to adopt a foreign policy in the spirit of resisting Japanese aggression and a domestic policy in the spirit of uniting the national forces and of making the regime more democratic; and not only in the fact that the North-East Army headed by Chang Hsui-lang, Yui Sui-chun, the 17th Army headed by Yan Hu-chen and Sun Vyi-ju, and other prominent military and political leaders of China, introduced a proposal for the establishment of a united national front between the Communist Party, the Kuomintang and other organisations, for joint resistance to the aggressor.

The positive side of this Plenary Session was expressed further not only in the fact that for the first time since the breakdown of collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, a number of true disciples of Sun Yat-sen and prominent leaders of the Kuomintang in the persons of Sun Tsin-lin, Sun Fo, Fyn Yui-san, Li Li-chung, Lu Chung-lin, Shi-In and others proposed "the restoration of the three great political principles of Sun Yat-sen, namely, an alliance with the U.S.S.R., an alliance with the Communist Party, and support for the workers' and peasants' mass movements."

The Plenary Session itself adopted a decision in which it fundamentally declares itself in favour of the possibility of collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China, although it makes this collaboration conditional upon the acceptance of the four following points: (1) the abolition of the Red Army, (2) the abolition of the Soviet Government, (3) the cessation of Red propaganda and the acceptance of the three principles of Sun Yat-sen, and (4) the cessation of the class struggle.

What is the actual essence of these four conditions? There can be no doubt that on this point differences in principle exist between the Communists and honest Kuomintang patriots on the one hand, and the pro-

Japanese elements and people who have betrayed Sun Yat-sen, on the other. The pro-Japanese elements interpret the first two conditions to mean the physical annihilation of the Red Army or, at any rate, the so-called reorganisation of the Red Army by the removal of its commanding officers and political workers.

The Communists and honest Kuomintang patriots, on the other hand, understand these conditions in quite another way. They understand the point about the Red Army to mean the *conversation of the Red Army into a national-revolutionary army maintaining its present commanders and political workers, and its inclusion in all-Chinese united national-revolutionary army, which must be subordinated to a united command, for the fulfilment of a common military plan in the common struggle against the foreign aggressor.*

The question, of course, cannot be limited merely to a formal change of name, but means a certain change in the character of the Red Army, *i.e.*, its conversion into a component part, into the most efficient section, of the all-Chinese army of the united national anti-Japanese front. The point about the Soviets is also interpreted by the Communists and honest Kuomintang members to mean not merely the formal change of the name of the Soviets into local authorities of the Chinese Republic, but also a real change in the character of the power of the Soviets, *i.e.*, the conversion of the Soviet Power into a general democratic Power acting in agreement with a united all-Chinese Central Government.

This interpretation of these conditions by Communists and honest Kuomintang members is the only correct and real approach to the question! The readiness of the Communists to make concessions in politics has definite limits. To go beyond those limits would only be harmful for the liberation struggle of the Chinese people. Therefore, not only have the Communists no right to go beyond these limits, but honest Kuomintang patriots have no right to demand it. And if the first two of the four conditions put forward by the Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang possess the concrete essence attributed to them by the Communists, then this has in the main been dealt with on more than one occasion in various documents of the Communist Party and, in particular, were mentioned quite clearly and concisely in the appeal addressed by the C.P. of China to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang.

With regard to the third conditions. The pro-Japanese elements and those who have betrayed Sun Yat-sen have apparently here brought forward the old theory, widely known since the time of the 1925-27 revolution, and invented by Dei Chi-tao, concerning "the incompatibility of two beliefs."

This groundless "theory" has long been thoroughly

refuted by life itself and the history of China and of the whole world; it fundamentally contradicts the spirit of the doctrine and works of Sun Yat-sen. The pro-Japanese elements are making use of this "theory" in order to interpret the third point to mean that the Communists undertake to relinquish their own Communist convictions. The Communists and true disciples of Sun Yat-sen, on the other hand, understand this to mean something quite different. They know that under the elastic conception of "red propaganda," slanderers can, if they wish, bring forward anything they like.

Who does not know that during the 1925-27 revolutionary period, the imperialists and militarists of the Beiyuan and Anhwei clique give the title of "reds" not only to the Communists, but also to the Kuomintang members, and used the term "red propaganda" to refer not only to the propaganda of the Communist Party, but also of the Kuomintang? And now the Japanese militarists and their agents call not only the Communists "reds," but also all honest patriots, and the "red movement" means for them not only the Soviet movement, but also the entire patriotic, anti-Japanese movement in Manchuria and throughout China. On the other hand, the Communists and all honest patriots are prepared to make use of this point in order to introduce clarity to the whole of the Chinese people as regards the relations between Communism and Sun Yat-senism.

Despite all the differences in principle between Communism and Sun Yat-senism, the Communists as followers of the brilliant tenets of Marxism-Leninism, as inheritors of the great past of their people and the whole of mankind, and as people continuing it, have never considered the three principles of Sun Yat-sen to be an insurmountable obstacle to collaboration between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang in the struggle against the common enemy. And this is the more so to-day, in the face of the unprecedented national crisis of the Chinese people.

On the contrary, the Communists consider that the three fundamental slogans of Sun Yat-sen, *i.e.*, nationalism, democracy and the well-being of the people, facilitate collaboration to-day between the members of the Communist and Kuomintang Parties, since both the Communists and honest disciples of Sun Yat-sen, in the conditions existing in China to-day, have to fight unceasingly for *national independence, democratic liberties and the material well-being of the whole of the Chinese people.*

Honest Kuomintang members—true disciples of Sun Yat-sen—well remember the instructions of their great leader that "Communism not only does not contradict the doctrine of the well-being of the people, but on the contrary, Communism is the friend of this doctrine." They, true disciples of Sun Yat-sen, well remember that their great leader who carried on a

forty years' struggle for the freedom and equality of China, constantly entered into a militant alliance and agreement with all currents and parties for the common struggle against the common enemy; and he particularly valued the alliance with the Communist Party of China.

Finally, as regards the class struggle, everybody is aware of the fact that it is not the Communist Party that engenders class struggle; on the contrary, in modern society it is the class struggle that "gives birth to" the Communist Party. But there is the definite political aim behind this condition of the Kuomintang Plenary Session and the line on this question contained in the manifesto, of accusing the Communists of "artificially dividing up Chinese society into so-called classes and of inciting an internal struggle among the Chinese people thus weakening and splitting the national might of China." However, attempts of this kind can hardly be crowned with success.

Who is unaware that it is precisely the Chinese Communists who in the moment of unprecedented national crisis have been the first to raise aloft the banner calling for the unity of all the forces of the Chinese people for a common struggle against the foreign enemy? Who is unaware that the policy of creating a united national front advanced by the Communist Party, means nothing other than uniting all sections of Chinese society for joint struggle against the aggressors? Who is unaware that it was precisely to strengthen and unite China's national might that the Communist Party of China came forward sooner and more resolutely than all others and is doing so now, in favour of the cessation of all internecine warfare, openly declared its rejection of the armed struggle against the Kuomintang Government, and itself decided to cease the confiscation of the landowners' estates, etc.

It is not true that the Communists have striven to bring about the "artificial division of Chinese society into classes" or the "weakening and splitting of the national might of China" by inciting an internal struggle among the Chinese people.

So the conditions put forward by the Plenary Session of the Kuomintang, if correctly understood, do not put forward an insurmountable obstacle to collaboration between the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang. And the reports in the foreign press apparently coincide with the facts, when they announce that negotiations are proceeding on the basis of these four conditions and of the proposals of the Communist Party of China to the Third Plenary Session of the Kuomintang so as to achieve a concrete agreement between the two parties for a united anti-Japanese national front.

In any case, the work of establishing collaboration between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang

and other organisations on the basis of a common platform—in the sphere of foreign policy, resistance to Japanese aggression ; in domestic policy, the democratisation of the regime and the improvement of the conditions of the people—will advance in spite of all, by the will of the whole of the Chinese people.

* * * *

Has the danger passed of a renewal of a military drive by the Nanking Government against the Chinese Red Army ? Has a situation definitely been achieved in China favouring the rapid achievement of a united anti-Japanese national front ? Unfortunately *not as yet* : the influence of the pro-Japanese elements in the Kuomintang and the Nanking Government is still strong; the position inside the Kuomintang is contradictory as a consequence of the tense struggle between the pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese currents.

This can be seen not only in the resolutions of the Third Plenary Session, but also in the practical activity of the Nanking Government following it. The following facts go to show that a change in a positive direction is taking place, in a greater or lesser degree, in the policy of the Kuomintang : the removal of pro-Japanese elements headed by Chang Chiun from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the appointment of Van Chung Hui to the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs; the resolute protest of the Nanking Government against the bandit onslaught of Italian Fascists on the Chinese cinema in Shanghai, and in particular the actual cessation of military hostilities by the Nanking units against the main forces of the Red Army in North Shensi and East Kiangsu, and the continuation of negotiations with representatives of the Communist Party regarding the united anti-Japanese national front.

But there are facts of another kind as well : the concentration of large military forces (over 40 divisions) at all the strategic positions in North-West China, instead of the promised withdrawal of all the Nanking units from Shensi and Kiangsu; the continuation of a violent attack by the troops of Ma Bu-fan against the Red Army units in West Kiangsu and the failure to take serious measures to stop the military action of Ma Bu-fan; the transfer of the North-Eastern army from Shensi and Kiangsu to Honan and Anhwei for the purpose of "reorganisation" and "re-training," although promises were made to leave it in the old place; the fact that Chang Hsueh-lang does not really enjoy personal freedom and has not been restored to his military and political posts; the provocative murder of General Van Yi-tsei—national hero and sincere supporter of the united anti-Japanese front—and also of his comrades-in-arms; the fact that seven leaders of the all-China National Salvation Association are kept in prison, and the unwillingness to release political prisoners; and, finally,

what is particularly important, the deliberate dragging-out of the negotiations with the Communist Party and the presentation of a number of excessive demands to the Red Army and the Communist Party. All this goes to show that the pro-Japanese elements continue stubbornly to egg the Kuomintang on to a policy contradicting the will of the Chinese people.

It is a matter of duty and honour for every Chinese to-day to give the utmost support to the struggle of the Communist Party of China and of the anti-Japanese political and military forces of the Kuomintang and the Nanking Government against the intrigues and provocative acts of pro-Japanese agents.

To disarm them completely and render them harmless, what is needed is to demolish their lying inventions and fairy-tales taken chiefly from Japanese sources and aimed against the creation of a united anti-Japanese national front in China.

The pro-Japanese elements make the hypocritical declaration that they are "for the national front," but "only against the slogan of the Communists regarding the People's Front." There is no basis whatever for this invention, for what the Communist Party of China clearly and concisely supports is the creation of a united anti-Japanese *national* front; this, of course, is not the same as the people's front, which is mainly a front of working people, directed first and foremost against the enemy of the people at home.

The social composition of the National united front is far broader than the people's front and is directed against the foreign invader and his agents. The idle chatter of the pro-Japanese elements about the national front is only carried on with a view to replacing the concrete struggle for the creation of the united *anti-Japanese* national front by such talk. Clear proof of this is provided by the fact that the pro-Japanese elements, who are in the habit at all times and places of playing with words about the popular or national fronts, maintain silence as to the purpose of this front and as to the forces against which it is levelled.

The pro-Japanese elements assert that as far as the Communist Party of China is concerned, the slogan of the united anti-Japanese national front is only a "screen to cover its real aim of struggle to overthrow the power of the Kuomintang and the Nanking Government." It is clear how false this assertion is.

In its appeal to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang, the C.P. of China openly announced the cessation of military hostilities against the power of the Kuomintang. But actually it was considerably earlier, in the appeal of August 1, 1935, "To all the Chinese people concerning the new policy of uniting all the national forces of China to resist Japan and save the fatherland," that the Communist Party of China gave clear expression to this

fundamental idea. Later, in its open letter to the C.E.C. and all members of the Kuomintang, dated August 25, the Communist Party of China still more clearly and precisely confirmed and further developed this idea.

In the August letter to the Kuomintang, the Communist Party of China gave concrete expression to the questions of collaboration between the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang, the creation of an all-China Government of National Defence, and an all-Chinese United anti-Japanese Army. In the same letter the Communist Party of China openly declared its readiness to fight for the establishment of an all-Chinese United Democratic Republic, with an all-Chinese Parliament, elected by universal suffrage, and to include the Soviet regions in this united democratic republic and participate in the work of the all-Chinese Parliament.

What does this mean from the viewpoint of the changes in the political situation in China? It means:

1. Whereas formerly the question was: either the Kuomintang or the C.P. of China, now it must be put differently, namely: not a struggle between the Kuomintang and the C.P. of China, but collaboration and joint struggle between the C.P. and the Kuomintang and other organisations against the Japanese marauders.

2. Whereas formerly the question was: either the Red Army or the Nanking troops, now it must be put differently, namely: not civil war between the Red Army of China and other Chinese troops, but the establishment of an all-Chinese United National Army, including the Chinese Red Army and all other Chinese troops, for joint struggle against the Japanese imperialists.

3. Whereas formerly the question was: either the power of the Kuomintang, or Soviet power, now it must be put differently, namely: not a struggle between the Kuomintang and the Soviets, but the creation of an all-Chinese National Government on the basis of a united democratic republic by merging the different forms of power existing in China so as to bring about the unification of the forces of the nation and to strengthen the national defence of China.

Through their vanguard, the Communist Party, the workers, peasants and all advanced, revolutionary elements in China declare their readiness, at the given stage and in face of the common enemy of the Chinese people, to give up the struggle to institute the Soviet regime in China, and are ready to support a widely democratic regime in the country.

At the same time the propertied classes in China must subordinate their interests to the common interests of the people and make corresponding political and economic concessions to the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people.

The position of the C.P. of China and of the Red

Army in connection with the Siani events in December, 1936, and the appeal of the C.C. of the Communist Party of China to the Third Plenary Session of the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang were only further steps to give concrete shape to the new policy of the C.P. of China and to operate it consistently. It is the policy of creating a united national front on the basis of political and military collaboration between the C.P., the Kuomintang and other organisations to resist Japan and save the fatherland.

In agreeing to transform the Red Army into a National Revolutionary Army, and the Soviets into widely democratic organs of government, in agreeing to give up the confiscation of the landowners' estates, etc., the C.P. of China took as its starting point the estimate of the actual situation which had come about in China, i.e., the fact of the growing activity of Japanese militarism and its agents in China and the real danger of the Chinese people becoming subjected to complete colonial enslavement.

If the C.P. of China acts as the Kuomintang does, i.e., if it does not want to be the first to make the necessary practical concessions to its ally, then collaboration between the members of the Communist and Kuomintang Parties for a joint struggle for national independence will not be brought about.

Despite the intrigues of pro-Japanese elements, the C.P. of China is taking concrete steps to hasten on the creation of an all-Chinese National Government and an all-Chinese United National Army, on the basis of collaboration between the C.P. and the Kuomintang. These steps of the C.P. of China will inevitably influence the Kuomintang in the sense of a turn towards the united anti-Japanese National Front.

All the chatter of the pro-Japanese elements as to the alleged intention of the C.P. to overthrow the Kuomintang, under the guise of the policy of the united anti-Japanese national front, is just as false as is the chatter of certain Kuomintang circles about the "complete capitulation" of the C.P. to the Kuomintang or about "eradicating Communism in China."

Is it not time these Kuomintang circles understood the real essence of the policy of the united anti-Japanese national front, which means a political agreement between the C.P., the Kuomintang and other organisations on the basis of a common platform of struggle, while preserving complete independence, both politically and organisationally, for these parties and organisations?

Is it not time that these Kuomintang circles understood the need for collaboration between the Kuomintang and the C.P. of China in a common anti-Japanese struggle, collaboration which not only excludes efforts by one party to suppress the other or to bring about capitulation by one to the other, but makes it an obligation on both sides to maintain an attitude of mutual esteem and confidence.

Is it not time that the official press and Kuomintang correspondents ceased their slander against the Communists, in the interests of uniting the country and the people for national salvation? It is high time they did!

The pro-Japanese elements assert that collaboration between the C.P. of China and the Kuomintang is merely a short-term manoeuvre of the C.P. of China, and that soon after such collaboration has been established or, more precisely, during the process, or at the end of the anti-Japanese struggle, the Communists will turn their weapons against the Kuomintang. The Chinese Communists give the following reply to this: firstly, the struggle to drive out the Japanese imperialists from China and to obtain national independence for the Chinese people is no light short-term task at all; secondly, the Chinese Communists not only want to collaborate with the Kuomintang during the period of anti-Japanese struggle, but are prepared, together with all honest members of the Kuomintang—true disciples of Sun Yat-sen—to fight in the future as well for an independent, free and happy future for the great Chinese people.

Slanderers assert that the policy of creating a united anti-Japanese national front in China is dictated not by the interests of the Chinese people, but by the interests of the Soviet Union. Nonsense! In occupying our Manchuria and Jehol, in invading our Chahar, Hopei and Suiyuan, and preparing to swallow up the whole of China, the Japanese aggressors hid, and still hide, their activities behind a smoke-screen, alleging that all these operations are aimed "only at preparing war against the Russian Bolsheviks, and not the plundering of China." Yet the national traitors shamelessly oppose the unification of all the forces of the Chinese people and their struggle against the Japanese imperialists precisely under the pretext that "it is no use," "it is only to the advantage of the U.S.S.R."

Anybody who can speak thus, even though he be a Chinese to outward appearance, is in his soul a faithful hound of the Japanese militarists. Such people are like the foul Trotskyists, agents of the Japanese secret service, whose behaviour, as the great Chinese national writer, the late Lu Siun, quite justly remarked: "Contradicts the elementary human dignity of the modern Chinese!"

The Chinese Communists pursue the policy of creating a united anti-Japanese national front in the interests of their own Chinese people, for the sake of their salvation and well-being. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, as everybody is aware, is sufficiently strong to defend itself against the attacks of any state, and in particular against attempts of aggression by Japan.

But let us suppose that the creation of a united anti-Japanese national front in China coincides simultaneously with the interests of the Soviet Union. What is wrong in that? What do the Chinese people lose thereby? Is it not truer to say that the Chinese people will only gain thereby in their anti-Japanese national liberation struggle?

It should be understood that the national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people against the instigators of world war, against the Japanese Fascist militarists, allies of German and Italian Fascism, oppressors of the colonial peoples, and mortal enemies of the Japanese people, coincides not only with the interests of the peoples of Japan, Korea, Formosa, not only with the interests of all the countries of the Pacific Coast; it should be understood that the cause of the Chinese people engaged in the struggle against Japanese imperialism is the cause of all friends of the Chinese people, of the whole of progressive mankind.

No "ideological" and practical obstacles will help the pro-Japanese politicians. It can be said with full confidence that the absolute majority not only of the Chinese people, but also of the Kuomintang, are to an ever-growing degree actively declaring for collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China as the basis for the creation of a united anti-Japanese national front of the whole of the Chinese people. This state of affairs should stimulate all far-sighted, influential, political and military leaders of the Kuomintang, and in particular Chiang Kai-shek, to hasten to part with the pro-Japanese elements who are urging China to take the road of suicide.

These should be the prospects before China. For the creation of the united anti-Japanese national front on the basis of the establishment of collaboration between the C.P. of China and the Kuomintang is the only road, the key to the salvation and advance of the Chinese people.

FOR THE ORGANISATION OF THE STRUGGLE AND VICTORY*

By JOSE DIAZ

IN my report on the tasks of our Party in connection with the war, I shall deal mainly with the following questions: (1) The character of our struggle; (2) what must be done to win the war, on the battlefields, in industry, and behind the lines; (3) the tasks of our Party.

From the day of the election victory in February, 1936, and until the rebellion in July, our Party was clearly pointing out that the reactionary and Fascist forces would not consider themselves defeated, in spite of the fact that they had been removed by the will of the people, freely expressed in the ballot, and that it was necessary to prepare for defence against the inevitably aggressive actions of reaction and Fascism.

We also gave warning that the speed with which the demands of the people were being carried out did not correspond to the urgent needs of the masses, nor to the need for rapidly defending the democratic system against onslaughts by reaction.

The situation in Spain is such that the fate of our country will be decided in the course of a very few months. It is therefore necessary rapidly to catch up with all that has been neglected. We do not intend the decisions of this Plenum of the Central Committee only for the Communists, but we want the tasks which will be outlined here to be assimilated and carried into practice by all the anti-Fascist masses in Spain, so that they will all march solidly along the only path which can lead to victory in the war. (*Loud applause.*)

WE FIGHT FOR A NEW TYPE OF DEMOCRATIC PARLIAMENTARY REPUBLIC

When we speak of the character of the present struggle we have to establish the point: against whom and against what did the Fascists raise the rebellion on July 18. The Fascists rose up in arms against the whole of the Spanish people, against the will of the people, clearly expressed in the elections of February 16. In order to justify their criminal act, the

rebels tried to claim that they had begun a "preventive revolution" in order to hinder the establishment of Communism in Spain. But the programme of the Frente Popular, which constituted the basis on which the struggle was carried on which led to the victory of February 16, cannot be reproached with resembling Communism in any way whatsoever. The electoral struggle simply aimed at defending the Democratic Republic and its institutions, and at creating the conditions necessary for satisfying the urgent demands of the Spanish people.

In order to make clear to all my view of the character of our struggle against Fascism, I will remind you of the fact that a month after the beginning of the rebellion, our Party launched the slogan of extending the Frente Popular, of uniting the whole of the Spanish people, for the civil war—the conflict between Democracy and Fascism—had become a war for national independence, a war for national liberation.

Our struggle, the content of which is profoundly national, has also a clearly expressed international character. A concise and brilliant definition of the international character of our struggle was given by our great Comrade Stalin and expounded at greater length by Comrade Dimitrov. Comrade Stalin said in his historic telegram to the Central Committee of our Party:

"The working people of the Soviet Union are only doing their duty by giving every aid in their power to the revolutionary masses of Spain. They realise that the liberation of Spain from the oppression of the Fascist reactionaries is not the private affair of the Spaniards, but the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind."

Commenting on the definition of the international character of our struggle, as given by Comrade Stalin, Comrade Dimitrov, in an article published at the beginning of the year, wrote:

"At the same time it must not be forgotten that to hasten and facilitate the victory of the Spanish people, who are defending with their blood not only their own freedom and independence, but also the democratic liberties of other peoples and also the cause of peace, it is necessary still further to increase the actions of solidarity of the international proletariat and of all democratic forces."

In these few words, the international character and

* Abridged stenogram of the Report of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain at the Enlarged Plenum of the Central Committee, March 5, 1937.

significance of our struggle in Spain is splendidly explained.

There is no doubt that a victory by Spain over Fascism will serve as a tremendous impulse for the development of democracy not only in Spain, but in France, England and other countries. Our victory will also exercise a tremendous influence on the political situation in Germany, Italy and all countries which are now under the rule of Fascism, because it will show them the road to liberation from Fascist tyranny. On the contrary, if we were to lose the war it would be a terrible blow for democracy everywhere not only in Spain, but throughout the world. Defeat would mean an advance, if only temporary, of international Fascism, and a wave of terror and barbarism which would spread over the whole world, driving all the peoples into the abyss of war.

Therefore, in face of the tasks laid upon us by the war, and in view of the tremendous sacrifices which we shall have to make in order to win it, we want rapidly to create the necessary conditions for victory.

We are fighting for a democratic republic, for *a new type of democratic parliamentary republic*. The struggle in Spain does not aim at forming a democratic republic of the French type or like the republics of other capitalist countries. No, the democratic republic for which we are fighting is a different republic. We are fighting to destroy the material foundation on which reaction and Fascism were based, for unless this foundation is destroyed it will be impossible to have genuine political democracy.

In our struggle we are striving to bring about the *destruction of the material basis of semi-feudal Spain*, in order to root out Fascism once and for all.

We must liquidate the class of big landowners, who have participated to a man in the military-Fascist rebellion. We must nationalise their estates, and turn them over to the agricultural labourers and peasants, for cultivation either individually or collectively, according as they desire.

It is necessary to destroy the economic and political power of the Church, which was the centre of the conspiracy against the interests of the masses, and one of the strongest mainstays of semi-feudal Spain. To this end the property of the Church must be confiscated and nationalised. The struggle against the semi-feudal economic and political rule of the Church does not by any means signify a fight against religion. On the contrary, only a republican and democratic Spain, a free and progressive Spain, will ensure freedom of religion in our country.

We must also set about putting an end to the remnants of the caste spirit of the old army, which served semi-feudal Spain and was used to suppress progressive tendencies.

We must put an end to the financial oligarchy, to the bankers and manufacturers who were closely

connected with the landowners and the Church and hindered the development of the national economy. We must proceed to the nationalisation of the Bank of Spain and the chief industries of the country. This is the only means of satisfying the needs of the front and the rear.

In addition to these main points, the solution of which will lead to the disappearance of the semi-feudal castes which were dominant in Spain, and will lead to the reorganisation of the material and social basis of our new, democratic, parliamentary republic, we must introduce genuinely universal suffrage and secure the participation of the entire people in the political and economic life of the country.

Such is the new type of democratic and parliamentary republic being fought for by our Party and, together with it, by the entire Spanish people.

In all the provinces under the rule of the Government, there are no longer any landlords, big bankers or big manufacturers, while the Church no longer exists there as a ruling power. This is the actual state of affairs, and the fact that arms are in the hands of the people, in the hands of the really anti-Fascist people, in the hands of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petty-bourgeoisie is a guarantee that all that we have won will remain for all time. This is the greatest guarantee that the past can never return. And precisely because we have a guarantee which secures what we have won, we should not lose our heads and skip over reality, trying to carry out experiments of "Libertarian Communism" (Anarchist) or "Socialisation" in the factories or in the countryside. The stage of the development of the democratic revolution through which we are passing requires the participation in the struggle of all anti-Fascist forces, and these experiments can only result in driving away a very important section of those forces.

THE ATTITUDE OF OTHER PARTIES TOWARDS THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

When the Communist Party put forward the slogan of the defence of the democratic republic, a considerable section of our Socialist comrades defended the point of view that the democratic republic had become an anachronism, and that it was necessary to set up a Socialist republic. This would have meant splitting the democratic petty-bourgeois and popular forces away from the working class. The Anarchists in turn advocated "Libertarian Communism," and, from the slogan of a "self-sufficient" National Confederation of Labour passed, through the slogan of a "revolutionary alliance between the U.G.T. and the C.N.T.," to the slogan of a trade union type of Government to immediately bring about the "Social revolution." Finally, some of the Republicans, realising that it was impossible to return

to the republic of April 14, 1931, have resisted the adoption of a programme of radical social reforms which would convert Spain into a new type of democratic republic.

May be in the beginning the various premature attempts of "socialisation" and "collectivisation" which were the result of an unclear understanding of the character of the present struggle, might have been justified by the fact that the big landlords and manufacturers had deserted their estates and factories and that it was necessary at all costs to continue production. Now, on the contrary, they cannot be justified at all. At the present time, when there is a Government of the Frente Popular, in which all the forces engaged in the fight against Fascism are represented, such things are not only not desirable, but absolutely impermissible.

At the present time the political parties and the trade unions also recognise the necessity for universal military service, a single command, the co-ordination of industry on the basis of a plan, etc.

The fact that these fundamental points are recognised by all the parties and trade unions participating in the People's Front and represented in the Government is a big step forward. But the fundamental problem of the present day is not only the recognition of the correctness of these points; the decisive point is the *speed at which they are put into operation*. It required eight months of war for the sum total of the problems raised by the Communist Party from the very first day of the war to be understood. But we cannot wait another eight months for these tasks to be carried into life. If the Government does not take steps immediately to fulfil the economic, military and political tasks necessary to win the war; if this is not done in the briefest possible time—for the situation does not admit of delay—if, in spite of the support of the entire people, the Government proves incapable of carrying into life the things which the situation urgently demands, then the Government will be doomed. Either the Government carries out the measures necessary to win the war, or the Government will cease to be the Government. (The delegates rise and heartily applaud Comrade Diaz.)

FOR A REGULAR ARMY, FOR A SINGLE COMMAND, FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE REAR

Everyone knows that our war is a modern type of war, i.e., a war in which the enemy has a well-trained army, one which is experienced in war and is abundantly supplied with the most modern means of destruction. And while the enemy does not possess large forces of Spaniards, he receives reinforcements from the regular armies of Germany and Italy, and, in the first place, technically-trained personnel, which gives the war an extremely severe character.

To this army of the enemy we oppose the People's Army, now in the process of formation, and drawing its fighters from the wide masses of the people of our country. We also have modern weapons. But we have to learn to use our technique, to learn the science of war, because war is both a science and an art. It is not enough to have right on one's side, as some romantic people assert; one must be able to back up right with force.

There is no doubt that tremendous achievements have been made in the creation of the People's Army, but the process of its formation is far from being completed. Anyone who claims the opposite, underestimates the strength of the enemy, and will not be able to create the necessary conditions for victory.

To what extent has our army been turned into a regular army? The commanding staff has taken certain steps in this direction. Little by little the militia detachments of the various parties and trade unions are being liquidated and are giving way to a regular army, with its companies, battalions, brigades and divisions. Universal military service has been introduced. But the question of reserves is still a sharp one, the importance of which has not yet been realised by those concerned.

The principle of a single command has not yet been understood by many people. For some people, single command means that Catalonia must have its own command, the Basque Provinces must have theirs; Asturias, the South and the North, will have their own command, and all of them will be more or less closely connected with the Ministry of War. As opposed to this, it must be said that single command means the existence of a general staff possessing real power, and composed of military men and civilians, devoted to the interests of the people, planning and directing operations, single command pre-supposes an accurate knowledge of what positions and forces we possess, the distribution of arms and people according to plan, the right to transfer troops from one front to another.

There are people who chatter about the non-political character of our People's Army. Can an army which has been gathered together on a voluntary basis for the struggle against Fascism—this expression of the most revolting and brutal policy ever known in history—be called a non-political army? Our army is a political army, serving as the bulwark of the Frente Popular, serving the people. Our army is defending by force of arms the policy of the Frente Popular, which has strengthened the democratic republic which the Fascists want to destroy with the aid of foreign Fascism. Our army is defending by force of arms the independence of our country, the land and liberty of our people. It is defending bread, work and peace for all champions of progress and civilisation.

Our army is an army of the people, and must be trained in the spirit of hatred for the Fascists of our own country, for the butchers of the people, and for foreign Fascism, which is lighting the flames of war. Our army must be trained in the spirit of love for the people and their rights. All armies which have arisen from the midst of the people have been the embodiment of a really popular policy. Such was the army of the French Revolution. Such was, and is, the workers' and peasants' army of the Soviet Union. Such was and is the army which is fighting for the independence of China. Who, then, is interested in our army being non-political? The answer is: Generals Franco and Queipo, and all the Fascist scum are so interested, along with their direct and indirect agents, who, unfortunately, may be and are in our ranks, in the ranks of our army.

Incompetent people and traitors must be driven out of the army and mercilessly punished. And this must not be done negligently and when some disaster or other looms ahead, but systematically. At the same time we must be resolute in operating a policy of promoting and training new cadres of officers who have distinguished themselves in battle. (Applause.)

In addition to the establishment of strict discipline in the army, it is necessary to establish the principle of responsibility by the commanders. I ask you: Have the causes of the defeats at Talavera and Toledo been investigated? Have those who are to blame been punished? Unfortunately, no. Have those responsible for the fall of Malaga been punished? Again, no. It is said that investigations are proceeding, but the people, deeply stirred by these events, cannot wait for weeks. They demand that those responsible for the defeats be tried quickly and that they be given exemplary punishment.

We must react rapidly and resolutely to those who are responsible for military defeats. It is not sufficient at the demand of the people to remove a general who has organised a defeat and directly or indirectly participated in acts of sabotage against the army, and immediately afterwards to appoint him to another position. (Stormy applause.) I declare from this platform, with a full sense of my responsibility, that we will not cease for a moment our efforts to bring about a thorough cleansing of the commanding staff.

We need an army which is constantly in action. We cannot permit a situation where at a time when on some fronts not only are the enemy's attacks being beaten off, but counter-attacks are carried on to the point of utter exhaustion, on other fronts troops sit in the trenches for months on end doing nothing, without making attacks, without even undertaking sorties against the enemy.

Our shores must be fortified and coastal defences created. It was no secret to anyone that the attack

on Malaga was prepared from land and sea, and that the chief role in the capture of the town was played by an Italian landing party. This must not be repeated. Fortifications must be erected on our frontiers at suitable strategic points so that every attempt of hostile forces to make a landing will cost them battleships. Still more intensive work must be carried on to disintegrate the enemy's forces. Propaganda in their ranks must be intensified. Many soldiers have already come over to our side from the ranks of the rebels. There are not a few anti-Fascists among the men mobilised by the rebel generals, and they are awaiting a convenient moment to come over to us. For this reason, along with increasing our propaganda, we must first guarantee the lives of all prisoners.

We must stimulate the formation of guerilla detachments, especially among the peasants, to act in the rear of the enemy. Even now there are groups of armed men who have preferred to take to the mountains rather than submit to the Fascists. We must get into contact with these groups, help them with food, ammunition, and send them people capable of leading them.

Our rear must be a fighting rear. In this fierce struggle, which demands so many sacrifices, it is impermissible for so many people to be passive and evading service. The districts behind the lines must be cleansed. To cleanse these districts from parasites, we must immediately begin to issue identity certificates to all citizens. All must do useful work and help in the victory. This means that the principle: "He who does not work shall not eat" must be amended to mean that he whose work does not hasten victory shall not eat.

THE FORMATION OF A POWERFUL WAR INDUSTRY IS A MOST URGENT AND IMPORTANT TASK

If we want to win the war—and we have no doubt that we shall do so—we must establish a war industry capable of supplying the fronts with everything necessary. The problem of establishing a powerful war industry can and must be solved, and solved rapidly. Planfulness must be introduced into production, while disorder and stupidity must be eliminated. In the Basque Provinces, in Catalonia, in the Levant, there are sufficient factories already engaged in the manufacture of military supplies, but there is no co-ordination between them. New factories are being built, but still more could be put up. In order to ensure the maximum increase in the war industry, a special Ministry must be established, if necessary, to deal with this problem. We cannot permit endless wailing about the unfairness of the isolation to which we have been doomed by the democratic countries. Instead of this, we must make serious efforts to set all

our national resources into motion. Our Party advances this problem because it is one of the decisive conditions of victory. The trade union organisations—the U.G.T. and a considerable part of the C.N.T.—realise the need for co-operation, and they are co-operating in establishing a powerful war industry. But all these efforts must be co-ordinated and the creative abilities of the people stimulated. At the initiative of the workers themselves, military supplies are already being manufactured in the Basque Provinces, Catalonia and the Levant. In Madrid, the enthusiasm and fighting spirit has spread from the trenches to the factories and mills.

We could mention a number of munitions factories where, after the organisation of shock “brigades” and owing to the competition that developed among the workers, output increased by 50 per cent. and even by 100 per cent. *We already have “Stakhanovites of the war industry” in our factories.* We have young workers whose output is three times the former standards. Take Urbano Ramos, for example. He is a worker at one of the war factories, and each shift he produces 790 details as against the standard output of 205.

This initiative, this enthusiasm, must be organised, so as rapidly to create a powerful war industry. The factories must work not 8, 10 or 12 hours, but right round the clock in three shifts, increasing the number of workers if this is required. The Central Government and the Governments of Catalonia and the Basque Provinces must understand that just as we must have a united army and a single command, we also need a united war industry capable of supplying the necessary arms and military supplies to the People's Army on all fronts.

GREATER ATTENTION IN THE VILLAGES

The defence of the interests of the peasants has been the constant care of our Party. Our Party was the first to raise a voice of protest against lawless buccaneering in the countryside. Thanks to this, we have succeeded in gradually squeezing out the so-called uncontrolled elements, so that the peasants could convince themselves that the town workers are not new exploiters, but their allies and leaders. You all remember the attacks made on our comrades for such weighty “crimes” as the desire to organise the peasants, so as to draw them into the policy of the Frente Popular and participation in the war. There were those who considered that there were no more peasants in Spain and that we were inventing them just for the purpose of organising Peasants' Federations and splitting the Federation of Agricultural Workers. We were accused of wanting to restore land ownership, as we recognised the rights of the peasants to own land. Our comrade, Matei, a tireless

fighter for the organisation of the peasants, was threatened with death for his insistent work among the peasantry, while many of our comrades really laid down their lives in the struggle to defend the interests of the peasants.

Our Party, true to Lenin's theory, which teaches us to regard the working peasants as the natural allies of the proletariat, did not retreat before difficulties, before provocations of one kind or another, and continued to build peasant organisations. True to our policy of unity, we proposed to include the peasant organisations in the Federation of Land Workers, which is affiliated to the U.G.T. We naturally demanded the confiscation of the property of the big landowners, who are enemies of the people. And after our comrade, Uribe, entered the Frente Popular Government, a decree was passed giving the land to the peasants.

Now that the peasants have the land given to them by the Republic, they must defend this Republic at the front and in the rear. We must strengthen the bonds of friendship between the agricultural labourers and the peasants by the organisation of the former into trade unions and the latter into production co-operative societies. We must establish contact committees in the country districts so as to improve the leadership of the whole peasant movement.

We must stimulate the growth of agricultural production. The Minister of Agriculture and the Government must, by establishing fixed prices profitable to the peasants, stimulate the production of such crops as wheat, rice, potatoes and vegetables. The extensive provision of credits for agricultural co-operative societies must be organised with the aim of increasing and improving the quality of agricultural production. All measures must be adopted to prevent frivolous elements sowing unrest in the country districts by their thoughtless actions and causing discontent among the peasants, our best allies. (Applause.)

For the Strengthening of the People's Front.

For the Strengthening of the Unity of the Spanish People.

We support the Frente Popular Government in carrying out the basic tasks which face it. The chief tasks are to *purge the army, to form reserves, to create a single high command and to organise a powerful war industry.* In carrying out these tasks, the Frente Popular Government must count on all the trade unions and political parties represented in it. Our insistence in raising these problems has resulted in some of our allied organisations, and even the president of the Council of Ministers, calling us “to order” on several occasions.

People do not want to see, or they fail to understand, that our insistence is based on the profound conviction that if these tasks are not rapidly solved,

we endanger the outcome of the war, even though we possess all the necessary conditions to win it. In connection with the discussion of these problems, some people have tried to prove that it was our intention to conduct a political manoeuvre against the Government. How badly they know us who make such a statement! It was our Party that hammered out the People's Front. More than all others it has supported and still supports the Frente Popular Government and its leader, Comrade Largo Caballero. But our Party, which is conducting a clear political line and has no desire to play with the interests of the people, cannot cultivate blind partisanship, blind subordination to individuals. It does not flatter the leaders; it merely defends its political line through them. When our Party comes forward with proposals or criticism, it only wishes in this way to correct some political attitude which, in our opinion, should be changed.

The Frente Popular must be preserved at all costs. Whatever the difficulties on our path, the Communist Party will continue most energetically to defend the Frente Popular and its Government, the legitimate Government. Our Party will not allow anyone to attack with impunity the unity of the anti-Fascist forces. Our motto is: "Unity now, so as to guarantee victory, and unity later, so as to garner the fruits of victory!" And anyone who tries to break the unity of the Frente Popular, who tries to break the unity of the Spanish people engaged in the fight for the independence of Spain which is at stake in this war, such a person is consciously or unconsciously helping our enemies.

A government of the trade union type would have fatal and absolutely disastrous results. It would mean the disruption of the Frente Popular, not to speak of the disruption of the unity of the Spanish people. The tendency to form a trade union government is doomed to failure.

We must now think only of how to strengthen the Frente Popular, how to strengthen the unity of the Spanish people, and anyone who wants to break down this unity will be branded by our heroic fighters as an enemy of our cause. (Loud applause.)

OUR RELATIONS WITH THE SOCIALISTS, ANARCHISTS AND REPUBLICANS.

The points of contact between the Socialist and the Communist Parties at the present time are such as to raise the question of the formation of a single party of the proletariat. This must be our guiding star, our compass. But to make our unity indestructible, it must be based on complete ideological and tactical unity, and for this, it is first necessary to bring about constant *unity of action* to solve the problems of the present moment, and above all the main problem—that of ensuring victory as rapidly as possible.

At the present day, the decisive problem is unity of action at the front, in industry and in the rear. This will create the necessary conditions for later arriving at fusion. But for this, it is first necessary to remove the tension from the atmosphere which has grown heavy of late as the result of the charges made against us that we are "poaching members" from the Socialists and other proletarian organisations. It is in fact true that tens of thousands of workers are joining our Party, but they come to us voluntarily and consciously. They are attracted by our political line and by the self-sacrifice of the members of our Party. We do not recruit them by resorting to tricks, but we are guided by the directions of Comrade Dimitrov at the 7th Congress of the Comintern that "by our everyday mass work and our correct policy, we must *deserve and win the confidence of the working masses.*"

The new members who join our Party come to us not because they are tempted by promises or by personal advantages. We do not and cannot give such advantages. On the contrary, they know that they will have to take a place demanding struggle and sacrifice. For what does our Party demand of its members? It demands of them that they be the most disciplined, most efficient and bravest in the firing line; that they form shock groups and be the first to throw themselves into any breach made by the enemy; that they always take the lead during attacks; that they never retreat; that by their example they create the psychology of ever driving forward, even at the cost of tremendous sacrifices; that they are the most diligent and most unselfish workers at the point of production. This is what we demand of them! We demand that they form shock brigades, that they work not 6 or 8 hours, but 10, 12 or 14 hours or as long as is necessary to provide the front with a sufficient supply of ammunition; that they be the most fearless and the most vigilant in the rear; that they hunt out the profiteers and all who want to live at the expense of the people's blood; that they protect the women and children of the fighters; that they give aid during air raids, that all their thoughts, all their efforts, be directed towards securing victory, to the point of self-oblivion. And if under such circumstances the best sons of the people come to us, it is because they really want to fight and are ready to make sacrifices, but not because they hope to get something out of us, as this is impossible.

Our relations with the *Anarchist* comrades, including organisational relations, have improved considerably. The declaration signed by Comrade Vasques and myself on behalf of our organisations has assisted in establishing cordial relations between the members of the two parties. But this is not enough. We must still further strengthen the bonds of friendship between us, as the Anarchists are our brothers,

a part of our class, since we are fighting for common interests. Our enemies set rumours afoot that bloody clashes are inevitable between the Anarchists and the Communists, and that the question of who will crush the other will inevitably arise. It must be declared that those who spread such rumours are our enemies and enemies of the Anarchist comrades. (Loud applause.)

We want closely to co-operate with the Anarchists not only during the war, but after the victory. We must fight side by side with the Anarchist comrades against the lawless buccaneering of numerous "uncontrolled groups." Many such groups use the name of the Anarchists. But it would not be right to attribute to the C.N.T. as an organisation the lawless acts committed by the "uncontrolled" elements. Whatever banner these individuals may use to conceal themselves, whether it be the Anarchist or other banner, we must here call to mind what Comrade Dimitrov said when he was speaking of Van der Lubbe:

"Who is Van der Lubbe? Is he a Communist? By no means. Is he an Anarchist? No. He is a declassed worker, a lumpen-proletarian in revolt, a creature who has been misused, who has been utilised against the working-class. No, he is not a Communist. He is not an Anarchist. There is not a Communist, not an Anarchist in the world who would conduct himself like Van der Lubbe. Real Anarchists do senseless things, but in court they answer for them and explain their aims."

In proportion as correct relations are strengthened between all the organisations forming the Frente Popular, in proportion as all the organisations are proportionately represented in the leading political, economic and public organs of the country, the actions of the "uncontrolled" groups will rapidly come to an end, and the power and authority of the Government of the democratic republic will increase.

We maintain good relations with the Republicans. The Republicans have consciously participated in the great anti-Fascist movement hand in hand with the proletariat. They knew in advance that they were fighting not for an abstract republic but for a new type of republic. The Republicans, the petty bourgeoisie, have suffered as much as the proletariat from the semi-feudal oppression of the ruling sections—landowners, bankers and the military clique. They fight nobly and bravely at the front, and are capably carrying out leading work in the economic and political life of our country. The recent speeches of Senor Azana and Senor Martinez Barrio are clear examples going to confirm our words. Their position proves that the alliance between the forces of the proletariat and those of the petty bourgeoisie has a firm political basis. It is the duty of our Party to see that this basis is never undermined. (Cries of approval.)

The Communist Party recognises the historical

peculiarities of all nationalities and all their rights which they can only secure in full in Republican Democratic Spain. They have also understood this, and therefore honestly support the Central Government which realises the need for recognising the special rights of these nationalities in the economic, political and cultural spheres, and for respecting their religious beliefs. Thus all the conditions exist for the alliance of all Spaniards and peoples of Spain. And this task must be solved with the active support of our Party.

THE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE: THE FASCISTS, TROTSKYISTS AND "UNCONTROLLED" ELEMENTS

Who are the enemies of the people? The enemies of the people are the *Fascists, Trotskyists and the "uncontrolled" elements*. Our chief care at the present moment is to guarantee the unity of the whole Spanish people, i.e., the alliance between the proletariat and all the supporters of progress, all who want to see Spain prosperous and happy. But at the same time we must disclose and expose all the enemies of the people. Wherever they may hide. Our chief enemy is Fascism, against which we concentrate all our fire and all the hatred of the people. But our hatred is directed with equal force against the agents of Fascism, against those who, like the P.O.U.M., these Trotskyists in disguise, conceal themselves behind pseudo-revolutionary phraseology so as the better to fulfil their role as agents of our enemies in our own country. To destroy the "5th Column" we must destroy all those who defend the political slogans of the enemy. But the slogans of our enemy are *against* the democratic republic, *against* the anti-Fascist People's Front, *against* the Frente Popular Government, *against* the regular army, *against* the Soviet Union because it is showing such splendid solidarity with the Spanish people in this struggle.

No matter what pseudo-revolutionary slogans the Trotskyists use to camouflage themselves, their Fascist ears stick out everywhere. Who wanted to disperse Parliament with bayonets? Franco, and with him the local and foreign Fascists who organised the uprising. The Spanish Trotskyists demand the same thing, as is shown in the newspaper *Batalla* which, on January 30th, 1936, published a resolution of the Central Committee of the P.O.U.M. on the need for destroying the parliaments of Madrid and Barcelona because they are "absolutely unnecessary." Here is complete unanimity with the Fascists.

Franco and the rest of the scoundrels brazenly declare that they are defending their country, their nation. These people who have betrayed their country, who are selling our territory piece-meal to international Fascism, and have the impudence to call themselves "Nationalists," burst into fury when

we expose them as traitors to their country and butchers of the people. They do not recognise our right, the right of the Spanish people as established by law, to defend our country. What is the position of the Trotskyists in this regard? The same as that of Franco.

When the counter-revolutionary Trotskyist conspiracy was discovered in the Soviet Union, and the Trotskyist criminals—spies and wreckers—came before the proletarian court, the Spanish Trotskyists hastened to defend their friends and joined the chorus of the German and Italian Fascist press, which bitterly attacked the Soviet system for being able to expose the criminal machinations of the Fascist agents. It is clear from this that these agents of Fascism have nothing in common with the proletariat or with any honest ideas. We fight against the Trotskyists because they are the agents of our enemy who have penetrated into the ranks of the anti-Fascists. It would be a mistake to regard the Trotskyists as part of the working-class movement. They are an unprincipled group of counter-revolutionaries, agents of international Fascism, their chief being Trotsky, direct agent of the Gestapo. In their fury against the Soviet Union, against the great Bolshevik Party and against the Communist International, the Trotskyist stretch out their hands to the Fascists. This is why the Communists resolutely refuse to enter any organ whatever together with the Trotskyists. The Party must raise the question before the working masses of a ruthless struggle against the Trotskyists, so as to train the masses for the struggle against the hidden enemies of the working class.

Trotskyism is not a political party but a gang of counter-revolutionary elements. Fascism, Trotskyism and the "uncontrolled" elements are the three enemies of the people who must be removed from the political life not only of Spain but also of all civilised countries. (Loud applause.)

THE GROWTH AND COMPOSITION OF THE PARTY AND THE TASKS OF COMMUNISTS

Our political line, which has penetrated so deeply among the masses, is the line of the Frente Popular, the line of the proletarian united front, the line carried out with the aim of preserving and developing the alliance of all Spaniards in the struggle for national independence and for a republican and democratic Spain possessing a profound social content. It is precisely this political line that has attracted thousands of fighters at the front into the Party, including hundreds of the best representatives of the airfleet, navy and army. (The delegates rise to their feet and loudly greet the representatives of all arms present at the Plenum.)

Thousands of women have joined our ranks—a sign of their political awakening at this historic moment. They have come into our ranks because they have seen in our Party the best defender of their interests, the fighter for the equality of men and women. It is not without good reason that the symbolic figure of our Party is our colleague, Comrade Pasionaria, filled with fearlessness and the spirit of self-sacrifice. (All present rise and give a loud ovation to Comrade Dolores Ibarruri.)

At the present time the Communist Party, which has 131,600 members fighting at the front in the ranks of the People's Army, has 249,140 members, and this is only in the provinces ruled by the Republican Government. This figure includes 50,000 members of the united Socialist Party of Catalonia. The social composition of the Party is as follows: 87,660 industrial workers, 62,250 agricultural labourers, 76,700 peasants, 15,485 from the middle classes and 7,045 representatives of the intellectuals and the liberal professions. There are 19,300 women in the Communist Party. (Applause.)

We must be vigilant. It is not impossible that agents of the enemy have penetrated and will penetrate into our ranks. Our Party must constitute a model of honesty and proletarian morals. We must educate the new Party members, and this is one of the great tasks facing our Party. It is not sufficient to enlist such a mass of members into the Party. We must take account of the directions of our great Stalin as to the need for studying people, giving them help in political education and properly distributing work among them. We must follow the directions of Comrade Stalin, and you know what significance attaches to his words, which branded the practice when:

"instead of studying people, and only allocating them to positions after study, they are not infrequently moved about like pawns."

Our primary care and task must be, as our leader and teacher pointed out, to secure that:

"Our leaders show the greatest care for our workers, 'small' and 'great,' no matter what sphere they work in, carefully educating them, helping them when they need support, encouraging them when they show their first successes, bringing them forward, etc."

We must not forget the great Leninist truth: "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." And this is what our Party needs most of all. We cannot be satisfied with merely one central Party school for the education of cadres. Every District Committee must organise its own schools. The Party issues several newspapers every day. Permit me to greet our beloved paper *Mundo Obrero*, the fighting organ of our Party, which plays the role in the firing line of leader of the heroic fighters of Madrid. (The delegates rise to

their feet and amid loud and prolonged applause greet the representatives of *Mundo Obrero*.)

All the leading organs of the Party, beginning with the Central Committee and ending with the district committees must be more operative in their work. They must get rid of the remnants of sectarian tendencies in their relations with friendly organisations. There must be more of the collective spirit in work and in the solution of tasks. It is an impermissible situation when a secretary or a responsible worker in a committee usurps the position of the whole committee, settles all questions on his own authority, without drawing the other comrades into active participation in the work.

In view of the fact that our Party must be the basic instrument for strengthening the Frente Popular and for rallying the Spanish people for the struggle against home and foreign Fascists, the basic task of the Communists are as follows: *at the front* they must be models of discipline and heroism; they must be model fighters, but at the same time they must show the maximum vigilance towards the various acts of provocation and enemy espionage in the People's Army.

In industry they must be the best shock-workers. They must fight for the formation of a war industry, following the example of the Russian Bolsheviks, who never stop before any difficulties.

Our watchword must be: "Produce more and better."

In the villages, the Communists must stubbornly carry out the agrarian policy of our Party which has already produced so many good results. They must continue the work of organising the peasants and agricultural labourers into producing co-operative societies and trade unions. They must form committees of contact between the agricultural labourers and peasants, thus ensuring a close alliance between the working people of the country districts. They must convince everyone of the necessity to respect small ownership. They must see to the intensification and differentiation of the sowings, increasing agricultural production. They must fight for the provision of credits, seeds and fertilisers for the peasants.

As for the *intellectuals*, the Communists, whose ideas are built on a scientific basis and who are fighting for a splendid and happy life for all mankind, must day by day strengthen the bonds of brotherhood with the intellectuals and in practice must show that the people love science, art and literature, whereas Fascism is the synonym for superstition and ignorance, barbarism and the negation of culture. The Communists must fight to ensure such conditions for men of science that they will be able to give all their knowledge to the people and assist our victory.

The Communists must be the best *organisers* of

the rear, while paying the maximum attention to the needs of the front. The Communists must care for the wounded, invalids, the wives and children of the fighters, and see to the just distribution of food. They must fight to secure that all give the maximum of their labour to the cause of the war. They must mobilise all that is honest and healthy against concealed enemies, against war profiteers and against the idlers who are funkng at the rear.

The Communists must be the best defenders of the *trade unions*, and systematically recruit members to them. They must educate the masses in the unions and promote cadres for production from among them. They must fight to secure the operation of genuine trade union democracy which will permit the best representatives of the working class to occupy leading posts. On the basis of unity of action between the trade unions of the C.N.T. and the U.G.T., the Communists must assist in establishing the necessary conditions for the fusion of the National Confederation of Labour and the General Workers' Union into a single trade union federation. In order to strengthen still further the U.G.T., to which the vast majority of the members of our Party belong, we must seek in a comradely way to secure that if it is impossible to call a congress to elect a new leadership on a democratic basis, then that representatives of the Communist Party be included in the central leadership.

The Communists must strengthen and extend their work among *women*. It is necessary to strengthen the already existing organisation of anti-Fascist women and mobilise all the women of Spain in defence of their country and the national independence. A movement of the women of new Spain must be established.

Hundreds of thousands of Spanish Citizens are thirsting to maintain regular contacts with the great land of Socialism, the Soviet Union. It is therefore necessary to extend and develop in every way the present "Friends of the U.S.S.R." Society in Spain.

The I.L.D., which in the words of Comrade Dimitrov, "must become, as it were, the 'Red Cross' of the united front of the proletariat and the anti-Fascist people's front," must be given every aid so as to become in a position to fulfil the task placed on it at the present moment.

Every help must also be given to the *United Socialist Youth*, these splendid young people who have advanced thousands of fighters and excellent cadres from their ranks. We must secure that it becomes the only organisation of the youth. The losses suffered by the leading cadres of the United Socialist Youth must be made good by the intense recruiting of thousands of new members.

The agreement signed between the United Socialist Youth, the Anarchist Youth and the Republican

Youth aims at forming "brigades" for the increase of production in all factories, for improving the quality of production and lowering costs. On the basis of this agreement, the organisation of such "brigades" must take place in close collaboration with and under the leadership of the factory committees, consisting of members of the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. We must also strengthen our contacts with the organisations of our Party in Catalonia and the Basque Provinces. We must organise a constant interchange of experience with them by mutual representation in the respective central committees.

The unity and monolithic spirit of the Communist Party is our great pride. Our political line is clear and understandable to the broad masses of the Spanish people. If our political line is so comprehensible, it is because it is penetrated by the ideology and the strategic and tactical orientation of the Communist International. (Prolonged applause.) It is because the Party has been able correctly to apply the strategic line of the 7th Congress of the Communist International, as set out by our great comrade, Dimitrov. (Loud applause.)

**WE SHALL CONQUER BECAUSE WE ARE
FIGHTING NOT ONLY FOR OUR OWN
CAUSE, BUT FOR THE CAUSE OF ALL
PROGRESSIVE MANKIND**

To win the war that has been forced on us, we shall yet have to suffer and sacrifice a great deal. The struggle will be stubborn and long drawn out. International Fascism can still deal heavy blows at us. But, in spite of all, we profoundly believe in the fighting power of our people, and are therefore confident that we shall win. We shall win because we are fighting not only for our own cause, for the cause of our country, but for the cause of the whole of progressive mankind. We shall win because we are sure of international solidarity. We shall conquer because the heroic International Brigades, the best sons of the international proletariat, the best representatives of democracy, are fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, showing in practice their solidarity with us. The Communist Parties of France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, etc., have given us great help, and I am sure that at the present moment they will still further strengthen the campaign of solidarity with the Spanish people, so that if the so-called control is established, the workers and the democratic forces of their countries will not only not weaken their help, but, on the contrary, will strengthen it, for the defence of Spain is also the defence of their own peoples.

We shall conquer because, as Comrade Dimitrov said:

"The victory of the Spanish people over the Fascist reactionaries, the Fascist interventionists, and the establishment of a strong republican parliamentary democratic regime, based on the People's Front, will decisively undermine the material and political basis of Fascism in Spain, will lead to the further rallying of the democratic forces in France, Great Britain and other countries, where Fascism threatens to destroy the political rights and liberties which the people have won."

The Italian and German Fascists are preparing to render still more active aid to the Spanish rebels with men and munitions, and this creates a danger of a new, big war being unleashed. Will international democracy retreat again before the onslaught of the Fascists? We hope not. And this hope is founded on the fact that our brother Parties, in co-operation with democracy, will be able to demand of their governments that they offer deserved and categorical resistance to Germany and Italy, countries which are endangering the interests of France, Great Britain and all the democratic countries of the world. (Loud applause.)

Control is to be applied. They want to apply restrictions to us, to lock us up in our country on the pretext that this will hasten the termination of the war. We want nothing so much as the speedy conclusion of the war. But it must end in the triumph of the cause of the people, because it is a just and sacred cause. Otherwise the war cannot end. We have before us the example of the Soviet Union, our great sister country, which has been able to overcome all difficulties and defeat both internal and external enemies. The heroism of the Spanish people shows that we can follow this example. We shall win because the Soviet Union, the symbol of the liberation of oppressed peoples is on our side. (Prolonged applause. Cries of greeting to the Soviet Union and Comrade Stalin.)

Comrades, members of the Central Committee and the Enlarged Plenum of the C.C.! The general line of what needs to be done to ensure victory has been indicated. I am quite sure that with your participation our Plenum will take the right line which the masses need particularly now. We shall indicate the path along which they will arrive at victory. I repeat that our Enlarged Plenum cannot be a Plenum of the Communist Party alone. Our Plenum must become the Plenum of the broad masses of the people of all Spain.

I have, therefore, only to add: Comrades, forward! Long live the unity of the Spanish people and their struggle against Fascism.

Long live the anti-Fascist Frente Popular!

Long live our noble Communist Party!

Long live our noble Communist International,

which firmly holds the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin!

For the victory of the weapons of the people!

For a prosperous and happy Spain!

(An outburst of applause engulfs the last words of

the speaker. All stand and loudly applaud Comrade Diaz. Shouts in honour of the Communist Party, the Central Committee, the Soviet Union, the Frente Popular and the Democratic Republic. The ovation lasts several minutes, and ends with the singing of the "Internationale.")

IN MEMORY OF THREE COMRADES

By RAYMOND GUYOT

ON February 17, 1937, three of the bravest young fighters of the Spanish people: Comrades *Trifon Medrano* (Evaristo), *Luis Rodriguez Cuesta*, and *Augustin Zapirain* met a tragic death as a result of a shell exploding in the building where a meeting of the National Biscay Youth Committee was being held. Seven other members of the Committee, including the Secretary, *Pedro Filipe*, were wounded.

Comrades Medrano and Cuesta had been sent to Bilbao by the Executive Committee of the United Socialist Youth to help and advise the leaders of the Biscay Youth Organisation.

The death of Comrades Medrano, Cuesta and Zapirain leaves a great gap not only among the leading members of the United Socialist League of Youth; the whole of the Spanish youth, fighting heroically against Fascism, also severely feels this loss.

As soon as the tidings of the accident spread in Bilbao, members of the Youth League, workers from the factories, and militiamen crowded to the building where the youth leaders had perished. The next day the working people of Bilbao and of the whole of Biscay filed past unendingly to pay their last respects to their dead comrades. The funeral assumed the character of a mighty demonstration of the Basque people, and was attended by representatives of the Basque Government and of all the Parties of the People's Front. The tragedy caused profound emotion in Madrid, Valencia, Asturias and Catalonia.

Luis Rodriguez Cuesta was a militant member of the Young Socialist League, one of the leaders of the Provincial Committee of Asturias, and took an active part in the miners' struggle in October 1934. Along with the entire organisation, he drew the correct conclusion from this defeat of the miners, namely, that *unity* is the chief condition for the defeat of Fascism. After the amalgamation of the Young Communist and Young Socialist Leagues, he was elected a member of the Executive Committee of the United League. He was in Madrid when the traitor generals started the rebellion. The name of Cuesta is closely linked with the epic story of the heroic battles of the Montana barracks, Alcalá de Henares, El Pardo,

Somosierra and Guadarrama. I made the acquaintance of this fine comrade during my visit to the Cerdille front in September 1936, at which period he was Commissar of the "October" battalion, which was guarding the Alto de Leon; afterwards he became Commissar of the 22nd Brigade.

Augustin Zapirain was general secretary of the Biscay Young Communist League. He worked with might and main to bring about unity, his enthusiasm and confidence being increased by the fact that he had attended the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International, at which a delegation of the Young Socialist League was also present. After the amalgamation, he was made secretary of the United Socialist Youth Organisation in Biscay.

He was one of the most ardent fighters for democratic rights and national liberation for the Basques, and was proud to see all the Basque people, Communists, Socialists, Anarchists, Republicans and Catholics, rising as one man to repel the barbarians of Burgos, Berlin and Rome.

Zapirain was commander of a battalion in the "Thomas Macobe" column, and as leader of this battalion displayed amazing heroism and boundless self-sacrifice at Oviedo and in Biscay.

Trifon Medrana (Evaristo) was known and loved by the whole Spanish youth. He was a son of Madrid, the Spanish Verdun, where the whole people has written in letters of blood for international Fascism to read: *No pasaran!* (They shall not pass!)

The revolutionary youth in the Young Communist League had made Medrano their general secretary and his name was also well known among the whole people. He was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain. The foremost people in the international youth movement knew Medrano as one of the most ardent fighters for the unity of the Youth. He was assistant secretary of the United Socialist Youth, and certainly the best-loved comrade and colleague of Santiago Carillo.

The cruel tidings of Medrano's death plunged into mourning not only the Spanish Youth, but the anti-Fascist Youth of the whole world; his untimely death

is a severe loss to the leadership of the Young Communist International, of the Presidium of which he was a member.

Trifon *Medrano* was one of the finest and noblest figures of the Spanish Youth, whose heroism, contempt of death, and unbending will to victory have aroused the admiration of the world. He possessed all the qualities of this splendid Youth.

Trained in the school of the Communist Party of Spain, the young worker *Medrano* had assimilated the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and had himself become an example of firmness in leadership, competence in organisation, and heroism in face of the enemy. It is because *Medrano* was all this that the young workers and peasants, the militiamen and generals of the young army of the Republic, loved him so well.

I knew Comrade *Medrano* intimately, first as a member of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International. He took an active part in the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International, the resolutions of which gave such a great impetus to the whole movement of the working youth of the world. Then I knew him as secretary of the Young Communist League of Spain, and last year as secretary of the United Socialist Youth and commander of the "Aida Lafuente" battalion on the Navalperal front.

Medrano acquitted himself as leader of the Young Communist League with honour. He was elected to the position at one of the most difficult moments for our Spanish organisation. A Trotskyist group was threatening to disrupt the League and to divert it from the correct path. *Medrano*, as a loyal soldier of the Communist Party, liquidated this hostile group by winning over the young workers who had fallen under the influence of the Trotskyists, and by expelling these traitors from the Young Communist League. He performed a considerable service by convincing the Young Socialists of the counter-revolutionary rôle of Trotskyism. And when it became necessary to denounce and take disciplinary measures against the Trotskyist agents in the P.O.U.M., the ally of Franco, the Young Communist League was not alone, but had with it the Young Socialist League and the Republican Youth, all united in a solid bloc.

Medrano is dear to the Youth because he knew how to bring to its fruition the unity between the Young Communist and Young Socialist Leagues, and to bring about co-ordinated action by all the anti-Fascist forces of the Youth.

And when the question was raised quite recently of forming a vast league embracing all the anti-Fascist Youth who support the People's Front-Government, and who stand for mustering all the youth to save the fatherland from the foreign invader, *Medrano* threw himself with enthusiasm into the task.

With what joy he related that the various Republican Youth Leagues were already in favour of such a league, and that the idea met with great sympathy among the anarchist Youth.

Medrano lived long enough to see all the anti-Fascist youth presenting a solid front to the enemy, but he did not live to see this solid front take a more definite shape, as was his dream. But this unity will be achieved, and with the unity of all the peoples of the peninsula it will become the pledge of that victory which will give the youth freedom, prosperity, and a happy future.

Medrano the political leader proved to be a talented military leader as well. In September 1936, when I visited the sector of the Navalperal front where his battalion was in action, our comrade was in military uniform with a gold star on his breast.

This day *Medrano* was saying goodbye to the battalion he had commanded in the recent battle of Avila. I could mark the respect and affection all the soldiers had for him, both in the trenches and at the meetings of reservists held a few kilometres behind the lines.

The men told me that when a battle was taking place Comrade *Medrano* was always at the most dangerous posts.

From October, and up to the time the siege of Madrid began, *Medrano* remained attached to the Staff of the Madrid Defence Committee and later to the Central Staff.

This wonderful, but alas, too brief military career *Medrano* owed without a doubt to the political clarity and organisational ability he acquired in the ranks of the Communist Party.

Medrano often recalled the experiences he and *Carillo* met with on their return from Paris, where they had attended a meeting of the anti-Fascist Youth World Committee on the 17th of July. They crossed the frontier and were moving towards Madrid, but were cut off in the province of Leon, and so the two comrades fought for several days along with the irregulars. *Medrano* at this time knew practically nothing of military technique, never having been a soldier. And so when he became a commander, *Medrano* was always careful to point out to the youth that this ignorance of how to use arms was a fault unfortunately too widespread in Spain, a fault that has cost many precious human lives. To-day the example of Spain shows that "the moment has come to defend democracy by every means, including force of arms" (*Dimitrov*). This example should serve as a lesson to the Youth in every country menaced by Fascism.

Such was our *Medrano*, an example to all, both as political leader and military commander.

Three new names have been added to the list of heroes of the Spanish youth who have fallen in the

fight. Along with the names of *André Martin* (Perez), and *Lina Odena*, Young Communists, *F. de Rosa*, a Young Socialist, *Munioz*, the secretary of the Republican League of Youth, the youth of the world will cherish to rever the names of *Medrano*, *Cuesta*, and *Zapirain*.

In honour of their memory let the working youth tighten still closer the bonds of unity, let them not forget that it was one of the thousands of shells sent by Hitler that killed our comrades. Let us take action everywhere to end the criminal intervention in Spain of Hitler and Mussolini, and to develop our solidarity with the Spanish Youth.

The telegram sent by *Santiago Carillo*, secretary of the United Socialist Youth of Spain, to the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International regarding the death of the three comrades concluded thus: "We vow to redouble our efforts in the cause of the freedom of the Youth until we achieve victory."

May this vow become the vow of the youth of the world.

Farewell, dear Comrades *Medrano*, *Cuesta*, *Zapirain*! The cause for which you have given your noble young ardour, your last drop of blood will triumph.

POLITICAL NOTES

THE HITLER PUTSCH IN HUNGARY

By PETER WIEDEN

THE diplomatic representatives of the capitalist countries who, at the Moscow trial of the Trotskyist criminal band had the opportunity of gaining an insight into the infernal mechanism of the undermining work carried on by the Fascist war incendiaries and their agents must have said to themselves: "Such are the means and allies employed by Hitler Fascism in the Soviet Union. What are the means and allies employed by it in our countries?"

This question very quickly received a graphic answer. Several weeks after the trial of the anti-Soviet, Trotskyist Centre the Rumanian Government found itself forced to take action against the agents of Hitler Fascism in Rumania in order to prevent a forcible coup d'état by the Fascists linked up with Hitler and financed by Goebbels. Following on this, the Hungarian Government, that is the Government of a country friendly to Hitler Germany, succeeded at the last moment, in preventing an attempted putsch by the Hungarian Hitler guard. The German ambassador, *Von Mackensen*, and the chief of the German information Bureau, *Baron Von Hahn*, were implicated in this affair.

The events in Rumania where German diplomats openly participate in Fascist demonstrations, the events in Hungary where the German embassy served as the headquarters for the Fascists engaged in preparing a *putsch* gave a clear warning to all the small states in Europe and first and foremost to the south-east European countries of the danger threatening them from Hitler aggression.

All governments know, even if they publicly pretend that they do not, that Hitler Fascism prepared

the rebellion of the Spanish generals by supplying money and arms, that German and Italian divisions are waging war against the Spanish people in order to conquer Spain and to dismember it. The reactionary Governments openly sympathise with the Fascist Powers which have invaded Spain in order to crush the Spanish people and destroy the independence of Spain. Hitler calls his war against Spain a "Crusade against Bolshevism" and the reactionary Governments are in full agreement with such a "crusade."

But was the attempted putsch in Hungary which was suppressed in March of this year, also a crusade against Bolshevism"? Did the Fascists want to overthrow the Hungarian Prime Minister, *Daranyi*, because he was a "Red" or sympathised with the "Reds"?

The *Daranyi* Government shows its counter-revolutionary character daily. The Communist Party of Hungary is suppressed. Anyone suspected of Communist sympathies is severely punished. The reply of the Government to the recent miners' strike in *Fünfkirchen* was a bloodbath. The *Daranyi* Government is a government of the nobility, big landowners and capitalists; not even the German Ministry of Propaganda has ever doubted this. So then the putsch organised by Hitler Germany was not because of differences in "world outlook," but because of the very real interests of forcible expansion, of imperialist plunder.

At a mass meeting in Budapest, the Hungarian Christian Socialist Deputy, *Petrovacz*, clearly disclosed what was really the matter when he said:

"We must ask ourselves in astonishment whether

Germany is our friend since sentiments are expressed in the German Press hostile to the revision of the borders forced upon Hungary by the Treaty of St. Germaine? It is clear that Germany wants the 'Anschluss,'* and it is also clear that in Austria considerable sections of the population support these aspirations. I fear not only the downfall of a Christian State living in harmony with us, but also that the 'Anschluss' will not stop at the border of Austria and Hungary. We know that the dream of the Germans is a line from Raab to Steinamanger, cutting off Burgenland from Hungary. In connection with the German demands for colonies a French paper indicated that Germany has pretensions not only in Africa, but that it cannot ensure its existence without Hungary, and therefore it is the aim of Germany to annex all of Western Hungary."

Other Hungarian deputies stated that in the recent period the various leaders of the Fascist putschist organisations have received not less than three million German marks and that in recent months German agitators have literally flooded Western Hungary with leaflets. Furthermore, it has been established that the Budapest Chief of Police and a number of Hungarian Officers supported the putschist adventure and the plan to overthrow Daranyi and to replace him by a government "of the right," meaning by that nothing other than a government dependent upon Hitler. The former Prime Minister, Bethlen, and Tibor von Eckhardt, the ambitious leader of the "Small Farmers' Party" exposed the putschist plans and forced the weakling Daranyi, who cannot keep all the members of his cabinet in hand to adopt energetic measures. Eckhardt mobilised the peasants in the Hungarian villages and threatened to march on Budapest with a hundred thousand of them if the Government did not succeed in preventing the putsch.

Bethlen and Tibor von Eckhardt are far from sympathising with any kind of Left tendency, but they support a foreign policy that is opposed to turning Hungary into a German colony. Consequently their struggle against the Hungarian "Pfeilkreuzler" and "Sensenkreuzler" and other varieties of the German Fascist "Hakenkreuzler" (swastika) is in no way a struggle for freedom and democracy. The struggle on the other hand of Hitler's agents against these out-and-out reactionaries is by no means a struggle against "Bolshevism," or democracy which Hitler calls the first stage of Bolshevism. The struggle is simply as to whether Hungary is to preserve its independence or is to become a colony of Hitler Germany.

Goemboes, Daranyi's predecessor, pursued a foreign policy aimed at bringing about a rapprochement between Hungary and Hitler Germany in return for

which Germany temporarily supported the demand for the revision of Hungary's borders. But German imperialism was prepared to link up its policy with that of the Hungarian "revisionists" only as the glutton links up with the piece of meat he swallows. German imperialism wants to transform south-eastern Europe into its "sphere of influence" and so it is ready to "sacrifice" the demands of the Hungarian "revisionists" in order to establish better relations with Jugoslavia. In Hungary the opposition to the Goemboes policy grew, and when Goemboes died it was not one of his closest associates who became Prime Minister, but the colourless Daranyi, who stood between Goemboes and Bethlen. The relations between Hungary and Hitler Germany became cooler, and German Fascism considered it necessary to utilise more brutal methods in order to subordinate Hungary to its desires.

Hitler's foreign policy has sustained a number of reverses in the last months. The individuals spreading insolent and noisy German propaganda attempted, with some success, to spread panic amongst the Small States and to imbue them with a feeling that no serious resistance could be offered up to the powerful military apparatus of Hitler Germany, on the grounds that German "dynamics" would overthrow all obstacles with lightning rapidity.

This legend, created by German propaganda, was smashed to smithereens at the gates of Madrid. With a sigh of relief, the small nations saw that a people defending its liberty can offer up quite successful resistance to a military invasion, that Germany's military technique is not at all superior to that of other States, and that the Spanish people, inspired by the struggle for liberty, can cope with the barrack discipline of Fascism, armed though it is to the teeth.

However, not only the struggle of the Spanish people for freedom, and the Moscow trial of the Trotskyist agents of Hitler Fascism have placed Hitler Germany in such a difficult position, complications have further arisen because Hitler is beginning to meet with serious opposition in his foreign policy and because the covert opposition of the German people to the regime of war and hunger is growing from week to week.

It is becoming ever clearer to the peoples that Germany's armaments, Hitler's demands for colonies and for the extension of the German Reich, as well as the inner weaknesses of German Fascism are all bringing the outbreak of war terribly near. The peoples do not want war, and the governments are trying to get a clear picture of the real relation of forces, so as not to risk defeat by lining up with the weaker side. They see that, despite the criminal wrecking work of the Trotskyist Fascist agents of Germany and Japan, the might of the Soviet Union is invincible and growing tremendously. They see that

* i.e., the linking up of Austria to Germany.

the France of the Front Populaire is stronger than the France of Laval. They see England's ever-growing armaments. They see, finally, that it is possible to establish a peace front that is sufficiently strong to frustrate all the war plans of the Fascists.

It is thanks to this new situation that German foreign policy has sustained some reverses. In Finland there has been a political turn, as evidenced by the results of the presidential elections, and it is unlikely that Finland will be able to serve, as formerly, as a base for the operations of German Fascism. The Baltic States have recovered from their obsession with Hitler. The spirits of the democratic forces in Czechoslovakia are rising, and they are beginning to act with greater determination. The Austrian Government, despite its pact with Hitler Germany, has rejected the far-reaching demands of German foreign policy, and, under the pressure of the people, it has changed its attitude towards the agents of Hitler.

In face of this new situation, German Fascism began to display nerves, and attempted, forcibly, to transform Rumania and Hungary into spineless appendages of its foreign policy. However, the attempts to use force in bringing about a putsch not only failed, but have even assisted in increasing the tendencies of resistance to German imperialism in Central Europe. The relations between Austria and Czechoslovakia have improved. The journey of the Austrian Chancellor, Schuschnigg, to Budapest is a

first attempt to prepare closer collaboration between Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, to build a barrier in Central Europe against German imperialism. The Austrian governmental press now speaks openly of the fact that Italy is not strong enough now to guarantee the independence of Austria; of the fact that the maintenance of the independence of Czechoslovakia, which is being seriously threatened by Hitler, is a vitally urgent question for Austria, because Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia have common interests.

It would be premature to speak of a turn. There cannot, however, be any doubt that there is a growing appreciation in Austria and Hungary, which has hitherto revolved around the Berlin-Rome axis, that the policy of German Fascism constitutes a serious and direct danger to all these Powers, and at the same time there is a growing will to meet this danger jointly.

The recent events in Rumania, and especially in Hungary, the difficulties and resistance with which Hitler is meeting in a number of countries, are creating favourable conditions for a struggle against the Fascist war incendiaries and their agents within these countries. It is the duty and task of all anti-Fascists and friends of peace to utilise this situation in the most active fashion in order to raise bulwarks everywhere to impede Hitler Germany in the fulfilment of its plans of aggression.

IN THE LAND OF SOCIALISM

THE REVOLUTION OF FEBRUARY, 1917, IN RUSSIA, AND LENIN'S "APRIL THESES"

By A. KUCHKIN

THE bourgeois-democratic revolution brought about in Russia in February, 1917, by the proletariat and the peasants in army uniform, is of tremendous importance in the history of the world revolutionary movement. It put an end once and for all to the autocracy in Russia, which had played the role of world gendarme and with its troops helped the bourgeois governments to stamp out revolution in whatever West European country it broke out. The February Revolution opened up the road for the Russian proletariat to undertake a direct struggle against capitalism, for the Socialist revolution, for the establishment in Russia of the proletarian dictatorship wherewith to build Socialist society. It unloosed the forces of revolution in the West and the East.

The February bourgeois-democratic revolution was prepared by the Bolshevik Party, the Party of Lenin and Stalin. From the very beginning of its existence the whole struggle of the Party was directed towards the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy, towards the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, towards the transition of that revolution into the Socialist revolution, and towards the destruction of capitalism.

The experience of the struggle of the Bolsheviks must be thoroughly mastered by all sections of the Communist International and utilised in a manner to suit the concrete conditions reigning in each given country. Lenin wrote that the tactics of the Bolshevik Party are "an example in tactics for all." The

Communist Parties of all countries must thoroughly master Leninist strategy and tactics, so as to fulfil their historic role as leaders of the masses of working people, and first and foremost of the proletariat, the leading force both in the bourgeois-democratic and in the Socialist revolutions.

The whole trend of Russia's historical development, and in particular the imperialist war, prepared the ground for the February Revolution. The peoples, weary of the war, were no longer able to bear its burdens. There was a rise of the strike-wave in the countries of the West. The workers began to come out on the streets, demanding an end to the imperialist war and the satisfaction of their urgent interests. The soldiers of the opposing coalitions began to fraternise, a sign that the soldiers no longer wanted to shed their blood in the interests of the bourgeoisie. In connection with the approach of revolution, and with a view to averting it, the view was canvassed in influential ruling-class circles in a number of imperialist countries that it was necessary to conclude peace.

In this regard Lenin wrote in January, 1917, that

"a turning point has arrived in world policy from imperialist war to imperialist peace." (Lenin, Vol. XIX, p. 379. Russ. Ed.)

This turning-point testified to the advance of the revolution. The idea of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war grew to maturity among the workers of the West European countries and the soldiers.

In January, 1917, Lenin wrote :

"A revolutionary situation is at hand in Europe. The masses are tremendously dissatisfied and are full of unrest and anger." (Ibid. Page 385.)

Such were some of the characteristic features of the international situation on the eve of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution.

By this time the internal situation in Russia was pregnant with the conditions for a revolutionary outburst.

In 1917, Russia was passing through a period of tremendous economic breakdown. There was an acute fuel crisis in the country and a sharp decline in the output of coal. Many of the biggest enterprises stood idle for want of fuel. In 1916, 36 blast furnaces were closed down. By 1917, industry was supplying only one-half of the metal required by the munition factories.

Transport was in a catastrophic state. In the grain-producing regions there were about 1,000 million poods of grain available but, due to the dislocation of transport, were incapable of being despatched to the consuming regions. Even the munitions works had their transport requirements satisfied to the extent of only 50 per cent.

The peasant farms had gone to ruin and the sown area was curtailed. The lack of manpower strongly affected agriculture: when the February Revolution broke out, up to 16 million people had been drawn into the army.

The towns were on starvation rations. The army was in receipt of only half the standard rations, while the soldiers at the front actually received less than that amount, for both quartermasters and officers robbed the rank and file of their rations. There was a rapid rise in the cost of foodstuffs, coupled with a sharp decline in the wages of the workers. The profits, however, of the capitalists increased several times during the war, as compared with pre-war times. The oppression of the national minorities increased with every day that passed; in Middle Asia, for example, the Kazakhs, reduced to desperation, raised a revolt against the autocracy in 1916, but were suppressed with incredible ferocity.

The sum total of all this brought about acute discontent among the working people, and first and foremost among the factory workers. The class war grew more intense throughout the country. The strike movement increased. Strikes broke out in Petrograd, Moscow, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Kostroma, Briansk, Kharkov, Baku and other towns. The wave of strikes reached a high point in 1916. Whereas in 1915 the number of strikes was over 500,000, in 1917 the figure was almost a million.

There was a sullen feeling of unrest in the army. Dissatisfaction grew among the soldiers in connection with underfeeding and the insulting attitude of the officers. But the chief cause of discontent among the soldiers was that the imperialist war, which wore them out and ruined the peasant farms, continued to drag on, purposely continued in the interests of the capitalists and landowners.

The soldiers saw no hope of the war ending and deserted from the front. Defeatist sentiments grew among them. Entire regiments refused to undertake the offensive; they left their positions and marched towards the rear. Such regiments were either disbanded or were subjected to ferocious punishment, which only set the soldiers against the Tsarist regime. Soldiers shot down their officers at the front. Fraternisation developed between Russian soldiers and German and Austrian soldiers.

The spontaneous revolutionary movement of the masses increased with every day that passed. The tide of revolution rose.

The Bolshevik Party introduced the elements of organisation into this spontaneous movement. It called upon the workers, soldiers and peasants to make preparations for an armed uprising against the Tsarist Government, to fight for the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

The Bolsheviks carried on their revolutionary work in particularly difficult conditions during the years of the imperialist war. In the effort to secure peace in the rear, the Tsarist Government strove to destroy its chief domestic enemy—the Bolshevik Party. Thousands of foremost workers, members of the Bolshevik Party, languished in Tsarist dungeons. Stalin and Sverdlov, members of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, were in exile in Turukhansk, Yenisei territory, a most outlying, far-distant corner of Eastern Siberia, in the Arctic Circle. *Sergo Ordjonikidze*, member of the Central Committee, was in exile in Yakutia. Many prominent Bolsheviks, including *Litvinov*, *Vorovsky* and others, were having to live abroad. Lenin, leader and teacher of the Party, was living the life of an exile in Switzerland.

But all the efforts of the Tsarist secret police were unable to destroy the Bolshevik Party. Although it had been weakened considerably in the organisational sense, the Party never for a moment lost contact with the masses and led their struggle. The places of those foremost fighters and leaders who were seized by the police were taken by new comrades who continued the work of the Party among the workers, soldiers and peasants.

During the years of the imperialist war the cadres of the Bolshevik Party, trained and moulded by *Lenin* and *Stalin*, also continued their heroic struggle against the autocracy. The Bolshevik Party prepared the proletariat for the uprising, for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, into a war against “their own” government. It was precisely under the Bolshevik slogan of transforming the imperialist war into civil war that the work of mobilising the masses was carried on during the years of the imperialist war.

The Bolshevik Party was the only one to prepare for the revolution. The part played by all the other so-called Socialist Parties—the Mensheviks, including the Trotskyists, the S.R.s (Social Revolutionaries.—Ed.) and others—was that of stamping out the revolution. *The Bolshevik Party alone called upon the masses to storm the positions of the autocracy.*

Comrade Stalin, from his distant exile in Turukhansk, followed the revolutionary work of the Bolshevik Party. He watched the so-called Socialists engaged in activity that was of advantage to the autocracy and imperialism, and that supported the imperialist war; and in a letter to Lenin dated February 27, 1915, he wrote:

“I have recently read an article by the old fool Kropotkin; he has become completely feeble-minded. Also read a little thing by Plekhanov in ‘Rechi’—the incorrigible old gossip! . . . And the liquidators with their deputies—agents of the free economic society? There’s nobody to flog them, the devil take me. Must they really remain unpunished? Cheer us up by telling us that an organ will

very soon appear in which they will get their deserts and be flogged unsparingly and without ceasing.”*

Such a paper, the *Social-Democrat*, began to appear abroad during the war under Lenin’s guidance. In it Lenin mercilessly flogged the liquidators, S.R.s, and Trotskyists, who fought against the Bolshevik slogan of transforming the imperialist war into civil war, against the line of the Bolsheviks for an armed uprising. In the *Social-Democrat*, which reached Russia, Lenin called upon the masses to wage a life and death struggle against the autocracy. The *Social-Democrat* provided the Bolsheviks in Russia with the instructions of the leader of the Party and the proletariat.

But the Bolshevik Party had to wage a struggle not only against the Mensheviks, including the Trotskyists, and against the S.R.s, the Anarchists and others, but also against the opportunists in its own ranks. Kamenev declared himself against the Party slogan of the defeat of the Tsarist Government in the imperialist war. Bukharin, Radek, Pyatakov, supported by Zinoviev, fought against the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into civil war, against the right of nations to self-determination, and against the Leninist theory of the State and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Party smashed to pieces these opportunist viewpoints, and unmasked them before the Party’s membership and proletariat.

* * * *

During the imperialist war there were Bolshevik Party organisations in all the industrial centres of Russia. Many of them had their own secret printing presses and published leaflets which were distributed both in the rear and at the various fronts. A particularly large number of leaflets was issued by the Petrograd Committee.

Petrograd, the capital of Tsarist Russia, with its more than half a million workers, was the centre of the work of the Bolsheviks.

The class struggle took on its most acute forms there. The strongest and biggest Bolshevik organisations were there, numbering 1,200 Party members, in 1915. Almost every big works in Petrograd was a stronghold of Bolshevism; the Mensheviks and S.R.s had little influence there. From 1915 onwards the Bolshevik centre, the Bureau of the Central Committee, headed by Comrade Molotov, was in Petrograd. It issued directions to the local Party organisations regarding the preparations for the overthrow of the autocracy.

The Petrograd Party Committee, in the activity of which a direct part was played by Comrades *Molotov*,

* Reprinted in “Proletarskaya Revoliutsia,” No. 7, 1936. Russ., p. 167.

Kalinin, Andreyev, Antipov and others in the years 1915-17, rendered great service in preparing the February Revolution. Dealing with the work of the committee during the war, Lenin referred to

“the great extent to which the Petersburg Committee of our Party has developed its work. For Russia, and for the whole International, this is a real model of Social-Democratic work during a reactionary war and under most difficult conditions.”*

The Petrograd Committee of the Bolsheviks organised underground printing presses, printed leaflets, and distributed them among the workers and soldiers. It had contacts with a number of towns: Moscow, Kronstadt, etc., with the Baltic Fleet, and with the Army on the Northern Front.

In the beginning of October, 1916, the Petrograd Committee issued a leaflet calling for the declaration of “*a resolute war against war.*” “Comrades,” ran the leaflet, “we call you to the struggle. . . . *Down with the criminal war and its instigators! Down with the Romanov monarchy! . . . Long Live Socialism!*”

The Petrograd proletariat responded to this call with strikes which, in October, covered over 200,000 workers. The strikers from the “Novyi Lesner” works won to their side the soldiers of the 181st Reserve Infantry Regiment billeted near by; by their joint forces they gave a sound beating to a detachment of police and dispersed them.

On January 22, 1917 (January 9—old style), on the 12th anniversary of “Bloody Sunday,” 300,000 workers went on strike in Petrograd in response to the call of the Petrograd Party Committee. Demonstrations took place in which the workers carried red flags and Bolshevik slogans. In February the strike movement spread to the other big towns, drawing in ever new factories and works. But Petrograd was in the forefront of the strike movement. The strikes, which were primarily of a political character directed against the autocracy, took place at the call and under the guidance of the Bolsheviks. The strikers came out on the streets with the Bolshevik slogans: “Down with the Autocracy!” “Long Live the Republic!” “Down with the War!”

On March 10 (February 25—old style), the strike in Petrograd became a *general strike*. Numerous demonstrations took place that day, and there were conflicts between the workers and the police and gendarmerie. In a number of districts in Petrograd the workers began to disarm the police and arm themselves. *The general strike developed into an armed uprising.*

The next day tremendous demonstrations took place throughout the whole of Petrograd. All the factories and works were closed. Poses of police and horse-patrols passed backwards and forwards through the streets, and outposts were placed at different points. Troops were concentrated in the centre of the capital, ready to mete out bloody punishment to the insurgent workers. Police and gendarmes armed with machine-guns took up their position on the housetops. The police and soldiers opened fire on the workers, and by the evening succeeded, by fire and sword, in dispersing the demonstrations.

On that same day the Bureau of the Central Committee issued a manifesto calling for armed action and the overthrow of Tsarism, for the creation of a Provisional Revolutionary Government of Workers and Peasants in army uniform.

“The task of the working class and the revolutionary army” ran the Manifesto of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, “is to set up a *Provisional Revolutionary Government*, which will stand at the head of the newly arising *republican order.*”*

In the factories and works, in the barracks and on the streets, the Bolsheviks called upon the workers and soldiers to undertake a resolute fight against the Tsarist Government. Unrest grew among the troops. During the whole of the night of March 11 (February 26—old style) the soldiers held heated discussions on the events of the day just passed. On the morning of March 12 (February 27—old style) there burst forth the hatred of the autocratic regime that had accumulated over ages. The Volynsky Regiment mutinied, and was joined by the Preobrazhensky and Litovsky Regiments. The three regiments, led by the workers, moved towards the headquarters of the Vyborg District Committee of the Bolsheviks. The workers of the Vyborg district moved towards the centre of the city together with the rebel soldiers. On the way the workers broke into the arsenal and took 40,000 rifles.

This is how the revolutionary alliance between the working class and the peasantry clad in army uniform came about, an alliance upon which the Bolsheviks had built their plan to destroy Tsarism.

Tsarism met with complete defeat. The Tsarist Ministers were thrown into the Peter and Paul Fortress; a few days later the Tsar himself was arrested.

Thus the slogans of the Bolsheviks regarding the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war and the overthrow of the Tsarist Government were put into life in February, 1917, by the masses of the people themselves.

As soon as the people learned of the overthrow of

* Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. V, p. 154. “A few Theses.”

* Pravda, No. 1 of March 5, 1917.

the Tsar they disarmed and arrested the police and gendarmes. Provisional Revolutionary Committees were formed in the localities to take the place of the overthrown Tsarist authorities.

The February Revolution was bourgeois-democratic in character, for it solved the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (the overthrow of Tsarism).

In February, 1917, the Bolshevik Party directly led the struggle of the workers and soldiers.

Among the 1,382 people who met their death during the February days on the streets of Petrograd, there were members of the Bolshevik Party, including P. Koryakov, member of the Petrograd Committee.

* * * *

The revolution raised the issue of the organisation of a new Government, the Government of a new class. The representatives of the bourgeoisie decided to adopt all possible measures to prevent the State power falling into the hands of the workers and peasants. They decided first and foremost to install order in the capital, and to do so without delay, before the wave of revolution spread to the provinces and the army at the front. The members of the Duma elected a Provisional Committee from among themselves, composed of 11 prominent members of the State Duma, led by Rodzianko, a monarchist and president of the Duma, and including Miliukov, the leader of the Constitutional Democrats, Chheidze, the leader of the Menshevik group in the Duma, and Kerensky. The Provisional Committee set up a War Commission, to which a number of generals and officers were appointed, and which was entrusted with the duty of immediately curbing the soldiers and restoring the old discipline among them.

Thus, the bourgeoisie immediately came forward as a counter-revolutionary force.

When the Provisional Committee received the news of the arrest of the Tsarist Ministers by the insurgent workers and soldiers it declared itself the Government. Rodzianko despatched telegrams throughout the whole of Russia announcing that the State Duma had set up a new Government in the shape of the Provisional Committee.

The bourgeoisie pretended to be on the side of the revolution, in order to gain time, to collect their forces, and to engulf the revolutionary conflagration in the blood of the workers and peasants. Rodzianko and Miliukov offered greetings to the regiments which came to the Tavrichesky Palace, and shouted "Hurrah!" in honour of the revolution; but at the same time they tried to persuade the soldiers to return to their barracks and give up their arms, with the promise that the new Government would see to all their vital interests.

Side by side with the bourgeois power there was born in the fire of revolution yet another power, that

of the workers and peasants, namely, *the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*.

In the evening of February 27 (March 12—new style) the first session of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Deputies took place in the Tavrichesky Palace, and it was there decided to set up a united organisation of workers and soldiers, to be called the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The Soviet immediately assumed the functions of government. At its first session it adopted a decision to the effect that all the State finances were withdrawn from the authority of the old Tsarist Government. A Food Commission was elected to organise the supply and distribution of foodstuffs, and it was decided to organise a Workers' Militia in the localities, in the factories and works, to uphold revolutionary order in the town.

On March 1 (14th—new style), during the session of the Petrograd Soviet, the soldiers' deputies drew up the historic "Order No. 1" covering the garrison of the Petrograd Region. The order brought the rights of soldiers and sailors up to the level of those of ordinary citizens, abolished the obligation of using titles when addressing officers* and compulsory saluting when off duty, ordered the election in the army and navy of soldiers' and sailors' committees, under whose control all arms were to be placed. "In all its political activities the army unit is subordinate to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and its committees," ran point 3 of the Order.

Thus, all army units, together with their arms and ammunition, were put at the disposal of the Soviet. The order was rapidly passed on to all garrisons and to all the war fronts, thereby immediately winning the rank-and-file soldiers to the side of the Soviet.

From the very first days of the formation of the Petrograd Soviet, all the workers and the entire Petrograd garrison went over to its side. *The Soviet had at its disposal the entire armed force of the revolution. The Provisional Committee did not have a single army unit at its disposal that it could set against the Soviet.*

Thus the Provisional Committee was powerless; its orders were only operative after sanction had been obtained from the Soviet. The masses felt no confidence in the Provisional Committee, but they trusted the Soviet absolutely and completely; they declared that they recognised the power of the Soviet alone, and would obey it alone.

But the overwhelming majority in the Soviet were Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries. Being the Left faction of the bourgeoisie, they considered that

* In the Tsarist army the titles "Your Honour," "Your Highness," etc., had to be used by the rank and file and non-commissioned officers when addressing commissioned officers.

after the overthrow of the autocracy all power should pass to the bourgeoisie.

When the question arose of organising a Provisional Government, the Mensheviks and S.R.s bowed the knee to the bourgeoisie. On March 1 (March 14—new style) the Menshevik-S.R. Executive Committee of the Soviet empowered four Mensheviks: Chheidze, Sukhanov, Sokolov and Steklov, and one Socialist-Revolutionary, Philippovsky, to go to the Provisional Committee of the State Duma and ask it to form a Provisional Government at its own discretion. The bourgeoisie willingly agreed to form a Provisional Government, and placed Prince Lvov, who before the revolution had been candidate for the post of Prime Minister of the Tsarist Government, in the leadership of it. The Cadet (Constitutional Democrat), Miliukov, was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs; Guchkov, a capitalist, was appointed War Minister; and Kerensky, Minister of Justice. Lenin wrote the following of the Provisional Government:

“This Government is not a fortuitous assemblage of persons.

“They are the representatives of the new class that has arisen to political power in Russia, the class of the capitalist landlords and the bourgeoisie, the class that for a long time has been ruling our country economically. . . .”*

The Mensheviks and S.R.s tried to persuade the masses that the Provisional Government would carry out the wishes of the revolutionary people, since it would be under the vigilant control of the Soviet. The Soviet issued a manifesto to the population, in which it called upon them to obey the orders of the Provisional Government and declared its support of the Government. The Mensheviks and S.R.s were fulfilling their role as agents of the bourgeoisie.

The Provisional Government was a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This dictatorship was able to operate all its measures only as a result of the support afforded to it by the Soviets. The Soviets actually constituted another government. They were, wrote Lenin of the Soviets,† “weak and embryonic as yet, but undoubtedly an actually existing and growing *other government*.” The Soviets were the organs of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

Thus, there came into being something hitherto unknown in history and never foreseen by anybody, a peculiar form of dual power, “. . . *the interlocking of two dictatorships*: the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie . . . and the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. . . .”‡

* Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 9. “Letters from Afar.”

† Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 27. “A Dual Power.”

‡ Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 48-49. “Tasks of the Proletariat in our Revolution.”

This dual power was the chief peculiarity of the February Revolution.

* * * *

The dual power thus developed could not be maintained for long. In the process of the class struggle one power had inevitably to leave the stage. From the very outset the bourgeoisie conducted a struggle to set up their own undivided power, understanding full well that the workers and soldiers would not stop the revolution at the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy, but would continue the struggle, continue it against the war, against the possession of the land by the big landlords, and against the capitalist system.

The bourgeoisie saw in the Soviets a mortal danger to their own rule. In pretending to be supporters of the revolution, the bourgeoisie aimed at gathering their forces in order to settle accounts with the revolution by blood and iron, and to consolidate their own rule.

From the very first days of the February Revolution the Bolshevik Party conducted a struggle for the undivided power of the Soviets, as the organs of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry; they did this in order, in the course of the revolution, to convert the Soviets into organs of proletarian dictatorship.

“The February Revolution” said Comrade Stalin, “harboured irreconcilable internal contradictions. The revolution was accomplished by the efforts of the workers and peasants (soldiers), whereas, as a result of the revolution, the power passed not to the workers and peasants, but to the bourgeoisie. In making the revolution, the workers and peasants wanted to put an end once and for all to the war and to secure peace, whereas the bourgeoisie upon coming to power strove to use the revolutionary ardour of the masses in order to continue the war, and to oppose peace. . . .”

“A new *Socialist* revolution was necessary to lead the country out of the impasse of imperialist war and economic ruin.”*

After the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy, the Bolshevik Party directed its course towards Socialist revolution. It waged a struggle against the Provisional Government, which was an imperialist Government; it conducted a struggle against the Mensheviks and S.R.s, unmasking their treacherous activities. The Party set itself the task of winning over the mass revolutionary-democratic organisations, namely, the trade unions, the soldiers’ committees, and particularly the Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’ and Peasants’ deputies, for the purpose of creating a political army to bring about the Socialist revolution.

By directing its course towards a Socialist revolution, the Party was fulfilling the instructions of its leader—Lenin.

* J. Stalin, “Marxism and the National and Colonial Question.” Co-op. Publishers, Moscow, p. 70-71.

The Party was ideologically equipped with Lenin's plan concerning the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the Socialist revolution, a plan which Lenin had already worked out in detail in 1905. The Party was armed with Lenin's doctrine concerning the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one single country.

Even before Lenin's arrival from abroad, the Party had received Lenin's first "Letter from Afar," which served as a new instruction to the Party. Lenin wrote:

"To judge by the scanty information at the writer's disposal here in Switzerland, the first stage of this first revolution, the *Russian* revolution of March 1, 1917 (March 14—new style) is at an end."*

And concerning the conditions governing the development and victory of the revolution, Lenin wrote:

". . . the only *guarantee* of liberty and of the complete destruction of Tsarism lies in *arming the proletariat*, in strengthening, extending and developing the role, significance, and power of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies." †

Lenin pointed out to the Party and the proletariat that the main task of the day was to prepare for victory in the *second stage* of the revolution—a task requiring the organisation of the proletariat themselves, and of the poor people both in town and country.

Lenin wrote that the Russian proletariat had two allies in their struggle against the bourgeoisie. The first ally consisted of the tens of millions of semi-proletarians and in part the small peasant population of Russia, and comprising the huge majority of the population; these would inevitably be under the influence, to a certain degree, of the bourgeoisie and particularly of the petty bourgeoisie. They it was who needed first and foremost and most of all to be enlightened and organised. The other ally, he wrote, was the proletariat of all countries.

"With these two allies," wrote Lenin, "the proletariat of Russia, *utilising the peculiarities* of the present transition movement, can and will proceed, first, to achieve a democratic republic and the complete victory of the peasantry over the landlords, and then to *Socialism*, which alone can give the war-weary peoples *peace, bread and freedom*." ‡

On March 12, 1917 (March 25—new style), Comrade Stalin—the most faithful follower and collaborator of Lenin, returned from exile to Petrograd, where he began to lead the work of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party and also the

newspaper *Pravda*. The *Pravda*, one of the editors of which was Comrade Molotov, helped considerably in bringing about the political maturity of the masses. Its simple and popular language was understood by the masses, who read it with great interest. It was precisely for this reason that the bourgeoisie loathed the *Pravda*, as did the Mensheviks and S.R.s.

In his articles in the *Pravda*, Comrade Stalin gave an analysis of the political situation inside the country and pointed to the chief tasks of the Party as follows:

"To *smash* the old power, it was enough to have a temporary alliance between the insurgent workers and soldiers. For it is clear on the face of it that the strength of the Russian Revolution lies in the alliance of workers and peasants, clad in soldier's uniform.

"But to *preserve* the rights obtained and *develop the revolution still further*, to do this, the *temporary* alliance of workers and soldiers is by no means enough.

"To achieve this, the alliance must be made conscious and stable, protracted and firm, firm enough to withstand the provocative attacks of the counter-revolution. For it is clear to all that the guarantee of the final victory of the Russian Revolution lies in rendering durable the alliance between the revolutionary worker and the revolutionary soldier."*

The alliance of workers and soldiers found its form of expression in the Soviets; consequently, the special attention of the Party had to be turned on them. The Soviets had to be more strongly organised and consolidated, while the whole of Russia had to be covered with a network of Soviets, serving as organs of power of the people.

In accordance with this line, Comrade Stalin advanced the slogan:

"Workers, peasants, soldiers! Unite everywhere in Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, organs of the alliance and power of the revolutionary forces of Russia!"

But the revolution cannot be victorious without an armed force, and it is the proletariat who first and foremost constitute such a force. An armed proletariat is the only guarantee of the victorious march of the revolution. Therefore it was essential to arm the workers and form them into a Red Guard.

"Immediately arm the workers, form a Workers' Guard," wrote Comrade Stalin. †

Comrade Stalin mercilessly tore the mask from the Provisional Government, explaining to the masses that it was an imperialist government, that all its shouting about the defence of liberty was only a screen behind which to hide the efforts of the bourgeoisie to continue the war to a "victorious conclusion."

He explained to the masses that the Mensheviks and S.R.s were agents of the bourgeoisie, that they were betraying the interests of the workers and peasants, and that if the masses did not turn away

* Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 3. "Letters from Afar."

† Ibid, p. 10. "Letters from Afar."

‡ Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 12. "Letters from Afar."

* "Pravda" No. 8 of March 14 (27), 1917.

† "Pravda" No. 12 of March 18 (31), 1917.

from them and stand under the banner of Bolshevism, then not a single radical question of the revolution would be solved, while the revolution itself would be crushed by the bourgeoisie.

* * * *

On the night of April 3 (16), 1917, Lenin arrived in Petrograd from abroad. A warm welcome was extended to the leader of the proletariat and the Bolshevik Party: tens of thousands of working men and women, soldiers, sailors, led by the Petrograd Bolshevik Party organisation, gathered together at the Finland Station to declare to their leader their readiness to follow him to ever newer victories, to the heights of human happiness.

Lenin mounted an armoured car and, in the rays of searchlights, delivered a short speech.

On April 4 (17) Lenin announced his "*April Theses*," of world historic importance, at a meeting of Bolsheviks. In these theses Lenin, with the utmost clarity, indicated the road of the further development of the revolution, indicated the plan of struggle of the proletariat, put forward concise slogans which rallied the workers and poorest peasantry to the struggle for the Socialist revolution.

The revolution had passed through its first stage, wrote Lenin in the "*April Theses*," and had entered into its second stage; a new task had now arisen, namely, the Socialist Revolution.

"The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that it represents a *transition* from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class consciousness and organisation of the proletariat, led to the assumption of power by the bourgeoisie—to the *second stage*, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poor strata of the peasantry." *

The proletariat can accomplish the Socialist revolution only if the majority of the workers and the poorest peasants follow the Bolshevik Party. *Lenin always taught the Party the truth that it was impermissible to set about accomplishing the revolution with the vanguard alone, that if the vanguard alone was thrown into the decisive battle against the forces of the class enemy, it would be smashed and the revolution perish.* Lenin taught that victory over the enemy could only be achieved when the whole class, or almost the whole of the class, followed the proletarian vanguard, when the wide masses of working and oppressed people took their stand on the side of the proletariat and directly supported its vanguard. Unless the majority of the working people in the country were won to the side of the Bolshevik Party there could be no question of the proletariat and poorest peasantry overthrowing the Government of

the bourgeoisie and taking over the reins of State power. But for the masses to take up their stand under the fighting banner of Bolshevism, they had to have their own political experience, they had by their own experience to become convinced of the harmful position, ruinous to the revolution, adopted by the petty-bourgeois parties, they had to be convinced of the correctness of the line and tactics of the Bolsheviks. Hence arose the basic task of the moment, namely, persistently and patiently to explain to the masses all the deception practised by the Mensheviks and S.R.s, and in that way to help the masses who supported them to take the side of the Bolsheviks.

It was with the utmost determination that, in developing his theses in his "Letters on Tactics" (in the middle of April), Lenin again and again exposed the position adopted by Trotsky the Menshevik—now agent of the Gestapo and enemy of the people—and his slogan: "Without the Tsar, but a working-class government." Trotsky always asserted that the peasantry were a reactionary force which would fight alongside the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, and that the revolution would inevitably come to ruin unless saved by a Socialist revolution in the West.

In his article entitled "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," Stalin wrote the following regarding the role and importance of the masses of working peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie in the victory of the Socialist Revolution and the building of Socialism:

"The problem of the toiling masses of the petty bourgeoisie, both urban and rural, the problem of winning over these masses to the side of the proletariat, is of very great importance for the proletarian revolution. On the question of whom the toiling people of town and country will support in the struggle for power, the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, of whose reserves they will become, the reserves of the bourgeoisie or the reserves of the proletariat—on this depends the fate of the revolution and the stability of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutions in France in 1848 and 1871 were crushed chiefly because the peasant reserves turned out to be on the side of the bourgeoisie. The October Revolution was victorious because it succeeded in depriving the bourgeoisie of its peasant reserves, because it was able to win over these reserves to the side of the proletariat, because in that revolution the proletariat proved to be the only guiding force for the millions of toiling masses in town and country." *

In his "April Theses," Lenin wrote that by virtue of its capitalist character the war, even under the Provisional Government, remained an imperialist war, and *that an end could not be put to it without overthrowing this Government.* However, Lenin uttered the warning that at the moment it was yet early to put forward the slogan of the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government, as "left" opportunists like Bogdatyev and others wanted, for

* Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 22. "Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution."

* J. Stalin, "Leninism" Vol. 1, p. 108. Co-op Publishers.

the Government drew its support from the Soviets, which would also then have to be overthrown—something, however, which could on no account be done.

Lenin pointed out that the Mensheviks and S.R.s were the chief obstacles in the way of the development of the revolution, since the Provisional Government only existed as a result of their support; and he called for a most resolute struggle against them.

The Mensheviks and S.R.s, who called themselves "Socialists," had actually betrayed Socialism long ago, and during the revolution were in a united front with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat and betrayed the interests of the people. It was precisely because of this that the slightest concessions made to them, any agreement whatsoever with them, would have meant betrayal of the proletariat, internationalism, and Socialism. A united front between the Bolsheviks and the petty-bourgeois parties would have been possible at a definite stage, the indispensable condition being that these parties resolutely defended the interests of the working people, that they conducted an irreconcilable struggle against the bourgeoisie and the landlords for the power of the people. But in so far as the Menshevik and S.R. parties betrayed the people, there could only be a merciless struggle waged against them for the purpose of completely isolating them from the masses.

Lenin's theses called upon the Russian soldiers at the front to fraternise with the German and Austrian soldiers. This fraternisation hastened on the revolution in a number of countries of Western Europe.

In his "April" theses, Lenin wrote that the Soviets were the only possible form of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry, and that therefore all State power should pass into the hands of the Soviets. It was on the basis of this Leninist line that the Bolshevik Party issued the slogan: "All power to the Soviets."

Further on in the theses it speaks of the need to confiscate the landowners' estates without compensation, and to introduce the nationalisation of the land throughout the country. The confiscation without compensation of the landowners' estates, for which the Russian peasants were fighting, brought the working masses of the rural districts under the banner of the Bolshevik Party.

The theses speak of the immediate arbitrary seizure of the landowners' estates, without waiting, as the peasants were advised by the Mensheviks and S.R.s, for the Constitutional Assembly to meet. These petty-bourgeois parties did everything possible to prevent the peasants from seizing the landowners' estates, and helped the Provisional Government to equip punitive expeditions against the peasants who raided the property of the landowners.

Developing his theses, Lenin said that on the national question the Bolshevik Party should insist

upon the right of self-determination to the point of separation from Russia for all nations and all peoples forcibly annexed, or forcibly held within the borders of the Tsarist autocratic State and oppressed by it.

Lenin proposed the fusion of all banks into one single national bank, to be controlled by the Soviets. Moreover, Lenin stressed the point that the immediate task of the proletariat was not to "introduce" Socialism immediately, that for the time being all that was demanded by the Party was the transition to control over the production and distribution of products. This is not yet Socialism, but only a step towards it.

With regard to the tasks of Party construction, the theses spoke of the need for immediately calling a Party Congress and for drawing up a new programme.* Lenin proposed that the name of the Party should be changed; instead of being called social-democratic, as hitherto, it should be called Communist. Lenin wrote: "We must call ourselves the *Communist Party*—just as Marx and Engels called themselves Communists."†

Finally, in his theses, Lenin put forward the task of creating a Third Communist International, stating:

"Our Party . . . must immediately found a Third International."

The main slogan put forward in the "April Theses" was the struggle of the Party for the Socialist dictatorship of the proletariat and the poorest peasants. It was under this slogan that the Bolsheviks trained their forces for the victory of the Socialist revolution.

Lenin's "April Theses" were a concrete programme of struggle for the Socialist Revolution, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Kamenev waged a struggle against Lenin and his "April Theses," being against the line of the Party for the development of the bourgeois-democratic into the Socialist revolution. While still in the Siberian town of Achinsk, he spoke at a town's meeting in the beginning of March, 1917, and called for collaboration between the classes; along with the Achinsk merchants, Kamenev sent a telegram of greetings to Prince Lvov, the head of the Provisional Government, to Rodzianko, the President of the State Duma, and to Mikhail Romonov. This was a most disgraceful act for a member of the Bolshevik Party; it was an act of treason against Marxism-Leninism, against Lenin's Party.

On arriving in Petrograd, Kamenev defended his viewpoint of support for the Provisional Govern-

* At that period the Party was still guided by the programme adopted in 1903, at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.

† Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. VI, p. 71-72. "The Tasks of the Proletariat in our Revolution."

ment. He was against fraternisation and called upon the soldiers to "stand firm at their posts, to answer bullet for bullet, shell for shell."

Thus at bottom Kamenev stood for the continuation of the imperialist war and therefore differed in no way on this question from any stalwart liberal, or cadet.

Kamenev declared that Lenin's line as given in the "April Theses" was "unacceptable" to him, "since it makes its starting-point the recognition of the bourgeois-democratic revolution as being *accomplished*, and is calculated upon the immediate regeneration of this revolution into a Socialist revolution."

At the basis of Kamenev's position lay the denial of the possibility of building Socialism in one country, especially in such a backward country as Russia. Kamenev fought to prevent the revolution passing beyond the bounds of bourgeois-democratic tasks.

Thus Kamenev sank to the Menshevik position, and it was precisely for this reason that Kamenev tried to drag the Party into an agreement with the Mensheviks and S.R.s.

Rykov, Nogin and other right opportunists, while in the Moscow Party organisation, defended Kamenev's views. But the Moscow Bolsheviks accepted Lenin's theses and rallied around Lenin.

Piatakov, in the Kiev organisation of the Bol-

sheviks, conducted a struggle against Lenin's "April Theses," regarding them as having no foundation, as being unacceptable to the proletariat.

Under the leadership of *Lenin and Stalin*, the Party crushed these viewpoints of the opportunists. Kamenev, Rykov and other right opportunists proved to be an insignificant minority in the Party. The overwhelming majority of the members of the Bolshevik Party accepted Lenin's "April Theses" and rallied around the leader of the Party and the proletariat.

Lenin's "April Theses" fired the class-conscious workers with fresh enthusiasm for the fight. The slogans given therein were vital and close to the masses. The self-sacrificing struggle waged to carry these slogans out in practice, the correct, Leninist approach towards the masses, ensured the Bolshevik Party's success in creating a political army for the conquest of State power by the proletariat.

The heroic struggle of the Party against the bourgeoisie and against their agents in the working-class movement, the Mensheviks and S.R.s; the irreconcilable struggle against opportunists rallied the workers and the poorest peasants around the Bolshevik banner, and brought them, under the guidance of *Lenin and Stalin*, to the victorious armed uprising in October, 1917, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

IN THE SECTIONS OF THE COMINTERN

THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "STATO OPERARIO"

G. DIMITROV

THE "Stato Operario," theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Italy began to appear 10 years ago at a time of exceptionally great difficulty for the working-class and Communist movements of Italy, at a time when Fascism had driven the Communist Party into a deeply underground existence, organised the most ferocious terror against it, and destroyed all the independent organisations and remnants of the liberties of the Italian working people. At that time the Italian Communists were faced with very difficult and complicated tasks. These consisted not only in holding high the banner of the Party before the working class and all working people of Italy, while courageously facing persecution, exile, prison, torture and death. The tasks

facing the Communist Party at that time consisted first and foremost in preventing Fascism from isolating the Communist vanguard from the working people, in preserving, extending and strengthening the connections between the Communist organisations and the urban and rural workers and the peasants. The Party had to exert all its efforts so as to march at the head of the daily struggle of the working people for bread and their rights, so as to direct this struggle towards the overthrow of the bloody dictatorship of Fascism. The Party had to bar the way to the extension of the ideological influence of Fascism among the working people, whom the Fascists had forcibly driven into their own organisations.

The Communist Party as a whole did not immediately understand all these tasks. It failed to change its slogans, its methods of work and forms of organisation with the rapidity that was necessary. Fascism made use of this tardiness which cost the Party heavy losses and was utilised by Fascism.

But the merit of the Italian Communists, who were the first to have to work and fight under conditions of Fascist dictatorship, lies in the fact that in a situation fraught with the greatest difficulties, and in spite of losses sustained and mistakes committed, they never lost courage in the face of the brutality of Fascism, but conducted an incessant struggle under the leadership of the Communist International to convert their Party into a true, Bolshevik Party, striving bravely to correct their mistakes, to do away with sectarianism and right opportunism, and to master the great principles of *Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin*.

The "Stato Operario" was one of the chief weapons of this struggle. Striving to educate the Party's cadres in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, the magazine helped to provide the whole of the working-class of Italy with this education and revolutionary orientation. While conducting an incessant ideological struggle against Fascism, the magazine at the same time became one of the factors for mustering all the anti-Fascist forces in the country. Herein lies the tremendous importance of the work performed by your magazine to which, on behalf of the Communist International I now send fraternal militant greetings.

The policy of Italian Fascism to-day is a criminal one of aggression and war. Having destroyed the independence of the Abyssinian people in fire and blood, Mussolini is now engaged in armed intervention against the Spanish people who do not want to subordinate themselves to Fascist dictatorship, and are conducting a heroic struggle in defence of their liberty and national independence. This policy of furious military aggression pursued by Italian Fascism which is resulting in a continuous decline in the economic position of Italy and the impoverishment of the Italian working people, is in contradiction to the vital interests not only of the working class, but of the whole of the Italian people. This policy, which is being pursued in close alliance with German Fascism, is actually making the destiny of the Italian people dependent upon the Fascist rulers of Germany, who are thrusting the peoples of Europe into a bloody catastrophe. This policy is in glaring contradiction to the democratic revolutionary traditions embodied in the immortal figure of Garibaldi, hero of the Italian people, with the traditions which are the inalienable inheritance of the Italian people.

This has been understood by the Italian soldiers sent by the Fascists to Spain who have now gone over to the ranks of the Republican troops.

The Italian workers and peasants who have contributed glorious pages to the history of the international working-class movement, to the history of the struggle for bread, freedom and peace among the peoples, are to-day confronted with the primary task of putting an end to the criminal intervention of Italian Fascism in Spain, of putting an end to Mussolini's military aggression, which is a menace to the peoples of the whole world. The example set by the volunteers of the Garibaldi Battalion who are heroically fighting in the ranks of the People's Republican Army of Spain, should call forth in Italy a wave of enthusiasm and the will to struggle. It is precisely in Italy itself that the chains of Fascist oppression must and will be broken once and for all by the daily struggle of the workers and farm labourers, peasants, artisans, young people, progressive intellectuals and all working people.

One of the necessary conditions for bringing this about is the task of unmasking, holding up to shame, and driving out of the ranks of the working people the Trotskyist agents of Fascism,—this gang, without ideals or principles, of diversionists, spies and terrorists, who organise terrorist acts against the leaders of the great Land of Socialism, and do their utmost to prevent the establishment of working-class unity and the development of the people's front movement against Fascism and war.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Italian Communists understand all the seriousness of the tasks which confront them today, and that they will exert every effort to solve these tasks.

On the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the militant organ of the Italian Communist Party, I send special greetings to the glorious fighters of the Italian Party—to *Gramsci, Terraccini, Parodi*, to all comrades, prisoners of Fascism, to all those who have not been broken by persecution or by being deprived of their liberty. The Communist International is proud of these comrades. The Communists and working people of the whole world will never forget that the struggle for the release of these foremost proletarian fighters is the duty of all who hate Fascism, of all who love liberty and peace.

From the bottom of my heart I wish the "Stato Operario" to continue in the future to fulfill its role successfully as the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Italy, the leader of the ideological struggle against Fascism, the educator of real Marxist cadres of the working class and tireless fighter for the establishment of a mighty anti-Fascist people's front in Italy.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN JUGOSLAVIA

By K. HORWAT

RECENT political events in Yugoslavia fully confirm both the estimation of the political situation given in the manifesto of the C.C. of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the task of the struggle to establish a popular anti-Fascist front, advanced therein.

Both by its home and foreign policy, the reactionary anti-people's government of Stoyadinovich is ever more zealously clearing the way for Fascism. In recent months it has been particularly demonstrative in making declarations about the struggle it is waging "against Fascism and against Communism." Actually, however, the Government is carrying on a furious campaign against consistent anti-Fascists and Democrats, and, above all, against the working class and its organisations, covering this up by loud talk about the necessity of combating the Communist menace. This is shown not only by the endless mass arrests of workers and supporters of the People's Front in general, and the brutal treatment meted out to prisoners in the police torture-chambers, but also by the New Year declaration of Koroshec, Minister of Police. Of the struggle against Fascism he said never a word, but declared that the sole danger to be fought was Communism. Not only does the Government look on with benevolent "neutrality" and toleration while the Fascists muster their forces and prepare for the seizure of power, but it affords them direct assistance. The Serbian Fascist forces as well are gathering around the former Government National Party of Yugoslavia, around the People's Party, around the "Zbor," which is in receipt of generous financial support from Hitler Germany. The Croatian Fascists, who only recently carried out an attack on the editorial offices of the organ of the Croatian Peasants' Party in Zagreb, are also rallying their forces. The banning of meetings of the democratic groups and parties is becoming a more and more frequent occurrence, whereas the Fascists hold their meetings and processions under police protection. Besides the Government Party, the Great-Serbian Fascist organisations and parties are the only legal organisations in Yugoslavia.

The Government shows no signs of carrying out its promises to restore political liberties. The Minister, Tsvetkovich, made the statement, during the budget debates in Parliament in the beginning of March, that the new political laws would be promulgated "when the time comes." The Minister, Koroshets, on the

other hand, promised that the Government would promulgate the new laws by arrangement with the semi-legal opposition democratic parties (extra-Parliamentary opposition). But this promise is only a manoeuvre. On the one hand, the Government wants to bring about a split in the ranks of the extra-Parliamentary opposition, and to come to terms with one section of it, particularly the Croatian Peasants' Party; on the other hand, the new political laws (on the press, meetings and elections), as designed by the Government, will be just like the existing ones, namely, slightly touched-up Fascist laws. The law on the defence of the State, which, in fact, nullifies even this "reform" of the political laws, is to remain in force.

The Government's aim was to secure the adoption of at least a waiting position and actual neutrality by the opposition. In fact, it achieved this as a result of the January talks between Stoyadinovich and Machek, although they failed to arrive at an agreement on the Croatian question. This suicidal policy of the opposition, this policy of wait and see, demobilises the masses and helps to maintain power in the hands of the Stoyadinovich Government, which rests on the Fascist Parliament, wherein it has won the majority to its side. As a result of this policy, the Government was able in the municipal elections last year to secure a majority of votes in the Serbian provinces by such means as open voting, unprecedented terror, and manipulating the vote. Utilising this, the Stoyadinovich Government has declared itself the lawful representative of the Serbian people, and, as such proposes to solve the State crisis by small concessions to the national bourgeoisie, Croats and others. If this does not succeed, the Monarchy and the ruling, big Serbian bourgeoisie have the Fascists, fostered by the Stoyadinovich Government, to fall back on.

Shortly after he came to power, Stoyadinovich announced a new course in Yugoslavia's foreign policy, a change to an independent foreign policy. At the end of 1935, Stoyadinovich had uttered the phrase: Even though Yugoslavia is not a big ship, it will pursue its own course and not follow in the wake of any of the great Powers. Actually, however, this change consists of Yugoslavia becoming more and more a shadow of English foreign policy. It is not for nothing that the banker Stoyadinovich, chairman of the Belgrade Exchange, is closely connected with

British financial circles. It is not for nothing that the Regent, Prince Paul, was educated in England and spent more of his life there than in Yugoslavia. It is not for nothing that the ex-King of England spent a long time last year "fishing" in Yugoslavian waters. It is not for nothing that a number of prominent English statesmen have visited Yugoslavia in the last two years. And, finally, it is not for nothing that Stoyadinovich, in his recent statements on Yugoslavia's foreign policy, has laid particular emphasis on the strengthening of friendly relations with Great Britain. The "new line" reflects all the negative and dangerous sides of Great Britain's vacillating foreign policy, of her tolerance of the Fascist aggressors. As a result, there has been a weakening of the relations between Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and France and the Balkan and Little Entente Powers on the other; thus, the gates are being opened ever-wider for the political and economic penetration of Hitlerism into Yugoslavia.

In the last few years Germany has advanced from fourth to first place in Yugoslavia's foreign trade. Krupp is directing the reconstruction in Zenic (Bosnia) of a huge and exceptionally important military metallurgical plant. German capital has a monopoly of Yugoslavia's bauxite industry. The tremendous fraud connected with the setting up of a "Technical Union" in Yugoslavia, which caused such a stir recently, has shown not only that German capital was preparing to set up a nitrogen industry in Yugoslavia, and was anxious to lay its hands altogether on the entire economic life of the country, but it also exposed the fact of the political penetration of Hitlerism into Yugoslavia. It became evident that in addition to possessing centres of Fascist propaganda in Yugoslavia ("Kulturbund," etc.), the Hitlerites have a real network of agents in the country in the shape of the Croat-Serbian Fascist organisation, the "Zbor."

Things reached such a pass that Stoyadinovich, in his statements on foreign policy made at the end of February this year before the Parliamentary Finance Commission, placed Yugoslavia's relations with its ally, France, on a par with its relations with Germany.

"We are neither Germanophiles, Italophiles, nor Francophiles" said Stoyadinovich, making no mention whatever of the country's friendship with France, a reference usually made hitherto by all its Foreign Ministers when beginning their speeches. Speaking of the Little Entente, Stoyadinovich advanced the view that the Little Entente Pact "guarantees our frontiers in relation to our northern neighbour" (i.e., Hungary), as though stressing, thereby, Yugoslavia's neutrality in the event of Germany attacking Czechoslovakia. Instead of a clear declaration in favour of collective security, Stoyadinovich

uttered a few commonplaces about Yugoslavia's interest in the maintenance of peace.

All this aroused tremendous indignation and mistrust in opposition and democratic circles with regard to the entire foreign policy of the Government; hence the attitude of distrust displayed by the opposition circles to the agreement of "lasting friendship" recently concluded between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. Being firm adherents of the policy of rallying together all the Balkan peoples in general, and of a rapprochement between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria in particular, these circles do not, and cannot, trust the sincerity of the present Governments in Belgrade and Sophia. The pact can become a step towards strengthening the peace front in the Balkans, if Governments desiring peace take the helm of power in both countries; but it can also be utilised by the Fascist aggressors for undermining and breaking up the Balkan Entente. This is what Germany and Italy are striving for, while the Stoyadinovich Government provides no guarantees that the pact will be made a weapon of resistance against the Fascist aggressors.

Under the influence of the general indignation in Yugoslavia, the protests of France, and, apparently, the advice of British diplomacy, which was obliged to check the excessive zeal of its protégé, Stoyadinovich had ten days later to make another speech on foreign policy, this time before a full session of Parliament.

In contrast with his former speech, Stoyadinovich felt called upon this time to lay particular stress on the traditional friendship existing between Yugoslavia and France, and to express himself more definitely in favour of the system of collective security. But it would be an illusion to think that this implies a serious change in the foreign policy of Yugoslavia; it is no more than the latest swing in this ever-shifting policy. The doors have not been closed to Hitler penetration. Yugoslavia has not joined the front of the States fighting for peace.

This became clear in a few days after Stoyadinovich made his last speech, when the Government faced the country with the accomplished fact of having concluded an agreement with Italian Fascism, mortal enemy of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. This agreement allegedly ensures peace and quiet in the regions bordering on Italy—but the entire country accepted it as an "Abyssinian agreement," as a manoeuvre of Italian Fascism, which now requires at least the neutrality of Yugoslavia so as to tear her away from her allies. Then, when everything is over in Spain, Italian Fascism will attack Yugoslavia as it did in Abyssinia, in spite of agreements with the latter.

What Yugoslavia needs is not such two-Power pacts as play into the hands of the Fascist aggressors, but a firm policy of collective security and of joining the peace front. The agreement with Italy gave rise

to universal indignation, demonstrations of protest in Belgrade and Zagreb while Ciano was still in Belgrade. Even in Parliament, when the Government's foreign policy was being discussed, the representatives of all groups, including the Yugoslav National Party, jointly attacked the foreign policy of Stoyadinovich.

The only reason why the Stoyadinovich Government is still able to hold the reins of power and to pursue a home and foreign policy which clears the way for Fascism is because discord continues in the ranks of the opposition, because a wide People's Front has not yet been formed, because the two great streams which sweep along the masses of the people, namely, the Peasants' Movement and the Workers' Movement, have not yet merged into a single force. Although recent events (such as the reactionary measures of the Government, the increase in the activity of the Fascist elements, the increased penetration of Hitlerism) show the full extent of the danger that threatens the masses of the people, nevertheless, the leaders of the extra-Parliamentary opposition (i.e., of the Serbian Democratic Parties and the Croatian Peasants' Party) have not drawn the corresponding lessons therefrom. In their effort to maintain, in one form or another, the dominant position of the Serbs in Yugoslavia, the leaders of the Serbian Democrats, Radicals, and farmers are still unable to find a basis for solving the Croatian question, and their parleys with the representatives of the Croatian Peasants' Party have been dragging on now for nearly two years. On the other hand, they are still failing to muster up the courage to take the determined step of establishing a People's Front, although voices are being raised within their own parties, with ever-growing persistence, calling for the formation of a People's Front (especially among the farmers and democrats). True, Davidovich, leader of the Democrats, felt obliged recently to take a step forward when under mass persuasion he issued the slogan of unity between all democratic elements.

But Machek and the leaders of the Croatian Peasants' Party are not contenting themselves with carrying on separate negotiations with the Government behind the backs of their partners in the extra-Parliamentary opposition; they are now particularly zealous in stressing the point that they are fighting on two fronts—against Fascism and against Communism, denouncing the introduction from without of "foreign ideas" such as that of the People's Front is alleged to be. In this way they are barring the way to equality and liberty, for only the formation of the People's Front and the triumph of democracy throughout Yugoslavia can secure equality and liberty for the Croatian and all the oppressed peoples in Yugoslavia. This ruinous policy and the compromising attitude adopted towards the Croatian Fascist elements, allegedly in the interests of the unity of the Croatian

people, are already bearing fruit: the Croatian Fascists have begun an open crusade against the Croatian Peasants' Party and against all its democratic, pacifist and Slavophile traditions, preaching racial theories, extolling Hitlerism, and inventing theories as that the Croatians are not of Slav origin at all, but of German, Gothic origin.

In the recent period the Government and the Fascists have begun to use new "allies" in their struggle against the People's Front. Under the leadership of an Italian agent, the Trotskyist, Tsilig, and with the connivance of the police, the Trotskyists are publishing provocative leaflets, signed by a non-existent Committee of Action of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. These forgeries make a mockery of the national demands of the Croatian people, and call for the overthrow of the bourgeois Government in general, etc.

However, in spite of Government terror, the provocative deeds of the Trotskyists, the calumny spread by the reactionary elements, and the failure of the leaders of the opposition parties to understand the need for the People's Front, the idea of the People's Front is making headway. Wherever the first practical steps have been taken to bring it into being, positive results have already been achieved in the struggle for peace, and against Fascism and reaction. Thus Fascist meetings and processions have been dispersed in a number of towns in Serbia, through the combined action of all the democratic elements. The Fascists were driven out of Kragujevac, one of the biggest working-class centres in Serbia, in spite of the efforts of the gendarmes who came to their assistance. Recently a huge demonstration took place in Belgrade against the Croat-Serbian agents of Hitler. In Slovenia, in spite of considerable difficulties and serious mistakes, particularly in relation to the Catholics, the People's Front is beginning to take shape under the name of the Workers' and Peasants' Front. Considerable results have also been obtained here, notably at the last municipal elections, when, in spite of the open ballot and terror, the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc received nearly one-third of the total votes cast.

The decisive explanation of the extraordinary delay in establishing the People's Front in Yugoslavia must be sought in the fact that the forces of the working class are disunited, that consequently they cannot throw all their weight into the balance and come forward as the strong political factor they ought to be, both by virtue of their numbers and the great range of their struggle. Comrade Dimitrov has said that

"the decisive role in the building of a powerful People's Front belongs to the working class," and that . . . "not only is disunity of the forces of the proletariat inadmissible, but any delay in forming a united front is inadmissible and criminal."

Yet it is just such disunity and delay that are taking place in Yugoslavia. The responsibility for this lies, first and foremost, on the group of leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions, united around Topalovich. This group has not only rejected all the proposals of the Communists for unity of action and trade union unity, but has frequently made all efforts possible to undermine and destroy the unity of action developed between different trade union organisations in the preparations for and during the course of strike battles. As a result of such sabotage, the tremendous strike wave of last year (involving 150,000 strikers), which has continued this year, was not utilised to strengthen the role of the working class in the building of the People's Front. Up to the present time this group of leaders has turned down the proposal of the Communists regarding joint struggle for an anti-Fascist People's Front, putting forward instead the "Left"-sounding slogan of the formation of a third front, a Workers' Front against the "two bourgeois fronts."

Quite recently, this group of Social-Democratic and trade union leaders has changed its viewpoint in so far as it now declares for collaboration between all democratic elements in the country, while, however, saying not a word about the need for working-class unity. By forming Government trade unions, and by supporting the Croatian Workers' Union, the Government is trying to deepen the split in the ranks of the working class, to deprive them of the right to strike, and to deprive them of the gains they have achieved in the sphere of labour legislation. Even here, however, the unity-wreckers could find nothing better to do than to proclaim to the Government their services in the struggle against Communism, hoping to curry

favour in this way. The result, however, was exactly the reverse, for the Government is meting out punishment not only to the Communists, but is launching an offensive on the free legal trade unions and on the whole of the legal working-class movement as well. The recently-published minimum wage decree to all intents and purposes legalises the present beggarly wages—which are far below the existence minimum—and forbids strikes in State and municipal enterprises. Never was the danger so great, never was the need for unity so urgent.

But in spite of all these difficulties and obstacles, the Communists are with the utmost persistence continuing the struggle to bring about united action, trade union unity, working-class unity, and the formation of a broad People's Front for the struggle for peace and democratic liberties.

At the same time the Communists are overcoming shortcomings and rectifying the mistakes committed in their own ranks. Along with the published manifesto, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia adopted a special resolution on the tactics of the Party. In this resolution both Right opportunistic errors and the sectarianism present in the practical activity of the Party and its leadership are both subjected to severe criticism. These two documents are of great importance to the C.P. of Yugoslavia at the present stage. They signify a real turn in the policy of the Party. They have been adopted enthusiastically by the whole Party. The manifesto of the Central Committee is the political basis on which, given strenuous work by all Communists, the unification of all democratic elements in Yugoslavia may be achieved.

“DIE INTERNATIONALE”—THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE C.C. OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

By A. KRAJEWSKI

WE have before us four numbers of *Die Internationale*—a magazine of Marxist theory and practice, the organ of the C.P. of Germany—which cover the period from the end of 1935 to the end of 1936.

Die Internationale has a glorious past. It was first published in 1915, in the heat of the world war, by Rosa Luxembourg and Franz Mehring, with the participation of Clara Zetkin, Tyshko-Jogishes and others. *Die Internationale* was to have become an organ of struggle against the imperialist war, against social-chauvinism, against the treachery of the official leadership of the Social-Democratic Party. But the first number, published illegally, was the only one to appear, it proving impossible to publish further issues. Its place was taken by the militant organ *Letters of Spartacus*. In 1919 the magazine was revived as the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Germany, which came into being at the end of 1918. In 1933, after 14 years' existence, it was again suppressed by German Fascism, and since then has been published illegally.

The four numbers of *Die Internationale* issued since the Brussels Conference of the C.P. of Germany took place, reflect the incredible difficulties against which the heroic members of the C.P. of Germany have to fight in the underground conditions of the Hitler regime; they reflect and treat the fighting experience gradually being accumulated by these cadres.

Problems of the united and people's front constitute the main theme of the articles. In No. 1 (December, 1935-January, 1936) there is an article by Comrade Franz entitled “The Struggle for the United Front,” regarding the negotiations between the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany and the Vorstand (C.C.) of the Social-Democratic Party. The article points to the difficulties requiring to be overcome by the C.P. of Germany in the struggle to set up a united proletarian front against Fascism and war. Several different pretexts (“the united front is a Communist Party manœuvre,” “the Social-Democratic cadres in Germany itself are against the united front,” “the united front with the Communists will drive the petty

bourgeois masses away from Social Democracy,” and so on) were used to reject the proposal of the Communists, and all attempts to achieve a united front were, at that time, reduced to naught. Only recently has the Communist Party succeeded in achieving certain partial successes in this sphere.

However, *Die Internationale* is far from ascribing all the difficulties in the way of the establishment of the united front *only* to the other anti-Fascist parties and groupings. In a number of articles (especially in reports from comrades working underground), attention is drawn to the sectarianism not yet overcome by many Communists, to the incorrect attitude towards the Social-Democratic workers. Thus, for example, the same issue contains correspondence from Berlin, giving examples of sectarianism. A certain leading comrade, after *three* meetings with a Social-Democratic Party official, broke off relations with him because, you see, he had nothing more to tell him, all arguments “having been exhausted.” The author of the article was quite right in asking how a comrade who beat a retreat before the difficulties of convincing a Social-Democratic worker seeking connections with the Communists could guide and give direction to a Party organisation. Further, the author pointed out that the Communists do not try to talk with the Social-Democratic workers in a language they can understand, and instead of explaining things to them in popular language, read them “supremely scientific” lectures, etc.

In another article, entitled “Some Lessons from the Work of Setting Up a United Front” (No. 2-3), it is also pointed out that Communists in factories often run away from the difficulties connected with convincing Social-Democratic workers. The reasons given are various, such as: “There are no Social Democrats at all in our factory,” or “You'll never convince our Social Democrats, anyhow.” But where comrades have thrown themselves into the work seriously and patiently, splendid results have soon been forthcoming. An article in No. 6-7 tells of a Communist who happened to meet an old acquaintance, a Social-Democratic worker, and when the latter insisted upon inviting him to visit his home and play

chess, refused, because, as he, the Communist, said, "there was no sense in renewing all the old arguments with that Social Democrat." When, however, he was persuaded to go, it transpired that the chess was merely a pretext, the aim being to get in touch with the Communist Party for the purpose of joint work. When another comrade was asked by Social-Democratic workers to undertake I.L.D. (International Labour Defence) work jointly with them, he refused with the words: "What sort of united front is that—it's only I.L.D. work?"

These self-critical articles show that the line of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and of the Brussels Conference of the C.P. of Germany penetrated into the ranks of the Party extremely slowly and with great difficulty. To-day this state of affairs has been overcome to a considerable extent, the directions given in the magazine having undoubtedly helped.

A long article by Comrade Walter, entitled: "Only Unity Against Hitler Can Save the German People" (No. 2-3), is devoted to the same subject. The author correctly points out that it became possible for the Fascists, who are constantly scoffing at the "47 parties which existed before Hitler," to appear in the role of representatives of the unity of the German people precisely because it has not been possible hitherto to set up a united and People's Front against the Fascists. Pointing to the awful need in which the masses are living to-day, the author stresses the point that although Germany ceased long ago to pay any reparations at all, yet the thousands of millions of marks wrung from the people in taxation to cover these payments have remained in force and even increased, thus providing the Fascist dictatorship with huge sums of money for its war preparations. While noting the first successful steps in the direction of setting up a united and People's Front, the author calls upon the working people, Communists, Social Democrats, Catholics and all anti-Fascists to join forces for the struggle for a democratic Germany.

In a number of articles, the magazine attacks Brandler and individual small groups of Social Democrats who oppose the establishment of the united front. The magazine particularly attacks the Trotskyists who, incidentally, are working their way into these organisations and using them to carry on provocative undermining work against the united front (No. 2-3). After the Brussels Conference of the C.P. of Germany, the Trotskyist gang, in their miserable sheet "Unser Wort" (Our Word) made foul attacks against the united front, hurling themselves with fury against those among the Social Democrats inclined towards the united front. The Trotskyist bandits tried to cast a slur upon a number of leading Social Democrats—Breitscheid, Schiff and others—who, together with the Communists, protested against

the execution of Claus. These scoundrels completely exposed themselves as agents of the Gestapo (this was before the trial of the Trotskyist-Zinovievist Terrorist Centre) by justifying the execution of anti-Fascist fighters in Germany with cynical references to the death sentences passed in the U.S.S.R. on the murderers of Comrade Kirov.

The magazine pays considerably less attention to the problem of the People's Front than to that of the United Front. True, this question is touched upon in a number of long and short articles, while there is a special and lengthy article by Comrade Burger, entitled: "The Middle Class and the People's Front." Nevertheless, it cannot be said that this question has occupied a central place in the magazine. There is too little attention paid to the problem of work among the Catholic masses. The well-written "Open Letter to All Catholics," issued in July, 1936, by the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany, was specially devoted to this question.

The question of the *programme of the People's Front* and of the slogan of the struggle for a democratic Republic has not been treated sufficiently in the magazine; two articles being devoted to this subject. First and foremost, there is an article by Comrade Pieck in No. 4-5, while in the article by Comrade Walter, already mentioned, this question is also dealt with. But this circle of questions requires careful consideration and elaboration, the more so since, as Comrade Walter himself emphasised, our handling of the question is being questioned by certain anti-Fascist groupings. Our attitude in principle towards bourgeois democracy, the significance of our present struggle in defence of the democratic liberties which have been abolished by the Fascists, and the way to connect this slogan with the daily interests of the working people and the definite fighting level attained by the masses—all these are points on which there should be complete clarity in the minds of our cadres and all working people. We must ensure that everybody understands that this is not a manoeuvre, that the slogan of the struggle for a democratic Republic, in which the people secure preponderating influence, where they destroy the privileges of the big capitalists and landowners, and uproot Fascism, that this slogan is put forward by the Communists as one which, at the given stage, unites wide sections of the German people against Fascist dictatorship.

Although it is pointed out in the articles on the United and People's Front that the main task confronting the masses is the struggle against war and Fascism, yet the *question of the struggle against the preparation of war, of the struggle for peace* is not sufficiently clearly put forward as the central problem. A number of special articles is devoted to this theme, but in these as well the question has not been raised with sufficient clarity. The *whole* policy of Fascism

is subordinated to the preparation of a war of conquest. In this connection ever greater and greater burdens are laid upon *all* sections of the people, with the exception of the big capitalists, the big landowners, and the upper ranks of the Fascist bureaucracy. *The struggle against the preparation of war, the struggle for peace is the decisive link in the struggle against the Fascist dictatorship.*

This question is all the more acute because German Fascism is actually already conducting a war of conquest in Spain. It was only possible for the magazine to express its opinion thoroughly on this point in the last (6-7) number. But the article published therein suffers from the very serious defect that nothing is said in it about the *tasks of the Communist Party of Germany* and of the whole of the anti-Fascist camp in Germany, in relation to the heroic struggle of the Spanish people against the rebellion organised by the German and Italian Fascists.

The article by H. Behrend, entitled "From Rohrbach to Rohrbach—Our Struggle Against Hitler's Colonial Policy" (No. 2-3), contains interesting data connected with the question of the preparation of war. In reply to the argument of the Fascists that Germany is being stifled within its narrow frontiers and needs expansion, the author points to the following: On the one hand, as Germany became industrialised, emigration from Germany—despite the rapid growth of the population—diminished. During the decade 1851-1860 there were 1,130,000 emigrants; in the period 1891-1900 it had fallen to 529,000, and in 1901-1910 to 269,000. On the other hand, the author shows how tremendous are the latifundia of the biggest landowners. Out of a total number of 5,144,000 farms, 7,200 (0.17 per cent.) owned by the biggest landlords cover 10,112,000 hectares (over 25 per cent. of the total arable land). Thus, for example, ex-Kaiser Wilhelm II. owns 97,043 hectares of land; Prince Friedrich Hohenzollern-Siegmaringen, 46,036 hectares; Prince Solms-Baruth, 38,774 hectares, etc. In Upper Silesia, where the peasants are in dire want, Prince Pless, a big landowner, owns 50,505 hectares of land; Prince Hohenlohe, 48,121 hectares, etc. In truth, the landlords are being "stifled" on their "insignificant plots of land"!

Another big subject treated in the magazine is that of *work in the mass Fascist organisations*. Comrade Walter's article in No. 6-7 utilises an accumulation of rich experience to provide a number of valuable points of guidance. Comrade Walter opposes the view that Communists operating in mass organisations should only concern themselves with the special interests of the members of the given organisation. The task of the Communists is to raise *all* the problems of the anti-Fascist struggle, and skillfully to refute all the false arguments of the Fascists. It is not enough, says the author, to describe the barbarous

conditions of the life and work of the masses; they must be led into the struggle for better conditions by correctly formulating their demands and making use of the demagogic promises and slogans of the Fascists in order to draw the masses into the struggle. Comrade Walter gives a number of examples to show how this work should be conducted.

In this sphere there are also a number of self-critical notes in the magazine. Thus, a brief article in No. 4-5 speaks of "arguments" still current in some sections of the Party against work in the mass Fascist organisations. One comrade declares that "for reasons of principle" no posts whatsoever must be occupied in Fascist organisations, for this would mean giving support to Fascism. Another says that to occupy a post in a Fascist organisation means to lose the confidence of the masses. A third declares: Why work in the Labour Front? We must build up the illegal trade unions, etc., etc.

Side by side with all this, the magazine gives a number of positive examples of work. In No. 6-7 there is printed the report of a Party cell in one of the unemployed labour service camps, which provides extremely interesting material concerning methods of fighting against the conditions in these camps. In No. 2-3 there is a reprint of "A Conversation about Winter Aid between a Storm Trooper and a Communist," previously printed in the *Fakel*, a Berlin illegal newspaper. It is written in clear and simple language and shows how agitation should be carried on among the masses deceived by the Fascists. And then there are critical notes (No. 2-3) on Party newspapers which deal with lofty matters, but are unable in simple convincing language to utilise concrete facts to explain all the questions of everyday life which puzzle the reader.

In No. 2-3 there is an article by M. Fuchs on the question of *restoring the so-called free trade unions*. The author stresses the point that the Communists reject the idea of forming their own special trade unions or trade union oppositions, and are fighting to set up united free trade unions. But it is impossible to achieve this end without collaboration with the Social Democrats and also with the Christian workers. The task of the Communists is to overcome the feeling of passivity and expectation among these workers, not to become separated from them, but to draw them into the movement. One of the methods of drawing these workers into activity is to carry on work inside the organisations of the Labour Front. Thus, the struggle to restore the free trade unions rests upon the struggle for the united front and is directly bound up with the work in the mass Fascist organisations. All our active members should clearly understand that activity of a trade union character inside the "German Labour Front"

forms the basis for the creation of an independent trade union movement.

The magazine pays too little attention to the *youth*. Apart from two or three brief articles about the exploitation of juvenile labour, there is only one article dealing at length with this subject. Yet the author himself establishes the fact that the Fascists are displaying particular energy, and not without success, in their efforts to subordinate the working youth to their influence, although, of course, they are not in a position to solve a single one of the questions connected with the needs of the youth. As an example, the author points to the fact that in 1936 alone out of 1,200,000 young people finishing school, only 350,000 obtained work. In the recent period it has been growing increasingly clear to both Social Democrats and Catholics that the struggle of the young generation is a necessary, component part of the general struggle against Fascist dictatorship and for the preservation of peace. The author notes the undoubted improvement in our work among the proletarian youth. Whereas formerly the Young Communist League frequently contented itself with general phrases, now the work has become more concrete, and takes into account the special features of the position of various groups among the youth. On the other hand, whereas formerly the Y.C.L. used only illegal methods of work, only distributing leaflets, which brought a minimum of results and frequently led to discovery by the police and heavy losses, now the main work is done through legal channels, by drawing the youth into action of one kind or another in the mass organisations, factories, labour service camps, schools, etc. Practical experience has shown that this work brings in quite good results. The author cites interesting examples of the anti-Fascist sentiments of the youth in Berlin and other towns, and of action undertaken by them, but for the time being this action is of an isolated and scattered character.

The task of the Communist Party, says the author, is to see to it that all anti-Fascists help the youth everywhere, in the factories, mass organisations, and at home, to fight successfully for their economic, cultural and other needs. To achieve this, adult anti-Fascists must make close contacts with the youth, study their needs and feelings, and train them in the spirit of the struggle for peace, liberty and progress, of hatred for Fascist obscurantism. Let us add that this task is far from being adequately carried out not only by other groupings in the anti-Fascist front, but also by the Communists, especially in respect to contacts with the *peasant* youth. The magazine says nothing at all about the peasant youth.

In the magazine there is also no mention of work among the *women*. There is absolutely no doubt that the importance of his work is underestimated in the

Party, yet nobody can question the tremendous importance of this work. This question is touched upon only *indirectly* in a small article (in No. 1) on Fascist methods of paying wages. Only because the author of this article is herself a woman, a Party worker in Germany, and because she has to work together with other women, does she speak of their conditions in the factory, of the furious exploitation there, and of the resistance of the working women. This article compares favourably with the others by reason of its concrete character and display of a real knowledge of the conditions under which the women work in that factory. The author describes the Fascist methods of splitting the ranks of the working women, the attempts to set the "novices" against the old working women, and describes concretely how the Fascists strive to bring about an intensification of labour and how the working women resist it. The author makes use of the glaring fact of 69 cases of fainting on a hot July day in 1936 in a department employing 240 working women to show how they are over-taxed by the terrific speed-up. One can only hope that other Party workers will *learn* from this author how to approach their workmates, how to study their living conditions in the course of outwardly unimportant conversations, and thus to find points of support for their anti-fascist work.

The struggle conducted by the magazine against the *ideology of national socialism* is insufficient, there being only two articles in this regard. The first (in No. 1) on the special subject: "Concerning the Fascist 'scientific' criticism of the Marxian theory" covers five small pages with extremely terse and general material wherein a number of "arguments" "refuting Marxism" are enumerated and it is shown that they do not hold water. The second article aims at showing active Party workers "how to fight against the arguments of the National Socialists." The author points out that the Fascists maintain themselves not only by means of terror, that the Fascist ideology is by no means a factor of secondary importance, but one of the chief conditions of the domination of Fascism. The lesson drawn by the author is that we must give an answer to *all* the arguments of the Fascist ideologists, taking account of the special features of each argument and the concrete conditions in which it is put forward. Unfortunately, the author himself does not adhere to the method he himself recommends. While giving a general outline of the arguments (incidentally, not always sufficiently convincing for the unconvinced) to be used in refuting those of the Fascists, the author does not support these arguments of his with any concrete material. Thus the reader is left to seek out the necessary material himself (it is not difficult to realise that this is no easy task when working illegally). It would be more correct not to burden

several pages with a whole mass of heterogeneous arguments, but to analyse and refute them—even if several articles were necessary—so as to be of real use to Party workers in their practical work.

An article, entitled “National-Socialism—The Dictatorship of the Monopolists,” deals with the *class nature of Fascism*. However, while proving the general thesis that “Fascism is the dictatorship of monopolist capital,” the author does not bring the *main thing* to light, does not show the peculiar features, the specific character of the Fascist dictatorship. Monopolies became “one of the foundations of the entire economic life” (Lenin) right at the outset of the twentieth century, and since that time have been dictating their will to the bourgeois governments to an ever-growing degree. “If it were necessary,” said Lenin, “to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism, we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism.”* At that period there could be no question yet of Fascism. Therefore, it is not enough to say that Fascism is the dictatorship of monopolist capital. This way of putting the question leads to the struggle of the masses against Fascism being weakened and not strengthened. The author does not reveal the true nature of Fascism, for he glosses over its main feature, glosses over the fact that Fascism, as Comrade Dimitrov emphasised, is “*the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialistic elements of finance capital*,”† a dictatorship being operated in specific conditions, in the *period of the most profound social upheavals* of capitalist society. Precisely because many millions of people and, in particular, masses of the petty bourgeoisie and peasantry are set into action in connection with these profound social upheavals and seek new paths—it becomes possible for the Fascists to win their support by demagogically playing upon their specially urgent needs and requirements. This is why Comrade Dimitrov emphasised the point that “the accession to power of Fascism is not an ordinary succession of one bourgeois government by another, but a substitution of one state form of class domination of the bourgeoisie for another form.”‡ These questions un-

* Lenin: Selected Works (in English), Vol. V, Chapter VII. “Imperialism as a Special Stage of Capitalism,” p. 80, Co-operative Publishing Society.

† G. Dimitrov: Report at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

‡ G. Dimitrov. Ibid.

questionably require elaboration on the pages of the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Germany.

A number of valuable points are given in the articles regarding the carrying on of Party work in secret, which uncover the provocative methods used by the class enemy. It is worth while mentioning here the following methods adopted by the Gestapo. Gestapo agents put Communist literature into the letter-boxes, so that those who fall into the snare and fail to hand the material over to the police are arrested. The Communist Party warns the working people against this form of provocation, explaining at the same time that the Party never uses such methods of distributing literature.

There are a number of articles written on the *Soviet Union*. Besides the historic speech delivered by Comrade *Stalin* at the conference of Stakhanov workers (printed in No. 1), articles were also printed on the importance and prospects of the Stakhanov Movement (No. 2-3), on the democracy of the Socialist State, concerning the Draft Constitution (No. 4-5), and on the trial of Trotskyist-Zinovievist Terrorists (No. 6-7). The last article gives a good description of the road taken by the Trotskyist-Zinovievist gang who have become the agents of the Gestapo. The author settles accounts with the organ of the C.C. of German Social Democracy, the *Neuer Vorwaerts*, published in Prague, which, like the other organs of the parties of the Second International, sought to defend the foul band of terrorists. The author replies to the advocates of the bandits with the indignant words of Comrade Dimitrov: “To defend the foul terrorists is to aid Fascism.” In the article, however, it is not pointed out that the Trotsky-Zinovievist terrorists have long ceased to be any sort of political tendency whatsoever in the working class, have become transformed into a band of unprincipled scoundrels and agents of Fascism, who direct their activity towards one definite aim, namely, the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

To sum up: despite a number of such lapses and mistakes, the magazine gives quite a good reflection of the heroic struggle of the vanguard of the German working class, and serves the great cause of giving the German working class a weapon to help them in delivering a mortal blow against the Fascist dictatorship.

NOW YOU KNOW

- ¶ How the Party works in the U.S.S.R. under the leadership of Stalin.
- ¶ What the defects are and how they are to be remedied.
- ¶ How the CHINESE are fighting for national liberation, and how the SPANISH Communists are organising the struggle for victory—for democracy.
- ¶ You have read of the role of the Bolshevists and the Trotsky Terrorists in the 1917 Revolution.
- ¶ And articles on the workers' fight from many lands.

To keep up-to-date, to be well informed, you must place a regular order for the "COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL."

If you are a good Communist you will get all your friends to do likewise.

TO PUT INTO PRACTICE
**CONGRESS
DECISIONS**
REQUIRES A BACKGROUND
OF THEORY

Our Easypayway System brings the following classics within the reach of all:

★ READINGS IN LENINISM (4 vols)	-	-	per vol.	2/-
★ LENIN'S SELECTED WORKS (vols 1-7)	-	-	per vol.	5/-
★ FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF MARXISM (Plekhanov)	-	-	-	2/6
★ MARX, ENGELS, MARXISM (Lenin)	-	-	-	2/6
★ ENGELS ON "CAPITAL"	-	-	-	2/6
★ CLASS STRUGGLES IN FRANCE (Marx)	-	-	-	2/6
★ THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION (Stalin)	-	-	-	2/6
★ ANTI-DÜHRING (Engels)	-	-	-	5/-
★ MARX AND THE TRADE UNIONS	-	-	-	2/6
★ GERMANY, REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION	-	-	-	2/6

Write NOW for further Lists and Terms to :

WORKERS' BOOKSHOP LIMITED
Britain's Largest Distributors of Left Wing Literature

49 FARRINGDON ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

Tel: HOLborn 6393

AND AT 16 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2
