

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

No. 10

1940

THE QUESTION OF WORKING CLASS UNITY

F. FÜRNBURG

METAMORPHOSES OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRATISM

P. WIEDEN

TWENTY-ONE WARS

G. FRIEDRICH

FREDERICK ENGELS

B. PONOMAREV

PRICE 20 CENTS

## She Knew Them All!—

V. I. Lenin, Walt Whitman, Eugene Debs, Clarence Darrow, Charles Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Upton Sinclair, Daniel DeLeon, "Big Bill" Haywood, Charles Steinmetz, Sacco and Vanzetti, Tom Mann, Nadezhda Krupskaya, Edwin Markham, Clara Zetkin, and a host of others. She writes about them in

# WE ARE MANY

By ELLA REEVE BLOOR

320 pages. Price \$2.25

Mother Bloor's long-awaited autobiography represents

- An event of major importance for tens of thousands.
- Five decades of struggle rich in experience for the cause of labor and the people.
- The story of the coming of age of the American working class.

To read this book is an unforgettable experience and an education!



Send in your order NOW to:

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

---

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

---

No. 10

OCTOBER

1940

---

## CONTENTS

The Question of Working Class Unity . . .	<i>F. Fűrnnberg</i> . . .	643
The Forty-Fifth Anniversary of the Death of Frederick Engels . . . . .	<i>B. Ponomarev</i> . . .	655
Metamorphoses of Social-Democratism . . .	<i>P. Wieden</i> . . .	676
Twenty-One Wars—The Birth Pains of the Second Imperialist War . . . . .	<i>G. Friedrich</i> . . .	690
New Life Blossoms from the Ruins . . . . .	<i>F. Leopold</i> . . .	700
The Attitude Toward Work Under the Soviets	<i>M. Lode</i> . . .	714
Declaration of the Lithuanian Sejm on the Joining of Lithuania to the U.S.S.R. . . . .		734

---

**Workers Library Publishers, Inc., P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City**  
**Subscription price: one year \$2.00; six months \$1.00. Single copies 20 cents.**



PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

An Important Contribution  
To American Labor History—

# LABOR IN WAR TIME

By JOHN STEUBEN

Price \$1.00

"In these days, when the Government and Big Capital and the Green-Hillman type of union officials are trying to hogtie organized labor and to force this country into the war, it is important that the workers be acquainted thoroughly with the devices that were used to similar ends during the first World War. Such knowledge is basic for a successful fight against the warmongers of today, who are adapting to the present situation many of their tricks of 1914-18.

"John Steuben, in his book, **Labor in Wartime**, gives a thoughtful and documented account of the experiences of the American workers during the last war. He exposes in full the schemes used by the Government, the employers and the reactionary trade union leaders at that time to break up the opposition of the workers to the war, to stifle their wage movements and to defeat their strikes and organizing campaigns. Every militant worker and progressive leader of labor should possess a copy of this valuable book."

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER



Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.



---

## THE QUESTION OF WORKING CLASS UNITY

BY F. FURNBERG

**T**HE baneful steamroller of the imperialist war even in its first year has already caught millions of people under its crushing weight. Tens of thousands have fallen in Poland, while millions are living there under the bitter oppression of military occupation.

They starve and vegetate without understanding whence these "elemental" forces have come that multiply the misery of their unhappy lot a hundredfold, or do they know what they should do to fend them off.

In Norway at one fell blow the illusion of "secure neutrality" was shattered and smashed to bits; the country and its people are being ground to dust by the tremendous impact of imperialist contradictions. Belgium and Holland, small but industrially highly developed countries with a comparatively high standard of life, have not only lost the last semblance of independence, have not only become the theater of a war waged without mercy, but may expect to be destroyed, utterly annihilated piecemeal, in the struggle of the imperialist powers.

France, which but a short time ago seemed so powerful and rich, which had an army of five million

men at its disposal, has not merely lost a war, but, thanks to the policy of betrayal of the ruling class, has collapsed in catastrophic manner, and by far not all the consequences of this collapse have come to view.

In the belligerent countries the nervous tension of the masses is becoming almost intolerable. During the day ten hours or more of strenuous work and at night flight to the air raid shelters that afford almost no sleep; on top of it all only the barest necessities in the way of food and clothes are to be had; and the official forecast is that things will get still worse.

In the so-called neutral capitalist countries, poverty and distress are on the increase, as are the war expenditures and other war burdens despite neutrality. The masses ask with anxiety: When will we be drawn into the vortex of war?

The life of the people is chaotic. What at the beginning of the war only few predicted, what the masses instinctively shrank from, and those holding the reins of power wanted to conceal, has now become a reality; poverty and distress, capitalist exploitation and oppression did not simply grow in volume, but are assuming such forms and propor-

tions that the livelihood and even the very life of every working man and woman is placed in jeopardy.

Scores of millions of people have already lost all their worldly possessions because of the war. Hundreds of thousands were forced to go to foreign lands, away from house and home, away from their beloved ones. Hundreds of thousands are without work and without a roof over their heads. They have lost everything of material value; they are uprooted, they have been deprived of the means of decent existence. Other hundreds of thousands see the same fate staring them in the face. Millions have been stripped of all their ideals. The state in which they lived or with which they were somehow or other connected no longer exists or is but a shadow of its former self. The leaders whom they trusted and who plunged them into nameless misfortune proved to be nothing but arrant traitors and cowards. The ideals which they cherished turned out to be hollow and inane. The organizations to which they belonged for decades are broken up and smashed.

The masses of the people are asking with increasing insistence: Why all this? Who is to blame for this war and who stands to gain by it? Who is to risk his life and who will profit by such sacrifice? Where is there an escape from this inferno into which we have been led? These ominous questions are undoubtedly already being agitated in the minds of the masses. And the clearer the answer that must be given to these questions becomes to the people, the more insistent, the more articulate

the people will become. The march of events is so precipitous today that the masses lose their faith in the past before they have acquired a new orientation. They are disabused of their illusions but are still disorientated.

\* \* \*

The second imperialist war has revealed the worst, the uttermost bankruptcy of a ruling class that history has ever recorded. After the World War of 1914 the bourgeoisie promised eternal prosperity and a steady improvement in the conditions of life. But it brought on the greatest economic crisis in history and increased poverty, distress and starvation immeasurably. The bourgeoisie promised the people eternal peace and disarmament, but it brought a new imperialist war, the frightfulness of which puts in the shadow all those of the past. The bourgeoisie promised liberty and democracy but it has established the bloodiest reaction and an unbridled war dictatorship.

In the countries which collapsed during the first year of the war the bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie is obvious to all. It can no longer be concealed by false promises of a golden future, for it is too palpable a fact that the future which the bourgeoisie can offer the masses in these countries will be even more gloomy than the present.

Without a doubt hundreds of thousands in France, Belgium and Norway have today already lost all faith in the ability of the ruling class to extricate them from the terrible position in which they find themselves.

In the belligerent countries the bourgeoisie conceals the bankruptcy of its policy by pleading the necessities of the war. Responsibility for the war is conveniently laid at the door of the other imperialists and the country's attention is centered on the needs of national defense. The war dictatorship and the privations and sufferings of the present are declared to be temporary things only which are forced upon the country by the enemy, and the ruling clique is ever so bountiful in its promises of a splendid era of prosperity that is to follow upon the war, an era in which "our own" people will enjoy ample liberty and a share in the rich spoils of war.

But the people heard this song once before, after the first imperialist war, and remember that things turned out quite different. Hence the masses put little stock into these promises. The people see how the war is dragging on, see that the great battles bring no decisive results, that the first year of the war is ended but the end of the war is not in sight. In these countries too there is increasing doubt as to whether the ruling class which involved the country in this war is willing and able to lead the people out of the war in a manner that will secure real peace and liberty for the working people and a real improvement in their condition. Their belief in the heretofore existing state of things, in the present order of society, begins to totter.

At the same time the working people in the capitalist countries see that the Soviet Union, on the other hand, not only preserves peace for its own nations but has this year

delivered twenty-three million people from the terrors of capitalism and the danger of war. No lies can hide the fact that the Soviet Union is the strongest and most active force fighting on behalf of peace among nations. Under the protection of the Red Army the building of socialism is making progress while the capitalist world is writhing in convulsive pain. Little wonder that the masses are beginning to ask themselves: Why is it possible to maintain peace over there; why does the Soviet system provide work for all, assure the working people their livelihood and lead them onward to a steady improvement in their material and cultural conditions of life? Is there no force, no possibility that will lead us too to the enjoyment of peace?

Yes, there is such a force; this force is the working class.

The working people, the workers and farmers, must not only bear all the burdens of the war but they have been shorn of their rights as never before. The war dictatorship of the bourgeoisie exercises unrestricted dominion. There is no free assembly, no free press, no freedom of organization. If the masses stir but the lease bit, their movement is crushed in blood. At no time in the history of mankind did hundreds of thousands pine in prisons and concentration camps as is the case now. The full weight of the war machine rests upon the people; the force and violence directed against the people at home is no less than that directed against the foreign foe, though the forms it assumes may be different.

The man-in-the-street asks him-

self: Is it possible at all to resist this rule of force and violence? Is it not a fact that the ruling classes are strong enough to nip every such attempt in the bud? Do they not have at their disposal the police, the army, the courts, the press, the radio—in short, everything, while we have nothing? Is there a force that can stand up against all this, that is capable of entering the fight with the prospect of success?

The answer is: Yes—the working class.

The working class is the class which possesses the force capable of opposing the imperialist war and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. It is concentrated in the factories and mills, and if the war dictatorship forbids the organizations of the workers, the latter make use of the organizations which the capitalists cannot do away with—namely, the factories, mills and workshops. Their work is the decisive source of nourishment not only of capitalism in general but also of the war. The working class has gone through thousands of fights, big and small; it has been tested and steeled in struggle. What it needs is a consciousness of its great social force, its complete liberation from the influence of the bourgeoisie. What it needs is unity and solidarity in its ranks.

\* \* \*

The more and the sooner the working class succeeds in establishing unity in its ranks on a national and international scale, the more will it be in a position to resist the unprecedented exploitation, distress and oppression, the more effectively

will it be able to fight against the imperialist war, the more numerous will be the masses which it will rally to its banner. This is the reason why the Communists consider it their most important, their decisive task precisely now to set up a united front and a people's front from among the people.

The Social-Democracy has always attempted to represent the united front from below—the unification of the workers in the factories, in the workers' suburbs, in the workers' organizations—as a maneuver of the Communists to establish their alleged "dictatorship" over the labor movement. This is nothing but a slanderous lie circulated for the purpose of preventing the formation of a united front and to keep the working class under the influence of Social-Democracy. Social-Democracy has always held that a united front is superfluous, claiming that it and the reformist trade unions were already taking care of the interests of the working class, and that if any arrangement with the Communists should become necessary and possible, it would be taken care of. The Social-Democratic leaders do not want the unification of the working class to take place over their heads and hence oppose this unification with all their might and main.

The working class has accumulated considerable experience during the last few years as to how the Social-Democratic leaders sabotage the united front. At first they had the effrontery to come out openly against any kind of united front. Then, yielding to the pressure of the masses who demanded a united

struggle against reaction and the war danger, they declared that they were ready to enter into a compact for the formation of a united front from above. At the same time they did everything in their power to prevent a united front from below, that is, real unity of the masses without which the united front cannot become effective. They shamelessly violated one agreement after another and finally broke up the united front altogether and, joining forces with the reactionaries, launched a fierce struggle against the Communists and all revolutionary workers.

To this bitter experience of the working class there has been added the revolting experience of the second imperialist war. Once more the working class has learned—this time in a most telling fashion—how the Social-Democratic and the reformist trade union leaders protect their interests. It is precisely with the aid of Social-Democracy that all the economic and political gains of the workers are being annulled. It was with the aid of Social-Democracy that the worst crime against the working people, the imperialist war with all its ensuing bloodshed, was brought about.

Social-Democracy entered the service of British imperialism and deceived the working class by issuing slogans which asserted that it was an "anti-fascist" war, a war for "liberty and democracy." At the same time Social-Democracy actively participated in the abolition of every vestige of liberty and democracy. Only a year has elapsed since then but not only has nothing re-

mained of these slogans of Social-Democracy but the diametrically opposite of what it promised has come true. Today even the Social-Democrats themselves are no longer able to speak or even dream of unity of the working class within the framework of the Social-Democratic parties, for Social-Democracy is bankrupt, the Second International is dead.

Unity with the Social-Democratic parties? How is unity with the Social-Democratic parties possible if the latter already act completely and quite openly as part of the bourgeoisie? The shabby remnants of the Polish Socialist Party, which together with its masters, the Polish squires, left the people in the lurch, now are a part of the most despicable and ridiculous "government" that ever disgraced the pages of history. There they find themselves in close solidarity with the worst enemies of the Polish people, and, like the Polish colonels, receive their infamous pay from the war chest of the British imperialists.

The Social-Democratic parties of Sweden and Denmark are making every effort to merge with the various bourgeois parties, including even the most reactionary, into a single "unity party." This is the unity that they desire. The Belgian De Mans and their ilk who changed front in the middle of the war cling desperately to their king and reaction, and declare that the main task now is to find a common language with the reactionaries.

The British Labor Party holds ministerial seats in the war government and promises to do everything

to cement its unity with the bourgeoisie.

The French Socialist Party is broken up, has crumbled to bits. Low-down, contemptible traitors like René Belin have entered the Petain government, this conglomeration of scoundrels and parasites. After smashing the French working class movement and plunging France into the abyss, they now declare that the class struggle has been abolished and that unity with the treasonable bourgeoisie is the most important item on the agenda. Obviously unity with the Social-Democratic parties would be tantamount to complete subordination to the bourgeoisie, to support of the imperialist war. The establishment of the united front of the working class demands that Social-Democracy be fought to the hilt.

But Social-Democracy has suffered not only political bankruptcy. It has not only become the paid tool of the bourgeoisie but has also collapsed organizationally in a number of countries. Only a short time ago there were large Social-Democratic parties in Norway, Holland, Belgium and France. These parties are now broken up; they no longer exist in their old form. The Social-Democratic bureaucracy endeavors to remain in the service of the bourgeoisie. Its vileness and cringing before the powers-that-be of its particular country is multiplying tenfold. But the position of Social-Democracy as a party has been smashed in these countries. The bolts that kept the masses riveted to the bourgeois regime have been broken and the Social-Democratic masses are now so situated that the

question of what is to be done becomes ever more urgent with them. Ever more urgent, for the mass of the Social-Democrats is not going to accept supinely their complete subordination to the bourgeoisie; they do not want war, but curse it. The Social-Democratic workers followed their leaders because they were not aware of the fact that these leaders were betraying their class. They believed that these leaders meant to fight capitalism in earnest and that the Social-Democratic way was sure to lead to socialism without too much difficulty and suffering. Now, when the whole world in which they dwelt lies in ruins before their eyes, when their leaders of yesterday make sport of their ideals and again have led them into war—now a veritable process of transformation is going on in the minds of the Social-Democratic masses.

The most active among them are beginning to take the stand that it is necessary to organize the struggle of the working class without and even against their former leaders. From below new people and new movements are beginning to emerge which no longer are simply "in opposition to the leadership" but want to veer about completely.

These oppositional tendencies in the question of the class struggle are of course only a beginning; the mass of the Social-Democrats are still confusedly contemplating the debris of their past. Only slowly are they becoming used to the idea that a new orientation has become necessary. At this point, the Communists in a comradely way address their Social-Democratic class brothers to



tell them that there is only one way out of the situation to which their leaders have brought them—the formation of a united front from below.

By a united front the Communists never meant that the Social-Democratic workers should be subordinated to the Communists, that in the leadership of the joint struggle the Social-Democratic workers should not enjoy equal rights. On the contrary, the Communists know full well that the united front—if it is to be converted from a mere slogan into reality—is a complicated and many-sided instrument which can only function when it is in the charge of people, from top to bottom, who enjoy the confidence of the masses, who are connected with them and are ready uncompromisingly to lead the class struggle. For this very reason the Communists are convinced that it is absolutely necessary to fight the traitorous leaders, to remove them and to promote new leaders from among the working class itself. The Communists are free from all jealousy, want no guardianship over, and seek no intrigues against, such new leaders and are always ready to fight jointly at their side.

The Communists have always been of the opinion that the struggle of the working class must be waged according to the specific conditions of each particular country and that therefore the united front of the workers cannot be set up according to a fixed scheme, according to a uniform pattern.

In the Baltic countries the workers were in a position, thanks to the

aid of the Soviet Union, to achieve unity in the most broadly conceived form, in the form of Soviets. The general membership and many of the functionaries of the Social-Democratic parties there saw their way clear to come over to the Communists and welded the working class and the entire people into a single whole. While this is the broadest form of unity—the aspirations of hundreds of thousands—the Communists are fully aware of the fact that such unity was possible only because of the special circumstances.

In Finland, where Social-Democracy became the protagonist of counter-revolution in the struggle against the Land of Socialism, the Social-Democratic workers are rallying their forces in a Left opposition movement. They learned a lesson from the war which the Finnish White Guards launched against the Soviet Union at the behest of the imperialists. They want not only peace but close, friendly relations with the Soviet Union, the country of socialism victorious. They are fighting to have the working class free itself from its vassalage to the bourgeoisie, and to uphold its own class interests which run parallel with those of the working people as a whole. The leaders and rank and file of this movement are Social-Democrats. Most of them have been members of the Social-Democratic Party for years. But these Social-Democrats are willing to fight as real Socialists. To unite in joint struggle with them signifies the formation of a united front from below.

Nicole's Socialist Party in Switzerland consists of Social-Democrats who only recently were expelled from the Socialist Party of Switzerland because of their consistent fight against the political truce with the bourgeoisie, because they direct their efforts against the imperialist war, because no campaign of incitement and slander could induce them to break faith with the U.S.S.R. They have thus given life to the united front from below without first concluding a pact with the Communists, for the Communists are engaged in the same struggle.

In France—on both sides of the demarcation line—the Social-Democratic masses were abandoned by their Social-Democratic leaders. They have left the workers of the occupied territory to their fate. They fled to Vichy or have retired to private life on the Riviera. In the unoccupied territory they pursue the line of supporting the reactionary dictatorship. The French working class and the masses of the French people in general who have already suffered so much this year are facing a winter without food and fuel, and without work. Hundreds of thousands are still on the streets because they cannot get back to their homes. The present conditions already foretell of the chaos, the misery, the bloody oppression which those in the seats of government are preparing for the immediate future. The Social-Democratic masses cannot remain passive in this situation. The Communists know that they are not a formless mass, that they have been able to

preserve certain remnants of their organization, that the workers have representatives who are their spokesmen and take the lead in action. In speaking today of a united front from below the French Communists do not mean that the Socialists are simply to be annexed to the Communists. What they do mean is that these spokesmen of the workers—Communists, Social-Democrats, trade union leaders, radicals and also non-partisans—should get together, on an absolutely equal footing, in the factories and the various localities, for the purpose of determining how to change the state of affairs in which the bourgeoisie always gets its fill while the workers starve; how to combat the campaign of persecutions; how to break the sabotage of the capitalists and how to counteract the constant treason to the French people.

The Communists will not reproach a single Social-Democrat for having formerly followed the Social-Democratic leaders that are now covered with shame and disgrace if today, at a time of direct need, he is ready to take part in the joint struggle of the workers. The Communists do not want to see that which can still be salvaged from the trade union, workers' sports and cultural organizations smashed or disintegrated. They want the unification of all the working class organizations which today are scattered and isolated, and which are willing to defend the interests of the proletariat in a united front of struggle. Thus the Communists put every shoulder to the wheel to

create a united front from below.

In England it is a question of rallying the rank and file and the functionaries of the Labor Party who are dissatisfied with the party's policy of political truce, who are opposed to the war dictatorship and the abrogation of democratic rights, who militantly fight against the masses working for reduced wages while the capitalists pile up enormous profits. The united front from below makes its appearance there among the lower organizations of the trade unions and of the cooperative party and of the various societies that fight for the rights of the people.

In the countries of reaction, where Social-Democracy has long ago been jettisoned by the bourgeoisie, the Communists are fighting against the arbitrary rule of force and against the demagoguery of reaction which seeks by all means to prevent the class unity of the workers. There it is a question of counteracting the nationalist poison in such a way that the struggle going on in the factories for the everyday interests of the workers should give rise to a united front which will comprise the Communists, Social-Democrats, non-partisans as well as nationalist workers. Only such a united front will be able to engender a force capable of waging a serious struggle against the imperialist war.

In the United States of America, where the workers are in the van of the struggle against the war incendiaries and war profiteers, a united front is being forged, primarily in the trade unions and in the struggle for trade union unity.

It is now necessary to enroll the workers into those mass organizations which are fighting against a further reduction in the living standard of the working people and against any policy calculated to involve America in the imperialist war. Despite the brutal persecution to which they are being exposed, the Communists are at the head of this struggle and are doing all in their power to make this united front from below effective and powerful, for it is the only force capable of rallying the masses of the people and of heading the course of events in another direction, that is, against the imperialist war.

In several South American countries, as, for instance, in Chile, the situation is entirely different. There the united front between Communists and Social-Democrats has been realized from top to bottom. There the working class, thanks to this united front, has become the mainstay of a people's front. The Communists strain every nerve to consolidate the position of the united front and the people's front among the masses and to render them capable of fighting reaction.

The establishment of a united front from below is today undoubtedly the task of the entire working class. Every class-conscious worker who is fighting for his own interests and in interests of his class will devote himself wholeheartedly to the erection of this united front. Nevertheless it is clear that due to the traditional part which they play in the working class movement, the workers who were organized in the Social-Democratic parties and in the trade

unions are today of particular importance. The Communists will therefore endeavor unremittingly to win them for the united front from below.

In this period of the reorientation of the masses of Social-Democratic workers, correct organization and development of the united front from below will determine whether Social-Democratism in the working class will suffer final defeat.

Only if we succeed in eradicating Social-Democratism in the working class movement shall we be able to prevent the bourgeoisie from extricating itself once more from its difficult position without the loss of its supremacy and despite its utter bankruptcy.

In 1918 Social-Democratism kept the workers from overthrowing the capitalist regime. Later on it was the decisive factor in consolidating bourgeois rule. During the period of world economic crisis Social-Democratism, which continued to spread disbelief in the strength of the working class, frustrated the establishment of joint action against the reactionaries. Owing to the fact that in the capitalist countries the influence of Social-Democratism in the working class movement was still strong, the Social-Democratic leaders were able to bring about the fall of the Spanish people's republic, and cover up the preparations being made for an imperialist war, and succeeded in dragging the popular masses once more into this war. Experience has shown that Social-Democratism is the root evil in the working class movement and if it is not eradicated the working class will live to see a still worse 1918.

The struggle against Social-Democratism is most intimately connected with the mastery of the theory of Marxism-Leninism by the revolutionary workers. It is precisely these troubled times in which we are now living and which abound in unexpected turns of events that make it necessary for every revolutionary worker to master the theory of the proletariat, to master Marxism-Leninism. This theory gives an insight into the laws of social development and makes it possible to determine the right orientation. Extermination of Social-Democratism in the working class and the inculcation of Marxism-Leninism are two aspects of the same question. In this connection the study of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* is and will remain of decisive importance, for the experience of this bold, intrepid and victorious Party is irreplaceable and in many respects serves as the guide of the working class movement in the capitalist countries.

The struggle against Social-Democratism is inseparably bound up with the struggle for the united front from below. To free oneself from the maze of mendacious illusions of Social-Democratism, which disarm the working class by diverting it from the class struggle and leading it along the road of reconciliation with the bourgeoisie, means to fight against the oppressors and exploiters. But he who treads the road of the class struggle, and not that of class conciliation which has led to the present situation, must fight against the treasonable leaders, must form a single

front with the Communists, and such people can be won over to the cause of the united front from below.

In creating, strengthening and developing a united front from below in every country, in accordance with the specific conditions there obtaining, the working class at the same time establishes unity of action on an international scale. For the struggle on behalf of the daily needs of the masses in the various countries is simultaneously a struggle against the imperialist war. If the working class in each country combats the chauvinist campaigns of incitement through the instrumentality of its united front and shows to the masses that those responsible for the war are to be found in their own country, it achieves precisely that great international proletarian solidarity which is the outgrowth of international unity of action. The struggle of the working class in each country, conducted through its united front from below, for the support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, constitutes that internationalism incarnate which expresses the fact that the basic interests of the working class of the capitalist countries coincide with those of the Soviet Union. Thus the creation of a united front from below is the only way to arrive at international united action of the working class which alone will provide a proletarian way out of the imperialist war.

\* \* \*

While the working class is the only force capable of ascertaining

the way out of the imperialist holocaust of war and of leading the struggle in this direction, it cannot achieve victory in this fight single-handed. In the great historic contest between the working class and the bourgeoisie the proletariat can emerge victorious only if it succeeds in arousing the whole of the working people against capitalism. Whether the working class succeeds in putting into motion the wide masses of the people—the peasantry and the middle classes in the cities—against the bourgeoisie and in winning them over to its side is the factor that will determine the end of the imperialist war. And more—the working class does not live isolated from the rest of toiling humanity. It not only influences the other sections of the people but vice versa is being influenced by them through their moods and their preparedness to fight. For this reason the formation of the united front of the working class and its struggle is most closely connected with the struggle for a people's front from below.

Today the interests of the widest masses of the people coincide more than ever with those of the working class. For is it not a fact that the farmer, the artisan and the small businessman suffer as much under the dead load of the imperialist war as the worker? Are their sons not equally called upon to do service at the front; are they not equally exposed to the murderous attacks of the enemy's bombs? Are they not equally bled white by finance capital? Tens of thousands of them are being proletarianized today at one blow, are losing all they had. They

realize more and more as the war continues that only union with the workers can bring them salvation.

Thus the creation of the united front of the workers must proceed hand in hand with the establishment of a people's front from below. The building and consolidation of the people's front from below will make it easier for the workers to set up their united front and fashion it into a firm core of the people. This new people's front, which is not based on a compact between parties but is simply and literally a struggle for life and livelihood, is bound to unfold new forms for its development. The struggle itself will give birth to these forms, and will do so all the more quickly the closer the connection between the working class and the laboring masses as a whole.

In one country in the world there already exists complete political and moral unity of the people: in the Soviet Union, this invincible socialist power. The eyes of the working people of the whole world hopefully look to this country whose unalterable and consistent policy of peace has demonstrated the vast difference in principle between capitalism and socialism.

The more the imperialist war increases the suffering of the people, the more the campaign of lies and calumny of the capitalists and of Social-Democracy against the Soviet Union loses in effectiveness. Faith in the Soviet Union is gaining ground and this faith represents a gigantic force which is working in the direction of a united and a people's front. It therefore requires no explanation as to why the united and the people's front in each country supports the policy of the Soviet Union with all their might and main. It is therefore quite comprehensible and quite right for the revolutionary working class to say that only those who support the Soviet Union and its policy and who fight for friendly and close relations with the Soviet Union can be real champions of the united and the people's front.

In the dismal days that have now fallen upon the people and which have brought them death and destruction, there is growing among the popular masses a force that will bring them a prosperous future, provided a united and a people's front from below is established. The fulfilment of this task is the duty of every revolutionary worker.



---

## THE FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FREDERICK ENGELS

BY B. PONOMAREV

**I**N THE minds of the working class of all countries, the name of Frederick Engels is linked up with the revolutionary theory of the proletarian movement for emancipation, with scientific socialism, which Engels founded jointly with Marx.

For thousands of years, oppressed and exploited people dreamed of a better fate, of emancipation from the oppression and enslavement to which the ruling classes subjected them. The finest minds of humanity sought long and arduously for the path which would lead to the abolition of slavery and poverty, to the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. Utopian dreamers and scientists, rebels and religious reformers were among the many who propounded their plans for reconstructing society anew. Countless "theories" were concocted with this end in view. But all of them were without foundation and at best remained mere dreams.

Only with the appearance of the modern proletariat did it become possible to create the truly scientific theory of the overthrow of the class rule of the exploiters and the transition to socialism. Marx and Engels disclosed to the world the immutable

laws of the economic development of society, laws by which mankind could accomplish the leap from the age-old "kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom." In the person of the working class they found the force that was destined to be the grave-digger of capitalism.

V. I. Lenin, in his obituary on Frederick Engels, wrote in 1895:

"Marx and Engels were the first to show that the working class and its demands was the necessary outcome of the modern economic order, which together with the bourgeoisie inevitably creates and organizes the proletariat. They have shown that it is not the well-meaning attempts of some noble-minded individuals that will deliver humanity from the ills which now oppress it, but the class struggle of the organized proletariat. Marx and Engels, in their scientific works, were the first to explain that socialism is not the fancy of dreamers, but the final aim and inevitable result of the development of the productive forces of modern society." (V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, p. 34, International Publishers, New York.)

Socialism was thereby transformed from a utopia into a science. The place of dreams about a better

future was taken by the inexorable laws of social development, the place of good intentions about the creation of a society without rich or poor was taken by the class struggle of the proletariat; in place of trust in the "strong men of the world" and "heroes," the idea was advanced of the dictatorship of the working class, which was destined to refashion the world and lead the people to socialism.

Thanks to Marx and Engels the theory of scientific socialism became a mighty force in the hands of the working class, for it alone gave a true interpretation of all the phases and processes of social development. It served the working class as a compass by which to steer in the difficult conditions of this development, indicating with precision the goal and the paths that had to be taken to reach it. For these reasons, a knowledge of this theory became the prime necessity for a successful struggle of the working class for its emancipation.

The working class is the social class to which belongs the future. History has imposed upon it the great task of the revolutionary transformation of the world. It is destined to reconstruct all human society on new, socialist principles, to remodel the economic and state structure, the culture and science, the ideology and morals, in a word, all phases of social life. That is why the science of the transformation of this society is also all-inclusive. Its great founders, Marx and Engels, developed its every aspect.

The three component parts of Marxism—political economy, philosophy and socialism—were given

genuinely scientific foundations and placed at the service of the proletariat in its struggle for emancipation. By having established the theory of dialectical materialism, Marx and Engels introduced the revolutionary scientific method into all fields of human knowledge. They evolved the philosophy of the proletariat, which provided the latter with the clue to the explanation of all phenomena in nature and society and served it as a powerful instrument not only in remolding human society, but in bending nature to its will. It is on the basis of this method that Marx and Engels discovered the most profound laws of nature, making it possible to adapt nature to the service of mankind once freed of exploitation.

These two geniuses of the proletariat probed into an unusually wide circle of problems. The rich heritage they left behind for the international proletariat, in the form of their writings and correspondence, constitutes an inexhaustible treasury of knowledge in all spheres of life. They shed a new light on all questions of economics and natural science, history and culture, military science and literature, as well as a host of others, propounding them from the standpoint of the revolutionary science of the proletariat. They laid the foundations for the strategy and tactics of the proletariat.

Not only did Marx and Engels elaborate the theory of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, but they were also direct participants in this struggle and its guides. Their lives typified the life of the leader of the new class, which is

destined to rebuild the world. Their entire activity was a model of indissoluble unity between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice. These leaders of the working class were at the same time the greatest theoreticians of their time. Today, the international proletariat finds this same unity of theory and practice in the persons of Lenin and Stalin.

All their lives, Marx and Engels were in the front ranks of the militant proletariat. The foundation of the Communist League, which was the embryo of the revolutionary proletarian party; the organization of the First International; close participation in the leadership of the German, French and other Socialist parties; Engels' struggle for revolutionary Marxism in the ranks of the Second International—all this is an imprescriptible part of the lives and activities of the founders of scientific socialism.

Today, when the capitalist world is enveloped in the flames of the second imperialist war, millions of working people are searching primarily for an answer to the agitating question with which the war confronts them. What are the reasons for military conflicts, what gives rise to wars, for what purposes are they waged, and what is the way out of the shambles into which millions of people have been plunged at the present time? The ruling classes of the capitalist states zealously spread their lying versions of the war. In order to force people to fight and die on the fields of an imperialist war, the bourgeoisie and its agents have first to fool the people. This has become a

prime necessity for the ruling classes in conducting a war.

In this difficult war situation, it is necessary for the working people, the working class, and, above all, its vanguard to make clear to themselves the true reasons for war, to disclose the positions of the various classes and to find the way out. It is no less important that the working people be able to distinguish between their true defenders and their false friends, the enemy agents who are pursuing the policy of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement. The only correct answer to all these agitating questions can be found in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Hence, in commemorating the forty-fifth anniversary of the death of Frederick Engels, one of the greatest theoreticians of the proletariat and one of its outstanding leaders, the working class must, first of all, turn to those of his works that treat of the questions which are of such moment today.

\* \* \*

Among the many subjects handled by Engels, military affairs and the history and problems of military science occupy an important place.

Marx and Engels lived in a period which abounded in wars. The battles of the French bourgeois revolution were still fresh in the minds of the older generation contemporary with Marx and Engels. Following on the revolution came the Napoleonic wars, which seized on a good half of the world, bringing about a revolution in military science, and leaving profound traces

on all social development. Marx and Engels were contemporaries with the military operations that took place in France and Germany in connection with the Revolution of 1848, Engels personally taking part in revolutionary battles in Germany.

There soon followed a rapid succession of wars in various parts of the world. The war between Turkey and Russia, subsequently becoming a war of Great Britain, France and Turkey against Russia; the war between Italy and Austria in 1859; the Civil War in America; the uprising in India; the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, and finally the war of 1870-71 between France and Prussia, culminating in the Paris Commune—such was the situation characteristic of that time.

On the other hand, the history of human society, the study of which Marx and Engels placed on a genuinely scientific foundations by establishing the theory of historical materialism, testified to the great part which wars played in the life of society. The working class inevitably came up against wars. What it needed was a scientific analysis of the question of war, a correct explanation of the causes engendering wars. For the practical struggle of the working class it was important for the latter to be able to determine its attitude towards each given war, to be able to take the position conforming with its class interests, the interests of social development. And the founders of Marxism analyzed all these problems.

Lenin stressed the vast importance of Engels' works on military questions, and pointed out how

necessary a knowledge of military matters is for the representatives of the working class.

"Take the military aspect," he said. "No Social-Democrat at all familiar with history, who has studied Engels, the great expert on this subject, has ever doubted the tremendous importance of military knowledge, the tremendous importance of military technique and military organization as an instrument to be used by the masses of the people and the classes of the people in deciding great historical conflicts." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 384-85, Russian edition.)

Engels has written many works, both large and small, on the theory of military science and on the history of wars, and has described and analyzed all the wars that took place during his lifetime. His articles "The Army," "The Infantry," "The Cavalry," "Artillery," "The Navy," "The History of the Rifle," the entire military sections of the *New American Encyclopedia*, the articles "Po and Rhine," "Savoy, Nice and the Rhine," his "Notes on the War," numerous passages on military matters in *Anti-Dühring* and other works constitute an enormous treasury of military knowledge, elaborated from the standpoint of scientific socialism.

For the first time in the history of mankind the question of war was put on a truly scientific foundation. The art of warfare was explained from the point of view of historical materialism, and, what is most important, certain fundamental principles were drawn up, whereby the working class could make the cor-

rect appraisal of any war and adopt the correct position with regard to it.

The army and military affairs have always been the "holy of holies" of the ruling classes. They have ever devoted special attention to the loyalty of the army, endeavoring to invest it with the aureole of the nation's defender. The army's officers have come from the aristocratic sections of the population and everywhere constituted a select caste. It has usually been impossible for a member of any other section of society to rise to an officer's rank. The ruling classes have ruthlessly tried to keep all ideas that did not suit them from penetrating into the army. Military leaders were depicted as the saviors of the nation, as people blessed with grace from on high. Military strategists, when theory began to enter into military affairs, were usually generals. War was depicted as an eternally existing phenomenon, and just as unavoidable for human society as the change from day to night in nature.

And all this was scattered to the winds. The mystical veils in which the ruling classes shrouded their unjust wars were rent, the social essence was disclosed and the class nature of the army was revealed. In his works, Engels showed with incontestable clarity that the army constituted one of the most important elements of the state apparatus, whose duty was to fulfill the will of the ruling classes. This is its basic significance, this is why such care is taken to keep all ideas that are dangerous from the point of view of these classes from penetrating into its ranks. This accounts

for the class selection of its commanding staff and for the entire internal structure of the army.

In his *Anti-Dühring* Engels brilliantly showed the dependence of the army on the development of the productive forces and the processes of social life, and pointed out that the art of warfare is a product of the historically established social and economic conditions.

"Nothing is more dependent on economic preconditions than precisely the army and navy," he wrote. "Their armaments, composition, organization, tactics and strategy depend above all on the stage reached at the time in production and communications. It is not the 'free creations of the mind' of generals of genius which have revolutionized war, but the inventions of better weapons and changes in the human material, the soldiers; at the very most, the part played by generals of genius is limited to adapting methods of fighting to the new weapons and combatants." (Frederick Engels, *Herr Eugene Dühring's Revolution in Science [Anti-Dühring]*, p. 188, International Publishers, New York.)

Engels applied the Marxist method in the province of military science as the only true and comprehensive method, the method that furnishes the clue to the history and theory of the art of warfare.

Engels showed that war itself was a historical and transient phenomena, by no means an eternal and natural condition of human society. Marxism teaches that wars arose with the appearance of class society. Hence the origin and causes

of war must be sought for in the policy of the classes in power in the given country. In developing and elaborating on the Marxist theory in application to the conditions of a new epoch, Lenin based himself on the heritage of Marx and Engels. Giving the classical formulation of war as a continuation of politics through the medium of new methods, Lenin wrote:

“. . . ‘war is simply the continuation of politics by other (i.e., violent) means.’ This formula belongs to Clausewitz, one of the greatest writers on the history of war, whose ideas were fertilized by Hegel. And this was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded every war as the continuation of the politics of the given interested powers—and the various classes within these countries—at a given time.” (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 179-80, International Publishers, New York.)

Marx and Engels gave many masterly examples of how to define the nature of a war and the position of the working class in relation to it. Among these, in the first place, are Engels’ articles on the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. These articles give an analysis of all the stages of the war, its decisive battles and the causes that brought France of Louis Bonaparte to defeat—an analysis that is brilliant not only from the social and political angle, but from the purely military standpoint as well.

The fifty-nine unsigned articles devoted to this war appeared in the London *Pall Mall Gazette* serially. They attracted general attention by reason of the fact that they were the

most profound and penetrating of all the reports about the war. It was at this time that Engels’ close circle of friends began to call him “General,” a nickname which Marx’s daughter had given him. But his contemporaries recall that many military experts, including members of the German General Staff, were convinced that the articles were being penned by a prominent Prussian general.

These articles, which went under the heading of “Notes on the War,” evinced with particular clarity Engels’ profound knowledge of military matters and his remarkable powers of penetration. His brilliant knowledge of military affairs, his scientific, Marxist approach to the war, a detailed acquaintance with the social conditions of development of both belligerent countries made it possible for Engels to make a number of predictions which were fully borne out by the further course of military events.

At the very beginning of the war, he laid bare both the plan of Napoleon III and the plan of the Prussian High Command. Subsequent events confirmed the correctness of Engels’ assumptions. Five days before the battle of Sedan, Engels pointed definitely to the inevitability of the defeat of the French army and even indicated the locality in which the defeat would be sustained. Behind the surface play of events, Engels was able to disclose their profound causes, which had their roots in the inherent rottenness of the empire of Louis Napoleon. The general atmosphere of venality, the financial speculation, the demagogic deception of the popular masses which



held sway in the Second Empire, all had their full effect on the army. The fact that "this second-rate canaille," as Marx and Engels dubbed Louis Napoleon, directed the military operations of the reactionary war he had engineered served as the finishing touch and brought about France's defeat.

The founders of Marxism drew the necessary conclusions for the working class from an analysis of the military events and an appraisal of the nature of the war. At the beginning of the war the sympathies of Marx and Engels were on the side of Prussia, for at that time the war was a progressive war for the latter, being directed against the reactionary empire of Napoleon III, whose victory would have brought with it the increased national fragmentation of Germany, strengthened reaction in Europe and dealt a blow to the revolutionary movement. However, matters were such only so long as Prussia had not been victorious and the war had not been turned into a reactionary war on her part as well. Lenin has given a splendid estimation of the dialectical approach of Marx and Engels to this war at its various stages:

"The war of 1870-71 was historically progressive on Germany's side up to the defeat of Napoleon III, because both he and the Tsar had long oppressed Germany, keeping it in a state of feudal decentralization. As soon as the war turned into a plunder of France (annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels decisively condemned the Germans. Even at the beginning of the war of 1870-71 Marx and Engels approved of Bebel's and Lieb-

knecht's refusal to vote for military appropriations; they advised the Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to defend the independent class interests of the proletariat." (V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War," *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 228, International Publishers, New York.

In connection with the change in the course of the war, the nature of Engels' "Notes on the War" also underwent a change. Whereas at the beginning of the war he spoke of the dangers which Louis Bonaparte was bringing Prussia, jeered at the incompetence of Louis Bonaparte's army and spoke favorably about the successes of Prussian arms, after the defeat of France, the overthrow of Napoleon III and the proclamation of a republic, his attitude towards the war as expressed in his "Notes on the War" changed. On Prussia's part the war had become an annexationist war. Its successes were impeding the development of the revolutionary movement in France. Engels quickly analyzed the altered character of the war in the very course of the military operations, and in his article on September 17, 1870, he was already writing: the "war, in which Germany, at the beginning, merely defended her own against French *chauvinisme*, appears to be changing gradually, but surely, into a war in the interests of a new German *chauvinisme*." And Engels writes approvingly about the fact that the people were rising in defense of France against the Prussians, that guerrilla warfare was developing behind the enemy's lines.

He cites many examples showing that the increasing exactions of the Prussian command and the added oppression were evoking greatly increased resistance on the part of the popular masses of France, and thoroughly examines all the opportunities which France, now already a republic, had at her command to beat off the foreign aggressor.

The highly suspicious behavior of the French generals did not escape his notice. Engels clearly showed up what lay behind the conduct of Francois Bazaine, who had surrendered Metz, one of the principal strongholds in the defense of the French Republic.

"As to the political motives," wrote Engels in one of his dispatches, "which are said to have caused Bazaine's inactivity after the revolution of September 4, and the political intrigues in which he engaged, with the connivance of the enemy, during the latter part of the investment—they are thoroughly in keeping with the Second Empire, which, in one form or another, they were intended to restore. It shows to what an extent that Second Empire had lost every comprehension of the French character if the general in command of the only regular army France then possessed could think of restoring the fallen dynasty with the help of the invader of his country."

Thiers, the butcher of the Paris Commune, followed this same path of treachery, quelling the proletariat of Paris with the assistance of Prussian bayonets.

Engels' "Notes on the War" are a model of a profoundly dialectical approach to determining the nature

of a war at any of its various stages. They show that even in the course of one and the same war, its character may change for both belligerents, and that in conformity with this, the tactics of the working class must also be altered.

These articles show, by the example of a war fraught with important social consequences, what enormous importance for the foremost representatives of the proletariat is a profound knowledge of military science, an ability to foresee the course of military operations, and to disclose the class nature of the position taken by the reactionary commanding staffs which direct the armed forces of the capitalist countries.

The stand taken by Engels in his "Notes on the War" was of added importance to the international working class movement in that their author was a German, in other words, a person belonging to the nation that had been victorious in the war. This Marxian stand of Engels' is a shining example of genuine proletarian internationalism.

\* \* \*

After the Franco-Prussian War, Engels continued to interest himself in military affairs and to follow the progress of military science with the utmost attention.

France's defeat and the suppression of the Paris Commune by the combined forces of the French bourgeoisie and the Prussian army led, as Marx and Engels had expected, to increased militarization throughout Europe. The antagonisms between the capitalist coun-

tries, and primarily between France and Germany, did not abate in the least after the war of 1870-71. On the contrary, they became even more pronounced and led to new outbreaks and armed clashes. The big industrial boom after the Franco-Prussian War brought with it an analogous advance in the production of armaments. The armies of the capitalist countries were re-equipped in conformity with the latest improvements, and correspondingly new methods of warfare were introduced.

Engels foresaw the inevitability of new wars arising out of the antagonisms between the capitalist states. With true prophetic genius he foretold the coming of the World War of 1914 thirty years before it broke out. In an introduction to a pamphlet by S. Borkheim\* written in 1887 Engels wrote that the future war would be a world war, that it would result in terrible devastation general demoralization, famine and incalculable distress for the mass of the people.

But behind all this Engels also saw the other side—the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class. Even if the war would push the organized working class movement back temporarily and wrest from it some of the positions it had won, it would in the end unleash forces which the ruling classes would no longer be able to control:

“. . . crowns will roll by dozens on the pavement and there will be nobody to pick them up. . . .

This, my lords, princes and statesmen, is where in your wisdom you have brought old Europe . . . at the end of the tragedy you will be ruined, and the victory of the proletariat will either be achieved or at any rate inevitable.” (*The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, pp. 456-57, International Publishers, New York.)

In 1918, when the imperialist war of 1914-18 showed how many of Engels' predictions were coming to pass “according to the book,” Lenin called this forecast of Engels' words of prophetic genius.

“Some of Engels' predictions have turned out differently,” wrote Lenin at that time. The world had changed in the thirty years of inconceivably rapid development since the advent of the epoch of imperialism after Engels' death. A new analysis of this epoch and an elaboration of the position of the working class were needed. Engels had not yet raised the slogan of the defeat of one's own government in a war and the transformation of imperialist war into a civil war.

This was done by Lenin. It was Lenin who armed the international proletariat with the new and potent weapon which enabled it to win its historic victory over capitalism on one-sixth of the globe.

Engel's profound knowledge of military science enabled him to elaborate the fundamental guiding principles for the one just war—the war of the oppressed against their oppressors, of the exploited against the exploiters. Marxism has given the working class the famous “rules for armed insurrection,” which taught the art of victory in

\**In Memory of the Supreme German Patriots, 1806-1807.*

the decisive battle which the working class conducts against the ruling classes:

"Insurrection is an art quite as much as war or any other, and subject to certain rules of proceeding, which, when neglected, will produce the ruin of the party neglecting them. . . . Firstly, never play with insurrection, unless you are fully prepared to face the consequences of your play. . . . Secondly, the insurrectionary career once entered upon, act with the greatest determination, and on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed rising; it is lost before it measures itself with its enemies. Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes, however small, but daily; keep up the moral ascendant which the first successful rising has given to you; rally thus those vacillating elements to your side which always follow the strongest impulse and which always look out for the safer side; force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known: *de l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace.*" (Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 135, International Publishers, New York.)

These splendid statements of Marx and Engels form a component part of the theory of the proletarian revolution, the creators of which were the founders of Marxism. It was on the basis of these Marxist postulates on armed insurrection that Lenin elaborated his famous plan for the October uprising which resulted in the victory of the socialist revolution. In expounding the

prerequisites for this victory, Lenin referred to Marx's and Engels' thesis on insurrection, urging that one learn from the classicists of Marxism in those decisive days.

Engels' works on the problems of war and the art of warfare are an irreplaceable weapon in the hands of the international proletariat. From the works of Engels, the vanguard of the working class learns a lesson on the imperativeness of a sound knowledge of military science, of the imperativeness of a profound, Marxist-Leninist analysis of developing military conflicts. From Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin it learns how to determine the stand of the working class quickly and correctly, and how to carry on the struggle against imperialist war successfully.

\* \* \*

Of no less vital importance is Engels' struggle for revolutionary Marxism, his many years of battle against the agents of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the working class movement. The theory of scientific socialism was itself evolved in the process of rigorous struggle against the ideologists hostile to the working class, against those who flaunted pseudo-socialist flags, as well as against those who were openly bourgeois. The Marxist doctrine was a severe blow to the bourgeoisie, which it sought to counteract by all possible means. In addition to open attacks on Marxism, a regular pack of distorters of Marxism, its undercover enemies, also arose. And the greater the recognition scientific socialism won for itself, the more its influence made itself felt on the work-

ing masses, so much the more did the enemy resort to attempts to emasculate its revolutionary essence. This was all the more dangerous by reason of the fact that such distortions of Marxism began to be disseminated in the ranks of the labor movement, in the parties of the working class and had pretensions to becoming the dominant ideology of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels devoted their whole lives to the fight against all enemies of the revolutionary doctrine of the proletariat.

First, Marx and Engels sought to create a working class party, which, according to their intention, was destined to guide the historic conflict for the overthrow of capitalism, which scientific socialism proved inevitable. This party was established in the course of fierce battles with innumerable enemies and primarily with the enemies within the labor movement itself.

The most important political conclusion of Marx's and Engels' scientific socialism is the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is what constitutes the essence of Marxism.

Lenin, in commenting on the doctrine of Marx and Engels, stressed the fact that only he is a Marxist who accepts the dictatorship of the proletariat. And for the very reason that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the core of Marxism and constitutes the force which the ruling classes under capitalism fear most of all, it is against this point that all the avowed and covert enemies of the working class are up in arms.

The struggle around this question

was what underlay all the battles of Marx and Engels against the host of their opponents. The most brilliant formulation of the dictatorship of the proletariat was given by Marx in a document leveled against the opportunists within the ranks of the German Social-Democratic Party—the *Critique of the Gotha Program*. And there were profound reasons for this. It was on this question that battle was given to all those who wanted to direct the very first steps of the newly created workers' party along a false path.

For years, the founders of Marxism fought against the opportunists in defense of this root postulate of scientific socialism, and for the training of a party capable of leading to the dictatorship of the working class. This defense of the policy of the proletariat and constant exposure of the petty-bourgeois, philistine and reformist views of socialism permeate all their work and their day-to-day struggle within the ranks of the international working class movement. In describing his joint activity with Marx in the organization of the working class, Engels writes:

“We have always fought to the very utmost against the petty-bourgeois and philistine disposition within the Party.” (*The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, p. 412.)

After Marx's death, Engels continued the fight, parrying every attack and beating back each onslaught of the enemies of revolutionary Marxism, whether it was an

avowed repudiation of Marxism, or a distortion of it.

When the vacillations in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany increased after the abrogation of the Anti-Socialist Law, and the frankly opportunist reformist elements, on the one hand, and the "Left," so-called "Young," on the other, increased their activities to a marked degree, Engels dealt them blow after blow. With a view to the success of the struggle against these vacillations, he urged that the *Critique of the Gotha Program* be published, the latter being known at that time only to the leadership of the party to whom Marx had addressed it in 1875.

Engels' proposal met with the resistance of the leadership, including Karl Kautsky, the editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, the newspaper in which Engels had proposed that the *Critique* be published. Only Engels' categorical insistence and his threat to publish Marx's manuscript in another paper forced the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party to agree to its publication. But they immediately made haste to weaken the importance of the famous postulates of the *Critique* on the dictatorship of the proletariat, and several of the party's leaders openly declared that the Social-Democratic movement did not share Marx's views on this question. Kautsky zealously defended Lassalle, who had been severely criticized by Marx, and thus justified the introduction of opportunism into the party program.

Engels foresaw the effect the *Critique of the Gotha Program* would have on the opportunists. In

a letter to Frederick Albert Sorge, Engels wrote that the *Critique of the Gotha Program* would prove a bombshell and evoke "bitterness and dissatisfaction" here and there, but that it would be of enormous service in the struggle against the anti-proletarian, opportunist elements. Subsequent events fully corroborated Engels' prediction. But the howlings of the reformists merely convinced Marx's old co-worker of the necessity of continuing and intensifying the struggle. And soon he sent a new bombshell into the camp of opportunism with his Introduction to Marx's pamphlet, *The Civil War in France*, directed entirely against reformism and Social-Democratic philistinism, which was spreading ever more widely in the party.

Using the example of the Paris Commune, with which Marx's pamphlet dealt, Engels explained the class nature of the bourgeois state, pointing out that in order to pass over into socialism, the victorious proletariat would have to smash the old state apparatus. Engels raised high the banner of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to a substantiation of which the brilliant pages of Marx's work were devoted. His famous postulate about the realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the Paris Commune he cast into the teeth of all the preachers of reformism:

"Of late the Social-Democratic philistine has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris



Commune. (Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 460.)

It was in the persons of these philistines that Engels saw the main danger to the working class movement and the Socialist Party of that time. This danger in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany increased to a marked degree after the abrogation of the "Exceptional Law on Socialists." Many petty-bourgeois elements and all sorts of vague sympathizers poured into the party. They aspired mainly to the ideological front, filling the columns of the party periodicals, which could now be published legally. They gained a considerable place for themselves in the parliamentary group. Reformist illusions and parliamentary legalism grew apace, the advocacy of a peaceful solution of social questions and the rejection of the principles of the class struggle increased greatly.

All this found its most consummate expression in the theory of the peaceful evolution of capitalism into socialism. The dissemination of this noxious theory was facilitated by the Centrist position held by the leadership of the party in the persons of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, who did not combat the reformists as they should have done. The opportunists became bolder and bolder, entrenching themselves more firmly. They met the publication of the *Critique of the Gotha Program* and Engels' Introduction to *The Civil War in France* with open hostility. Matters went so far that after the publication of these works several of the

leaders of the party stopped corresponding with Engels as a sign of their dissatisfaction with his sharp criticism. But all this merely served to spur Engels to renewed struggle against opportunism. Nothing could stop him from pursuing this path: neither the "pin-pricks" of the "socialist" philistines, nor the friendly personal relations with Bebel and Liebknecht, nor the danger of subjecting the party to a loss of prestige by openly criticizing its mistakes, upon which those who castigated Engels often speculated.

When the Social-Democratic Party drew up the draft Erfurt Program in 1891, Engels again let fly against "conciliatory opportunism." In his letter to Karl Kautsky on the draft program he directs his biting sarcasm against the "cheerful, pious, merry and free 'growth' of the filthy old mess 'into socialist society.'" The alpha and omega of opportunism, which is the starting point of the entire shameful path of the Second International—the theory of the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism—was ruthlessly condemned here by one of the founders of the scientific theory of the working class struggle for emancipation. Engels subjected the Erfurt Program to a comprehensive criticism and insisted that it include a definite warning against illusions on the score of the peaceful and legal path. As Lenin points out in commenting on this document, Engels in this letter stresses the definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the last few months before his

death, when he was already a sick man, Engels wrote the new Introduction to Marx's *Class Struggles in France*. This was Engels' last work. It serves as a vivid example of the struggle on two fronts for the correct political strategy and tactics of the proletarian party. In this work Engels speaks of the necessity of utilizing all the legal opportunities, of the need for intensive work in the matter of winning the masses of the people over to the side of the Socialist Party. He teaches that for a selfless revolutionary struggle on the barricades at the decisive moment the ground must be prepared by intensive work among the masses, by enlisting the laboring peasantry and the urban poor on the side of the working class.

When the opportunists endeavored to take advantage of Engels' remarks about the importance of legal work and about the parliamentary struggle in order to depict Engels as a peaceable adherent of legality at any price, publishing tendentiously selected excerpts from his "Introduction" to prove their point, Engels replied to these falsifiers with scathing criticism. He vehemently protested against the tampering with his article and the false interpretation that had been made of his views. The opportunists got their deserts.

All these utterances of Engels with regard to the Social-Democratic Party of Germany had a direct bearing on the Socialist parties of other countries as well. His struggle for revolutionary Marxism and against reformism extended to the entire international working

class movement. Engels also kept a keen eye on the development of the French party, on the British labor movement, on the spread of Marxism in Russia, on the struggle of the adherents of scientific socialism against the Anarchists in Italy and Spain, on the shoots of the Socialist movement springing up in the United States of America and many other countries.

Wherever the party of the working class stood in need of assistance, Engels hastened to give his advice and support, guiding the adherents of Marxism along the correct path with an able hand. Wherever the danger arose of opportunist vacillations, distortions of Marxism, or the penetration of an alien and hostile influence into the ideology of the working class party, Engels took up the cudgels against these dangers. He was able to discern the weak sides and the breeding places of vacillation in every party, and directed his fire against them.

Pointing to the correspondence of Marx and Engels to Sorge as an example of the struggle waged by the founders of Marxism against opportunism in the ranks of the international working class movement, Lenin wrote:

"And now two lines of Engels (and Marx's) stand out before us with special distinctness in their recommendations, directions, amendments, admonitions and instructions. While they call upon the Anglo-American Socialists more and more insistently to fuse with the labor movement and to rid their organizations of the narrow and hardened sectarian spirit, they taught the

German Social-Democrats more and more insistently to beware of falling into philistinism, into 'parliamentary idiotism' (an expression of Marx in his letter of September 19, 1879), into philistine intellectual opportunism." (V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, p. 107.)

The fight against opportunism extends to all aspects of the ideology and political activity of the party of the working class. With the passing of time, the working class movement expanded, its organizations grew, it began to carry more weight in the political life of the respective countries, the Marxist doctrines acquired more and more currency. But at the same time, the difficulties also grew, and bourgeois influence penetrated into the ranks of the working class organizations to an ever greater degree. The latter had to be able to adopt the line conforming with the interests of the proletariat in their parliamentary activity, in the trade union movement, in their attitude towards all other parties, in their attitude towards the peasantry, etc. The directives of the creators of scientific socialism and the leaders of the international proletariat correspond to these requirements. Their works, in particular the correspondence between Marx and Engels, and between them and other leading figures in the labor movement, are models of the fight against opportunism in all phases of the theory and practice of the Socialist movement.

In purging the Socialist movement of the dross of opportunism, Engels disclosed the source of bour-

geois influence in the working class organizations and showed the channels through which it flowed into the latter. He looked for the specific features that give rise to opportunist vacillation in the social and economic conditions in which the working class movement of the given country developed. Engels lived in England for many years. He and Marx were close to the British labor movement and clearly understood the policy of the British bourgeoisie, who strove to stem the labor leaders and make them the channels for their policies.

Engels pointed out that the liberal bourgeois policy of the British working class organizations was rooted in the position of Great Britain as a world monopolist. The dominant role of the British bourgeoisie on the world market was the economic basis of the opportunism in England, wrote Engels in a letter to Bebel in 1883. In a letter to Sorge in 1889 Engels describes the leaders of the British movement in the following cutting lines:

"The most repulsive thing here is the bourgeois 'respectability,' which has grown deep into the bones of the workers. The division of society into a scale of innumerable degrees, each recognized without question, each with its own pride but also its native respect for its 'betters' and 'superiors,' is so old and firmly established that the bourgeois still find it pretty easy to get their bait accepted. I am not at all sure, for instance, that John Burns is not secretly prouder of his popularity with Cardinal Manning, the Lord Mayor and the bourgeoisie in general than of his popularity with his

own class. And Champion—an ex-Lieutenant—has intrigued for years with bourgeois and especially with Conservative elements, preached socialism at the parsons' Church Congress, etc." (*The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, p. 461.)

"The labor lieutenants of the bourgeois class" was what Engels dubbed the "respectable" Laborites. This classical characterization of Engels is cited many times by Lenin and Stalin in their fight against the opportunists. It expresses with exceptional graphic power the lackey role, the role of bourgeois hireling, filled by the reformists of all hues in the ranks of the international labor movement.

In Germany Engels warned the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party against the influx of petty-bourgeois elements. He pointed out that the latter brought with them a non-proletarian ideology, which was particularly dangerous for the young but recently formed party. Many petty-bourgeois penmen, assuming a mask of Marxism, attached themselves to the Social-Democratic press for the sake of their earnings, making a "milch cow" of the party.

It is for this reason that, when legal publication of the party press was stopped in connection with the "Exceptional Law," these people wanted at all costs to beg the forgiveness of the government, above all, by meekness and fawning before the latter. They strove to foist their views on the party and to get it to pursue peaceable, reformist tactics. After the abrogation of the

"Exceptional Law," when it became possible for the party to take part in the elections, its tactics were more and more adapted to winning a bigger vote in the elections and more seats in the Reichstag. The opportunists immediately raised the cry that by coming out openly with a revolutionary program, particularly with an acknowledgement of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party would frighten the voters away from it. The party's Reichstag group became one of the principal hotbeds of opportunism. It was mainly through this channel that the influence of the bourgeoisie flowed.

After Engels' death, this influence grew greater and greater, until the entire activity of the Social-Democratic Party began to adapt itself to the parliamentary struggle, while the group in Parliament determined the party's policy. What Engels had pointed out about the principal hotbeds of opportunism and the channels through which it penetrates into the party was a hundred per cent correct. And the failure to follow the counsel of the founders of Marxism to destroy these breeding grounds resulted in the aggravation and spread of the disease to the entire organism.

The founders of Marxism looked ahead. They saw what would come of the philistinism and opportunist vacillations in the Social-Democratic movement, if they were not wiped out. In 1879, when the *Year-book of Social Science and Politics*, edited by Karl Hochberg, Edward Bernstein and Karl A. Schramm appeared, with its preaching of

arrantly opportunist views based on a repudiation of revolution and the advocacy of peaceful evolution of capitalism into socialism, Marx and Engels subjected the editorial trio to the most annihilating attack, and condemned the leadership of the party, who had given these "counter-revolutionary windbags" free play.

On September 17-18, 1879, Engels sent a "Circular Letter" written in the name of himself and Marx to the leadership of the German Social-Democratic Party—August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and others. In this letter Engels and Marx brand the "Manifesto of the Zurich Trio" as a highly dangerous document for the party, constituting a rallying standard for all the enemies of revolutionary Marxism:

"It is the representatives of the petty bourgeoisie who are here presenting themselves, full of anxiety that the proletariat, under the pressure of its revolutionary position, may 'go too far.' Instead of decided political opposition, general compromise; instead of the struggle against the government and the bourgeoisie, an attempt to win and persuade; instead of defiant resistance to ill-treatment from above, a humble submission and a confession that the punishment was deserved. . . . It is just the same with the class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. It is recognized on paper because its existence can no longer be denied, but in practice it is hushed up, diluted, attenuated." (*Ibid.*, p. 374.)

Marx and Engels prophetically foretold the complete degeneration

and subsequent counter-revolutionary path of those Social-Democrats who set out with a denial of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat and with the advocacy of reconciling the interests of the proletariat with the interests of the bourgeoisie:

"If Berlin should ever again be so uneducated as to have a March 18 [March 18, 1848—the street fighting in Berlin which started the Revolution] the Social-Democrats, instead of taking part in the fight as 'riff-raff with a mania for barricades' [the expression used by Höchberg, Bernstein and Schramm in the *Yearbook*] must rather 'follow the path of legality,' act pacifically, clear away the barricades and if necessary march with the glorious army against the rough, uneducated, one-sided masses." (*Ibid.*, p. 372.)

These words of Engels have been fully confirmed by the entire treacherous behavior of the German Social-Democrats. It was in Berlin and by Social-Democrats of the Noske brand that the uprising of the German workers was crushed in 1918, while the Kautskys and Hilferdings justified these heinous acts of the Social-Democratic hangers-on in the press.

Engels' many years of experience in the work of creating a genuinely proletarian party brought him to the conclusion that this task could be accomplished only in the process of irreconcilable battle against all sorts of enemies within the working class movement. On the basis of this experience, Engels arrived at his famous postulate about the over-

coming of differences within the party by means of struggle:

"It seems that every workers' party, in a great country, can only develop itself by internal struggle, and this is based on the laws of dialectical development in general. The German Party became what it is in the struggle between the Eisenachers and Lassalleans, and this tussle itself played a chief part. Unity only became possible when the gang of ruffians whom Lassalle had deliberately cultivated as tools had worked themselves out, and there too it was accomplished with much too much haste on our side. In France, those people who while indeed sacrificing the Bakuninist theory are still carrying on the Bakuninist methods of struggle, and at the same time trying to sacrifice the class character of the movement to their own particular end, must also first work themselves out before unity is possible again. To try to preach unity in such circumstances would be sheer folly. Moral sermons are useless as treatment for infantile diseases, which, under present-day conditions, have got to be gone through some time anyhow." (*Ibid.*, p. 382.)

Without the most determined struggle against the conveyors of the bourgeois influence within the working class movement, a genuinely revolutionary proletarian party cannot be forged. That is why the uprooting of opportunism, a severance from people and organizations holding reformist positions, and the expulsion of them from the ranks of the socialist movement are guarantees of success in the class battles against the bourgeoisie.

This thesis of Engels had as its

purpose to purge German Social-Democracy and the entire Second International of the anti-Marxist, opportunist elements, who were the conveyors of bourgeois influence over the proletariat. It has served as a guide to action also in the ranks of the Communist International, which from the day of its foundation has carried on an irreconcilable struggle against every kind of opportunism and enemy of the working class, purging itself of the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites and the like agents of the bourgeoisie.

In calling upon the Communists of all countries to learn from Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party how to wage relentless struggle against the opportunists, Stalin quoted this postulate of Engels from the tribune of the Seventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Basing themselves on Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin developed, from every angle, the question of the struggle against all kinds of bourgeois enemies within the working class movement and, guiding this struggle indefatigably over the course of tens of years, succeeded in winning an epoch-making victory, forging the great Bolshevik Party of the Communist International.

\* \* \*

Forty-five years have passed since the death of Engels, years of bitter struggle between revolutionary Marxism and opportunism.

Today the workers are able to compare the results of the struggle

for revolutionary Marxism, for its realization in practice, with the results of the struggle against Marxism and its opportunist distortion.

Where opportunism was defeated, where Lenin and Stalin waged unyielding struggle against it and succeeded in rooting it out of the ranks of the working class movement, there a great and historic victory of the working class has been won, capitalism has been overthrown, and socialist society has in the main been established. But where opportunism flourished, where after Engels' death revisionism battered, and where Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding, Vandervelde, MacDonald, Bauer, Adler and the like distorted the teachings of Marx and Engels, there the working class suffered defeat when the revolutionary wave was at its height, primarily because of the Social-Democratic policy of conciliation and of subordinating the interests of the proletariat to the interests of the bourgeoisie. The revisionist repudiation of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat led to the defeat of the revolution in practice.

The working people have paid a heavy price for the opportunism and revisionism of the Second International. Millions of people were slaughtered in the first imperialist World War, which Engels had foreseen; another twenty years of capitalist bondage followed, and today again the people have been thrust by the imperialists into the bloody maws of a new war.

These historic lessons of the two paths speak with the utmost elo-

quence of the fact that a defense of the genuine interests of the working class and of the working people demands a ruthless struggle against the policy of reformism, of Social-Democratism, which means a denial of the principles of Marx and Engels and of their doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution.

Marx's doctrine is omnipotent because it is true, said Lenin. At the present time, the tremendous turning point in the history of mankind, the creation of a new world, constitutes the most striking confirmation of this proposition. For the first time in the history of mankind, the victory of labor over capital, the overthrow of the age-old rule of the exploiters, the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and the building of socialism have been achieved, and all on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The theory of Marx and Engels, developed, elaborated and enriched by Lenin and Stalin, purged by them of the distortions of Social-Democratic opportunism, has served as a guide to action during the entire course of the struggle led by the Party of the Bolsheviks for the revolution and the victory of socialism.

*Marx and Engels turned socialism from a utopia into a science, Lenin and Stalin turned socialism into a reality, raising the Marxian science to a new level.* Today socialism is no longer the dream of bereft and oppressed people about a happier life on earth, no phantom utopia; today socialism is no longer merely

a scientific theory, but a society that actually exists on one-sixth of the globe.

The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union has imparted to Marxism a force such as it has never yet known before. The embodiment of the Marxist doctrine in practice shows millions of people all over the world the correctness of this theory. There have been and still are numerous theories of every kind about social development, theories both bourgeois and petty bourgeois. But only one theory of society, the theory created by the representatives of the working class, has been confirmed in practice. It has been put to the most rigorous of proofs, the proof of life. It has passed all the tests of history.

Today millions of people see just what it is that the triumph of Marxism in real life brings to the working people, see what the actual embodiment of the Marxist theory signifies. And the adherents of Marxism tell the working people of the world: if you want to know *what victorious Marxism* is, look at the U.S.S.R.; look at its splendid might; look at the victories it has won in town and country in so short a historical period; look at its free and happy people; look at the society that knows no crises, no unemployment and no poverty; look at the country that is safeguarded from the horrors of imperialist war, at the people who have been rid forever of wars waged in the interests of the exploiters; look at the Stalin Constitution, the living embodiment of what the working people have for centuries aspired to:

the right to work, the right to rest and recreation, the right to an education, the right to material security in old age. All this has been won on the basis of the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

From the very first appearance of Marxism, the bourgeoisie has waged a fierce battle against it. In it the bourgeoisie saw a tremendously powerful weapon that the working class had received for the destruction of the class domination of the bourgeoisie. And the further decay ate into the very heart of capitalism, the more acute its contradictions became, the closer the threat of capitalism's downfall, the more savage the ruling classes became in their attacks on Marxism.

They resorted to all sorts of methods to wipe out Marxism. At first they sought to hush up the doctrine of Marx. Then they strove to emasculate its revolutionary spirit through their agents within the working class movement. They launched scores of direct assaults on it. They subjected its adherents to the persecutions of the Middle Ages. They destroyed and prohibited Marxist literature. And what has been the result? Today Marxism is more powerful than ever before. And every new stage in the development of human society, every step of its life, brings fresh confirmation of the force and truth of Marxism. The army of its followers is greater than ever, and with every day it is growing stronger and larger throughout the world.

Stalin has given us a splendid



summary of the development of Marxism from the day of its inception to the present time. He said:

“More than eighty years have passed since Marxism stepped into the arena. During this time scores and hundreds of bourgeois governments have tried to destroy Marxism. But what happened? Bourgeois governments have come and gone, but Marxism still goes on.

“More than that, Marxism has achieved a complete victory on one-sixth of the globe—and has achieved victory in the very country in which Marxism was considered to have been utterly destroyed.” (J. V.

Stalin, in *Socialism Victorious*, p. 91, International Publishers, New York.)

The historic victories of Marxism in theory and in practice have been won on the basis of persistent struggle on the part of the foremost representatives of the working class for revolutionary Marxism, for its effectuation in life, and this struggle, which the international proletariat learns how to wage from Lenin and Stalin, is an indispensable requisite and guarantee of new victories for the working class in the future as well.

---

## METAMORPHOSES OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRATISM

BY P. WIEDEN

“IT IS impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democracy in the labor movement,” wrote Joseph Stalin in 1927 in his article “The International Character of the October Revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, *The October Revolution*, p. 164, International Publishers, New York.

Social-Democratism is not a proletarian but a bourgeois ideology. The views of the ruling class penetrate and filter in a thousand different ways through the whole of bourgeois society, find their echo in public opinion, in the principles of education and in the standard of life, in the judgments and prejudices not only of the ruling class but also of the broad masses of the people. In order to break this spell, in order to free oneself from the ideological influences of the class which commands all the instrumentalities of power—the national economy, the machinery of state and propaganda—a high degree of class-consciousness, perseverance and stamina is necessary. The proletariat succeeds only gradually and only by dint of experience and knowledge and with the aid of its revolutionary vanguard, in realizing the contradiction between its own interests and the prevailing views, in gaining the conviction that it must have its own ideology, *Marxism-Leninism*,

and in doing justice to its historic task of leading the peoples to a new world. This overcoming of the class-alien, bourgeois views, opinions and sentiments in its own ranks is an indispensable precondition for the victory of the working class.

Social-Democratism is *the ideological reflection of the policy of adaptation to the capitalist system*, to the bourgeoisie, an adaptation for multiple reasons and in multiple forms. The capitalists of those countries which derive a super-profit from the exploitation and robbery of colonial peoples have permitted a part of the working class to share in these super-profits and have thereby bred a *labor aristocracy*.

Wherever Social-Democracy became a strong party, a numerous officialdom was formed. Their position of administrators of public enterprises, members of parliaments, mayors, etc., instilled in them bourgeois habits of life. Such participation in various bourgeois governments and the gradual penetration of the municipal and state administrative apparatus offered ample opportunity to corrupt more or less a certain stratum of the workers and to reconcile them to the bourgeois state. Members of the middle class of every description—saloon-keepers, lawyers, minor officials and so forth—succeeded in playing a con-

siderable role in the Social-Democratic parties, and in engendering an atmosphere of foul stagnation. The whole staff of Social-Democratic officials became acquainted with an entirely new aspect of capitalism and succumbed to the enticement of leading a life of comfort and of partaking of the pleasant amenities accessible to the bourgeoisie.

And more: these people gained an insight into the tremendous and complicated mechanism of capitalism, they saw the plenitude of power of the ruling system and lost more and more their faith in the strength and capacity of the working class to smash this machine, to take the reins of power into its own hands and build a new world. Thus the bourgeoisie was able, through economic favoritism and petty concessions, to attach influential sections of the working class movement to itself, to flatter them by personal complaisance, and to impress them with their social power.

This adaptation of the leading Social-Democratic circles to the bourgeoisie did not come about overnight; it was a rather long process, and this transformation of the representatives of the working class, which was as profound as it was imperceptible, into the lackeys of the bourgeoisie had its effect upon the masses. The rapid expansion of the working class movement during the relatively calm period which preceded the first imperialist war was of itself apt to create illusions. By reason of its organization and the development of its class-consciousness on the basis of the immortal work of Marx and Engels,

the working class had become an important factor. The bourgeoisie found itself constrained to make concessions, particularly to the trade unions. The proletarian felt his power, realized his success and for the first time commanded the respect of society. The opportunists, eager for adaptation, interpreted this development to mean that it was possible to improve the condition of the working class in a peaceful way, without revolution or civil war; that it was thus also possible to reconstruct capitalism by peaceful reforms and to guide it finally into the channel of socialism.

This was the basis on which *revisionism* developed, the first systematic exposition of opportunism. Revisionism was the ideological expression of the changes that occurred in a relatively broad and leading section of the working class movement, and of the illusions among the masses, particularly the workers organized in trade unions. At the same time it was the ideology which corresponded to the requirements of the bourgeoisie of that period. Capitalism was not yet branded by death but was still confident and conscious of its strength. The upswing of technique, of industry and world trade increased the need of the capitalists for intelligent, skilled and progressive workers, and at the same time made it possible for them to grant economic concessions to these sections of their employees. The bourgeoisie could no longer consider the working class an insignificant force, and they therefore strove to win over certain of its influential sections and to delude them with the prospect

of peaceful development leading to a life of comfort and security. The social opportunism of that period was nothing else but a true reflection of these desires and needs of capitalism.

This first open manifestation of opportunism encountered resistance within the Social-Democratic parties. The Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, consistently opposed opportunism. It was Marxism that they defended, the Marxism which the creative genius of Lenin and Stalin developed further. But there were also people like Kautsky who *formally* championed the doctrine of Marx and Engels but tacitly abandoned its *fundamental* idea, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and now spoke of revolution only at festive gatherings and in anniversary articles. How far the bourgeoisie had succeeded in winning over also these leaders to its side became clear at one stroke in August, 1914. Opportunism appeared in the revolting form of *social-chauvinism*, of "civil peace," of supporting the imperialist war by supporting "one's own" bourgeoisie.

\* \* \*

Adaptation to the bourgeoisie in *deed* and adaptation to the moods and tendencies among the masses in *form*—such was and is the innermost essence of opportunism, which, after the foundation of the Communist International, became the all-dominant ideology of the Second International, became Social-Democratism.

Thus, during the years following the first World War we see Social-Democratism adapted in form to the

masses now set in motion, while in substance it was completely adapted to the bourgeoisie. The masses curse the war—Social-Democratism adopts an out-and-out pacifist tone. The masses demand the removal of those responsible for the war—Social-Democratism puts the full blame for the war on a few monarchs. The masses want the establishment of socialist society—Social-Democratism submits vague and impracticable "plans of socialization."

So much for externals. In essence, however, this means the *salvation of capitalism*. The cornerstone of Social-Democratism is the glorification of bourgeois democracy in the struggle against the proletarian revolution. But it is *counter-revolution* that stalks in the garb of bourgeois-democracy. The murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the overthrow of the Soviet dictatorship in Bavaria and Hungary, the arming of White Guards against the revolutionary workers, and the military intervention against the young Soviet state were all perpetrated "in the name of democracy."

At the same time Social-Democratism found it necessary to "catch" the moods of the working people, as Otto Bauer and other Social-Democratic leaders were wont to express it. On one occasion it would put "law and order" into the foreground, on another its demeanor would be "revolutionary"; on a third it would let loose a wave of White terror and on a fourth it would pretend to sympathize with the socialist aspirations of the masses; on a fifth occasion it would

speak to the accompaniment of machine-gun fire, and on a sixth would assuage the populace by soft speeches coming from the mouths of glib-tongued orators. But all these different methods had only one purpose in view: the salvation of capitalism. Social-Democratism in all its different shadings has been the *ideology of the salvation of capitalism during the periods of its greatest disruption.*

The temporary stabilization of capitalism until the new crisis of 1929 also had its ideological reflection in Social-Democratism. The talk about "organized capitalism" which could be heard as early as the World War now rapidly spread far and wide as if in illustration of Goethe's saying: "Pressed cottage cheese gains in breadth but not in strength."

The paeans which the capitalists sang in praise of "America's economic miracle," and of "capitalism without crises" reverberated far and wide and became the gospel of salvation of Social-Democratism. Capitalist rationalization, the intensified exploitation and speeding up of workers, was approved on the plea that it denotes a "transition to the general well being of the masses." The harmonious cooperation of all imperialist powers for the realization of an "organized world economy" was loudly proclaimed.

Closely connected herewith was the prophecy of the daily and hourly "collapse of the Soviet Union." Social-Democratism pictured in the most roseate hues the "peaceful development" of the capitalist world in contrast to the sacrifices made by the working people of the U.S.S.R.

who were building and securing socialism on one-sixth part of the world. Bloody class battles such as those of July 15, 1927, in Austria were set down merely as inconvenient and unnecessary interferences; the wars in Morocco, Syria, South America and Manchuria Social-Democratism held to be matters of no moment which could not change the picture as a whole of a "peaceful, progressive, organized" capitalism. And just as Social-Democratism rehashed the economic and political legends of capitalism, it took over a miscellany of bourgeois fads in the field of theory: from the theory of marginal utility to neo-Kantianism, from empirio-criticism to psychoanalysis, there was hardly any intellectual offal of the bourgeoisie which Social-Democratism did not gobble up with avidity and put into its eclectic beggar's broth.

\* \* \*

The gigantic world economic crisis which set in in 1929 swept away the "economic miracle" of America and together with it the theories of Social-Democratism adjusted to it. The "Socialist" lackeys made of course desperate efforts to discover "progressive tendencies" even in economic collapse. Characteristic of such efforts was, for instance, Otto Bauer's insolent statement that the crash of the Vienna *Kreditanstalt* and its "sanitation" at the expense of the toiling tax-payers was a transition to "state capitalism," a stage along the democratic way to socialism.

Such imbecilities, however, could not in the long run create any illusions about the catastrophe, and

Social-Democratism therefore made it its central task to help the decayed capitalist system out of its crisis by assuming the role of "physician at the sick bed of capitalism." As long as capitalism was sleek and fat the working class was not to touch it just because it was so sleek and fat. But now it did not want to touch it because it was being raked by a consuming fever, because in its pitiful plight it required solicitous care and attention. Whichever way you throw a cat it will always land on its feet. Whatever the situation was, Social-Democratism found a pretext for heading off the struggle against capitalism.

Social-Democratism embellished and idealized bourgeois-democracy, so-called, the same as before, but at the same time new views began to take shape in its camp which reflected a regrouping in the camp of the bourgeoisie. In a number of countries the most reactionary circles of finance capital and those which had most weight began to replace the bourgeois-democratic forms of government by "authoritarian," terrorist forms of government, and to prepare themselves for a war for the repartition of the world. And these tendencies became discernible in the appearance of new shades of Social-Democratism. During this period there arose in France a so-called "neo-socialism," in Belgium a "planism," in Germany and other countries a so-called "popular socialism."

In all these tendencies, which in each nation were differently attuned, the same reactionary catchwords could be found. Marxism

was declared "antiquated" in more or less direct language. An ideological campaign set in against the revolutionary theory of Marxism. The class struggle was branded a "fatal error." Concepts such as "class," "class-consciousness" and "proletariat" were discarded. Proletarian internationalism was countered with "national peculiarity" from which only a national-socialism could emerge. A capitalist "planned economy" was proposed as a prelude to socialism. The anti-Marxian revisionist theory of the state, which goes back to Lassalle, was trotted out once more and interpreted in the sense that the bourgeois state was assigned the mission to iron out differences in class interests and to introduce socialism from above, for which purpose it was claimed to be necessary to strengthen the authority of the state and to tighten the reins of government. The essence of the socialist transformation was to be sought not in material conditions but in the "inner renewal" of mankind, in the "overcoming of selfishness," in the "consciousness of the dignity of labor," etc. The argument was that the "civilization of the Occident" must be defended against "Eastern ideas," against Bolshevism, and the supremacy of the European nations maintained. These new forms of Social-Democratism were an ideological find for all the coadjutors of finance capital, which prepared to destroy all democratic rights and liberties and to let loose an imperialist war.

The situation in the camp of the bourgeoisie required that Social-

Democratism assume this color only in spots and not in its entirety. Influential circles of the bourgeoisie, particularly in the "victorious states," did not deem it expedient to tear down overnight the democratic facade of the bourgeois dictatorship, but considered it more advisable to abolish the democratic rights and liberties of the working people step by step. Essentially Social-Democratism adjusted itself to this trend in the camp of the ruling class. Far from calling upon the working class to defend the bourgeois-democratic rights and liberties boldly and consistently, it advocated a "prudent restriction" of democracy, a "voluntary retreat" in order not to "provoke" the reactionaries, the recognition without a fight of the "necessities of state," etc.

At the same time it struck up nationalist tunes, increased the incitement of animosity against the Soviet Union, sharpened its struggle against the Communists to prove to the bourgeoisie that Social-Democracy was a better bulwark against socialism than the new parties toward which finance capital was turning. Social-Democratism thus showed itself once more as the shadow of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement. As the bourgeoisie had no uniform line, its shadow could also not be uniform. But the differences in shade resulted merely from differences in tactical questions. On fundamental questions Social-Democratism was of uniform opinion: on the question of the complete subordination of the working class to the bourgeoisie, on the question of the disruption of

the class struggle, on the question of the affirmation of the bourgeois state, on the question of waging a ruthless struggle against the Communists, and of increasing incitement against the Soviet Union, in a word, on the question of the unconditional defense of capitalism against all revolutionary aspirations and movements.

\* \* \*

Immediately before the unleashing of the present European war, Social-Democratism assumed the function of veiling the war preparations of the imperialists, of frustrating the unity of the working class, of liquidating the liberation struggle of the Spanish people and of supporting politically and by propaganda the plan of conjuring up a war between Germany and the Soviet Union. In this period the pivotal point of Social-Democratism was the "*theory of capitulation.*" It sought by every means in its power to undermine the belief of the working class in its own strength and to call forth among the masses a sense of powerlessness and of hopelessness: It is no use fighting! The odds are overwhelmingly against the workers. They will be defeated without fail if they oppose the reactionaries in open class battle. In Austria they were crushed with much shedding of blood; in Spain their defeat is inevitable. It is therefore best if the proletariat withdraws, if it reconciles itself to the idea that an "era of counter-revolution has begun." International politics? That must be left to the bourgeoisie, to the governments. Resistance to aggression? That must

be left to the bourgeois statesmen and military leaders; they must decide what is to be done.

Social-Democratism spread such views in a thousand different ways. Under the cover of a mendacious and sanctimonious pacifism it sought to crush the resistance of the proletariat while at the same time it promoted the plans of the bourgeoisie for a war against the Soviet Union.

The stand taken on war and armed struggle is one of the most peculiar and indicative traits of Social-Democratism. The same people who regarded the outbreak of the first imperialist war as a national upsurge and who appealed to the workers to be ready to give their lives and their property for the imperialist "fatherland" could not sufficiently lament every drop of blood spilled during the revolution, and condemn the war against the oppressors as "inhuman." The same people who during the unjust and criminal war of the imperialists preached that "we must see it through" wrung their hands in despair when the workers showed their determination to oppose their class enemy with arms in hand, and gloomily prophesied that the armed struggle against reaction would reduce the country quite uselessly to a heap of stone and ashes. And the same people who helped to unleash the present imperialist war fairly oozed out "pacifism" as long as the Spanish people defended its independence by force of arms, as long as in France the Popular Front prevailed, as long as it was a question of maintaining peace by a policy of determined resistance. "Pacifism"

when a just war, a war of liberation, has been launched or is in the offing; "patriotism" when imperialist contradictions are being fought out in the field of battle—such is the attitude of Social-Democratism toward war and armed struggle.

This policy of capitulation—disguised as pacifism—which characterized Social-Democracy immediately before the outbreak of the war was interlinked with an intensified policy of anti-Communism. The bourgeoisie considered it indispensable to deprive the working class of its revolutionary leadership before the outbreak of the war, to separate the Socialist workers from their Communist class brothers, disorientate the laboring masses and calumniate and render suspect the Soviet Union in the eyes of the peoples.

It was Social-Democratism which assumed a great part of these tasks. While inciting against the Communists, Social-Democratism was pleased to acquit capitalism in advance of all guilt in the war that was impending. Elegiac observations on the "distressed capitalists" in Germany, and on the "proud Rhenish industrialists" who allegedly were affected worse than the workers by the existing regime alternated with astonishing "theories" on imperialism which certified that English, French and American imperialism had long ceased to be imperialisms, had long ceased to be bad wolves and had become good sheep.

And finally Social-Democratism painted the alluring picture of a peaceful division of the sources of raw material and spheres of influ-



ence between the imperialist great powers—at the expense of the colonial nations and of the Soviet Union. With the aid of this malodorous oil of peace the war machine was set agoing with the least possible noise.

\* \* \*

The moment that war broke out, Social-Democratism revealed itself as an ideology of imperialist war. It unconditionally extolled the war of the English and French imperialists as a war “for democracy,” “for the liberation of the oppressed peoples,” for “the establishment of a just and enduring peace.” The old slogan of a “United States of Europe” was once more fetched out and dished up in fresh form. “Europe” in the mouths of these “Socialist” preachers of war meant the unconditional supremacy of English and French imperialism, the amalgamation of all reactionary forces for the joint oppression of the colonial nations and for a joint struggle against the Soviet Union. “To win Germany for Europe” was the watchword which concealed the endeavor to disrupt the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union and unite all the imperialist states of Europe against the forces of socialism.

Once more to the capitalist bankrupts of Versailles was ascribed the ability to “organize” Europe; once more capitalism was praised as a system that was able to bring prosperity, liberty and lasting peace to the peoples. The imperialists spoke only in the most general terms about the aims of the war; they left it to their “Socialist”

decorators to depict the “world after the victory” in the richest of colors. Capitalism is being transformed perceptibly into a sort of socialism, averred the town-criers of Social-Democratism; they claimed that the contrast between capitalists and proletarians was hardly noticeable any more; that all conflicting interests would inevitably be adjusted; that only victory was lacking, and, this achieved, the new social order would arise in finished form.

It is no accident that the war propaganda emanating from the camp of Social-Democratism bore many tones similar to the war propaganda in the camp of the axis powers. In both camps the “organization of Europe,” the securing of peace through the unconditional supremacy of this or that group of imperialist powers, was designated as the most important aim of the war. Both advocated “social transformation” without class struggle, without the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production, without destroying the foundations of capitalism. Both promised the “liberation of peoples” from the imperialist yoke—of the other side. In both camps capitalism makes the utmost use of demagoguery in order to mislead the masses who yearn for peace, in order to dispel their anti-capitalist moods, and even to make use of them to promote the conduct of the war.

\* \* \*

The collapse of France and her so-called bourgeois “democracy,” the monstrous national betrayal by the French bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic helpers, has shaken

Social-Democratism to its foundation. However, it would be a serious mistake to consider Social-Democratism done for now, to overlook the considerable influence which it still exerts upon wide sections of the people.

At first sight, of course, the picture presented is contradictory. It might appear that Social-Democratism had ceased to exist as a uniform bourgeois ideology within the working class movement, as if it had split up into various irreconcilable views. In England and Sweden we see Social-Democratism unchanged in essence and re-issuing its old catchwords. In France, Belgium and partly also in other countries that have come under foreign rule we see a Social-Democratism, as expressed by Belin, Spinasse, Déat, Henrik de Man and other traitors, which rejects the old, more or less "democratic," forms of government of the bourgeoisie, which professes "authoritarian" methods, the open dictatorship of finance capital, which approves of the so-called "New Organization of Europe" and proclaims that the war is taking the course of a "European revolution." We see in Switzerland and in a few other countries how Social-Democratism preaches a "renewal of democracy" through the abolition of democratic rights and liberties, and how it regards the "authoritarian-democratic" system as its ideal.

This many-colored picture cannot of course unmake the fact that within the various forms of Social-Democratism the same substance is contained.

In all countries Social-Democratism rejects the class struggle and

promulgates "national unity" between the capitalists and the workers. In a letter published in greatly abridged form on August 27, 1940, in the Swedish *Sotsial-Demokraten*, Karl Wiik, a Finnish opposition Social-Democrat, stated quite correctly:

"For over a year they spoke of unity in national politics. But this unity has meant in fact that the working class is subordinated to the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The working class was compelled not only to make material sacrifices . . . but, what was worse, its convictions and principles were trampled underfoot."

Wiik continued that "general unity was proclaimed a national duty until one had to admit that it was the propertied class which profited by this unnatural union." This applies to Social-Democratism in all countries. What is the difference between the appeal of the English labor Minister Bevin to the workers to make every possible sacrifice and cooperate with the employers, and the statement published by the French "Socialist" Minister Belin in the *Dépeche de Toulouse* of July 29 which read:

"It is our most important task to create unity in the camp of labor, to imbue the workers with a national spirit to induce them to collaborate with the employers. The latter we shall ask to grant a greater measure of social justice. . . ."

And what is the difference between both of these "programs" and the formula of the Swiss Social-Democrat Grimm: "We must win the confidence of the people through

the removal of group and caste interests." (*Baseler Arbeiter Zeitung*, July 23.)

How far this process has gone may be gathered from a resolution passed by the congress of the Belgian trade unions and published on September 2 in the *Oeuvre*. This resolution, adopted on the motion of Henrik de Man, reads in part:

"The war which has taken us by surprise has led to a new order in Europe. We must loyally cooperate in the reorganization of the country and the rebirth of the people so that it may take the place which is its due in this new European order. Hence, the leading trade union functionaries declare that, like de Man, they too want to unite all constructive forces of the people into one great movement which is to serve the national interests, and for this purpose will put an end to all party politics. . . . They are of the opinion that the manifestations of the class struggle, which are the consequences of liberal and capitalist economic system, must in our country be replaced by a social and economic order in which the trade union organizations, upon the instruction of the people as a whole and under the control of the state, will fix the conditions of work and regulate production. In the expectation that our actions, intended to promote such a new order, will make it possible for us to establish in the place of the present trade unions a united front of the workers on a corporative basis, our organizations will seek to accomplish the following tasks: (1) the collection of membership dues; (2) legal advice; (3) defense of the interests of the workers in the existing parity committees and similar bodies; (4) the education of all members in the

spirit of the new social order, the establishment of which we make our aim, as well as in the spirit of the rights and duties of the working people. . . ."

The resolution ends with an appeal to the capitalist "leaders of industry" of the country to consider "the part they must play a commission entrusted to them by the whole of society." The concluding words are a profession of allegiance to the "Labor Front." Thus all trade union traditions were cast overboard, and the trade unions were expected to be nothing more henceforth than pillars supporting the capitalist system and the authorities in charge of the occupied area.

In all countries Social-Democratism demands the *subordination of the working class to the bourgeoisie*, the sacrifice of the interests of the proletariat which are identical with the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation. In all countries Social-Democracy rejects proletarian internationalism, and expects the workers to consider the war interests of their own bourgeoisie as paramount to the interests of the international proletariat.

In all countries Social-Democratism condemns the struggle against the war and its instigators, and tries to make the workers believe that there is no causal connection between the war and capitalism, that capitalism will be in a position to achieve a lasting and just peace.

In all countries Social-Democratism seeks to develop the essence of socialism in fog and sees non-existent "socialist traits" in the capitalist system. While calumniate-

ing and disparaging real socialism, such as exists in the Soviet Union and there alone, it does not hesitate to exalt capitalist war economy as a transition to socialism.

In all countries Social-Democratism is anti-communist and anti-Marxist.

And, finally, the focal point from which these various views hostile to the working class radiate and to which they gravitate is as follows: in all countries Social-Democratism disputes the strength and capacity of the working class to take its fate into its own hands, to carry out its own revolutionary policy, to place itself in the van of the peoples and to put an end to the war and its causes. It is virtually of decisive importance for the bourgeoisie that the working class should not become conscious of its own strength, that it should not realize what part it is capable of playing, what gigantic power it represents if it is closely knit and faces the imperialists united in rank. And Social-Democratism is the ideology, so indispensable for capitalism, of the self-abnegation and self-mutilation of the proletariat.

Look at England. Can anybody deny that the English working class could become a factor of the first order in determining the question of power, that it would be possible for it to influence essentially the further march of events? Even the English Labor leaders speak of the historic task of the English working class; but by this they mean of course nothing else but the complete subordination of the English workers to the English imperialists who are defending their world domination.

It is *indeed* a historic task that is facing the British proletariat. What an international change it would signalize if the English workers were to throw their entire weight as a *class* into the scales to transform England really into a land of freedom, if they were to league themselves with the liberation movements of all peoples oppressed by the British imperialists, if they were to propose a just peace to all nations on the basis of so bold a proletarian policy. Undoubtedly, the English working class *would be able* to accomplish this historic task. But this is precisely what Social-Democratism prevents it from doing.

Or let us cast a glance at America where the Socialist Party has dwindled down to a miserably small handful, but where Social-Democratism influences large sections of the working class. If the working class of the United States were to form a single class organization and to face the American imperialists with its demand for bread, liberty and peace as a single political power, it would have far-reaching repercussions on the international situation and might prove the starting point of a grand movement for the termination of the imperialist war.

Or look at France. A treacherous and criminal bourgeoisie flung this country into the abyss of an enormous catastrophe. The incalculable guilt of the ruling class and its lackeys, and the lack of integrity and capacity of all the leading cliques, from the extreme Right to the "Socialists," are so evident that the masses of the workers hurl imprecations at them and look for a

force that could bring them salvation. This force, upon which the future of France depends, can only be the working class. But the working class must be *aware* of *this* its power, if it to instill determination and confidence. It is Social-Democratism that seeks to dim the eye of the working class, that would fain check the circulation of its blood, that once more is offering to the working people the bankrupt bourgeoisie as the "savior of France."

In each individual country and on an international scale the working class is the personification of a gigantic potential force. But Social-Democratism seeks to prevent this potential force from becoming dynamic, seeks to prevent its transformation into directly efficacious energy. It shows to the working class only *one* side of the historic process which is going on at the present time, and does all in its power to obscure the *other* side. It shows only the immense war machinery of capitalism, the political and military might of reaction, the helplessness of the individual in the face of these mighty forces, the division and enfeeblement of the working class in many important countries. But it passes in silence, conceals and denies the growth of the forces of socialism, the increasing dislocation of capitalism, the great transformations in the sentiments and minds of the great masses of the people, the real possibilities of struggle and victory which ensue from all this for the working class.

It preaches that it is best to bear with patience the horrors of the war

and will not admit the thought that it is far better to make sacrifices for one's own cause, for the cause of each individual worker and the world proletariat as a whole. It wants to force the masses to accept but one alternative: the victory of either the one or the other imperialism, as if the world contained only imperialists and not also peoples, hundreds of millions of human beings that can rise up in arms to put an end to the war in their own way and in their own interests.

It is this systematic weakening, disorientation and disorganization of the working class that constitutes, despite all its *different* shades and hues, the *single* fundamental line of Social-Democratism. Where the bourgeoisie still demeans itself in "democratic" fashion, Social-Democratism likewise prefers to sport a "democratically" tinged attire. Where the bourgeoisie resorts to open "authoritarian" and terroristic forms of government, Social-Democratism is dyed accordingly. Everywhere the lackey bears the colors of his masters and it is this that distinguishes him as lackey.

As a result of this complete adaptation to the needs and requirements of the reactionary bourgeoisie, of decaying capitalism, Social-Democratism coalesces more and more with all the other anti-Marxist ideologies. There is a constant interrelation and passing over from the programmatic declarations of the Labor Party via the ideological expositions of Reni Belin and Henrik de Man to the "corporative" and "totalitarian" systems in which Social-Democracy comes to the end of its tether, but essential

elements of Social-Democratism still persist.

\* \* \*

Undoubtedly the events of the last few years and the experience which the toiling masses derived from them have shaken the foundations of Social-Democratism. The demand of countless Social-Democratic workers to enter upon *new ways* finds expression also in oppositional movements within the Social-Democratic parties and the trade unions, in the utterances of such Socialist working class leaders as Leon Nicole and Karl Wiik. But Social-Democratism in all its forms and variations is still an ideology that influences large sections of the workers and of the toilers generally. In part it feeds on the old traditions, old ties, old enured sentiments and mental dispositions. Ideological clarity in ones own mind does not keep pace with the whirlwind of events. In the brain of every person there are "lines of thought" which stubbornly continue to operate, there are deep-grooved "channels of thought" which conserve past impressions that no longer correspond to reality. It is not always easy to react with sufficient rapidity to all social changes and to take in the new situation in its entire complexity. Besides, the sinister force of reaction presses heavily upon the minds and spirits of the workers which makes its more difficult for them to draw the necessary conclusions from their experiences and to turn their thoughts determinedly to the new facts and conditions.

Furthermore, individual sections

and groups of the working people are being interested in the further existence of capitalism through questionable and to a great extent only supposed *advantages*. *National sentiment*, which in itself is perfectly justified but is abused and misguided by the bourgeoisie, blinds the eyes of many a working man. Fearing the risk involved in taking the initiative, many working people prefer to sit passively through the worst catastrophes rather than boldly fight in their own cause with all its attendant dangers. The dual nature of the middle classes which vacillate between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between sullen fears and nebulous hopes, is not without its effect on certain sections of the working class. And it is to these wavering, undecided and timorous elements that Social-Democratism addresses its appeal. They are the carriers which spread its pestiferous bacilli far and wide.

Thus, all the determined, class-conscious, revolutionary forces of the working class are confronted with the tremendous task of dealing a death blow to Social-Democratism in the working class movement. But they can only deal it a death blow if they *convince* the masses on the basis of facts and experience that Social-Democratism is nothing but the ideological shadow of capitalism in the working class movement, and if they at the same time provide an *example* for emulation in every situation, through their intrepidity, determination, resolution and political activity, an example which will encourage the workers and all toilers, which will strengthen and enhance their bravery, soli-

curity and initiative—these outstanding virtues of the proletarian fighter. The struggle against Social-Democratism is therefore a matter of unremitting and patient propaganda, as well as a matter of daily and undeviating defense of the direct interests of the working people, a matter of displaying exemplary proletarian heroism which will sweep along with it the broad masses of the people.

To expose the capitalist original behind its ideological shadow, Social-Democratism, to clear the view of the masses by hard and difficult

daily struggle so that they may be able to see the great historical development in progress; to imbue them with faith in their own strength, on the basis of their own struggle, but primarily on the basis of the victories achieved by socialism in the Soviet Union; to sweep them along by holding before them the example of Bolshevik boldness, determination and stamina—this is what is required to be able to deal a death blow to Social-Democratism in the working class movement and thus to spoil the parasitic game of capitalism.

---

## TWENTY-ONE WARS — THE BIRTH PAINS OF THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

BY G. FRIEDRICH

“THIS war, if there does not follow a series of revolutions, will soon be followed by other wars; the fable of the ‘last war’ is an empty, harmful fable, a philistine ‘myth.’” (V. I. Lenin, “Position and Tasks of the Socialist International, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 88.)

In the above words, written three months after the outbreak of the World War of 1914-18, Lenin, on the basis of his scientific analysis of imperialism, foretold the course of future events. Even before the first World War, Lenin, speaking at an international Socialist congress, pointed out that wars are an *inevitable* concomitant of *capitalism*; that in capitalist countries they are as much the natural order of things and a matter of course as the exploitation of the working class.

That is why, from its very inception, the Communist International exposed the pacifist phrases about the “last war,” with which at that time (1919) the Wilsons, the Blums, the Kautskys and the Hendersons hoped to lull the war-weary masses in all countries and to keep them from revolutionary struggle. That

was why the Communists branded the Versailles “peace” based on the redivision of the world in favor of the Anglo-French imperialists as a crime which was fraught with further evil, as the germ of a series of wars of revenge which would lead to a new, even more frightful, world carnage for a new redivision of the world.

The course of events from 1918 to 1940 has proved in a thousand ways that the Communists were right. In these twenty-two years hardly a year passed by without one or several sanguinary conflicts breaking out in various parts of the world—minor and major wars which led up to the present European war which, in its turn, shows an ever more pronounced tendency to spread and become a second world war.

The year 1919, the year when the Versailles “peace” system was established, was already marked by at least two imperialist wars of intervention launched by the Entente against the young Soviet Republic (Kolchak and Denikin); it was marked by the Polish campaign for the subjugation of Eastern Galicia; by Gabriel D’Annunzio’s military coup in Fiume and the war waged



jointly by Rumania and Czechoslovakia to overthrow the Soviet Government in Hungary. In 1920 the Poles made war upon the Soviet Republic, the Japanese embarked upon anti-Soviet intervention in the Far East, and Polish troops seized the city of Vilna from the Lithuanians. In 1921 the Poles staged the Korfanty rebellion in Upper Silesia. In 1921-22 war raged between Turkey and Greece. In 1923 France sent troops to occupy the Ruhr. The year 1924 was marked by war in Morocco (the liberation struggle of the Riffs against French and Spanish imperialism), and by the French campaign of "pacification" in Syria. In 1929 the Chinese White Guards provoked a conflict with the U.S.S.R. over the Soviet-owned Chinese-Eastern Railway. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria; and Bolivia and Paraguay engaged in war again over the Gran Chaco.\* The year 1932 was marked by hostilities between Colombia and Peru. In 1935 Italy launched her predatory war against Ethiopia. The year 1936, saw the beginning of the imperialist war of intervention against republican Spain, which lasted nearly three years. The Japano-Chinese war, which is still raging, began in 1937. The year 1938 was marked by the Japanese attack at Lake Khasan, and 1939 by a Japanese attack upon the Mongolian People's Republic.

In the fall of that same year, the present imperialist war in Europe broke out. Having started as a German-Polish war, it soon turned into a war between Germany on one

hand and England and France on the other, drew Norway, Holland, Belgium into its maelstrom, and has been further extended by Italy joining in the fight on the side of Germany.

Those are the plain facts, which fully bear out Lenin's prediction.

\* \* \*

The World War of 1914-18 resulted in the establishment of two systems of imperialist domination—that of Versailles and that of Washington. The system of Versailles was established in 1919 by the Anglo-French imperialists: it secured France's supremacy in the European continent, guaranteed by a chain of pacts of military assistance and alliances designed, on the one hand, to keep the defeated states in submission, and, on the other, to serve as a "sanitary cordon" against the Land of Socialism; it also converted the German colonies into British and French "mandates."

The Washington system was established at the Washington conference in 1922 (the Nine-Power Treaty): it signified the retreat of the then still weak Japanese imperialism before the superior strength of the United States and Great Britain; it enforced the "open door" policy and the demarcation of spheres of influence in the Pacific.

The two systems were inaugurated with the object of establishing a political balance of power among the antagonistic imperialist interests, to keep down the defeated and weak countries, to continue to enslave the working class and the colonial peoples, and to "put an

\* Gran Chaco, the interior plain between the two countries.—Ed.

end" to the young Soviet Republic—all in an effort to bolster up the shaken capitalist world system.

In forecasting the inevitable collapse of this "peace" system, the Communists based themselves on the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism. This law, discovered by Lenin, enriched Marxian scientific socialism with a new theory, according to which the development of the various powers within the imperialist system is proceeding unevenly and spasmodically, thus giving rise to ever new imperialist contradictions which cannot be removed by peaceful means. It further shows that the growth of the forces of the revolutionary working class and the development of the national liberation movement in the countries under the yoke of imperialism are also uneven.

Owing to this uneven development, periodic wars for the redivision of the world are inevitable, bringing in their train the weakening of the forces of imperialism and making it possible to pierce the front of imperialism at the point where it proves to be the weakest.

The Versailles system began to show cracks in the very first months of its existence. The revolutionary forces were gaining in strength, first, in the defeated countries; in Central and South Europe proletarian revolution was on the order of the day (revolutionary mass movements in Germany, Austria, Italy, Soviet power in Hungary and Bavaria, uprisings in Bulgaria, etc.). If the path mapped out by the newly-founded Communist International had been

followed, if the weak links had been used to force a breach in the capitalist system, to overthrow the bourgeoisie of those countries, it would have been possible at that time to destroy the poisonous roots of new imperialist wars of plunder, to bring the peoples of Europe real freedom, to solve the national problems in a real spirit of justice, and thus to blow up the Versailles system.

Unfortunately for the nations, the Social-Democratic parties succeeded in those years in diverting the working class to another path—the path of reformism, of surrender, of defeat.

Just as the irreconcilable antagonism between capitalism and the proletariat shook the foundations of the capitalist system in a number of countries, so did the antagonism between imperialism and the liberation movement of the peoples suffering from national or colonial oppression shake the foundations of the Versailles system, even in the very first years following the World War. Thus Turkey emerged victorious from her liberation war against Anglo-French oppression; the national-revolutionary movement made tremendous progress in China, culminating in the triumphal Northern campaign; the peoples of India and other colonies came into motion; and powerful liberation movements developed in the Latin American countries.

Nor did it take long for the antagonism between the victor countries and the vanquished countries to flare up anew. The inevitable disastrous results of the Versailles

peace for the whole capitalist world became evident as early as 1922-23—not only in the convulsions of inflation, and in the mounting anger of the working class of Germany and its fight against starvation and destitution. It also became evident in the incipient resistance of the German bourgeoisie, expressed in passive resistance to, and sabotage of, the provisions of the Versailles treaty, which led to the French occupation of the Ruhr in January, 1923. In order to be able to enforce the terms of the treaty, the victor countries began to arm at a furious pace.

In an appeal issued by the Soviet Government over the signature of M. I. Kalinin on the occasion of the invasion of the Ruhr, the situation was described in the following words:

“As a result of the Versailles Treaty Europe has been turned into a powder magazine, with sparks flying all around. . . . Peoples of Europe, the cause of peace is in mortal danger. The fate of peace is in your own hands!”

That was the situation at the beginning of 1923, scarcely four years after the conclusion of “peace.”

Finally, the correctness of the law of the uneven develop of capitalism was manifested also in the growing antagonisms among the victor states, caused by the new alignment of forces resulting from the Versailles Treaty. These antagonisms began to loom large on the very morrow of the signing of that peace treaty. Italian finance capital, dissatisfied with its small share of the

loot, turned against England and France, and its denunciation of the latter countries became ever more vehement. After the failure of its agents in Dalmatia to effect a “correction” by forcible means, and after the defeat of the Italian working class as a result of its being split by the reformists, the Italian financial oligarchy set up the fascist dictatorship, which inscribed on its banner the demand for a revision of the Versailles Treaty.

British imperialism, now outdone by the imperialism of the United States which had grown immensely rich as a result of the World War, endeavored to maintain its role as arbiter of Europe by playing off Germany and Italy against her French competitor. The antagonism between Great Britain and the United States resulting from their fight for world supremacy was but temporarily shelved by the Washington compromise for their joint struggle against Japan for the markets of Eastern Asia.

The imperialist powers hoped that they would be able to patch up all these rifts in their “peace system,” first and foremost at the expense of the Soviet Union. They derived that hope from the fact that they were all equally interested in a crusade against the Land of Socialism, from the fact that it would have been to their mutual interest to convert the U.S.S.R. into a colony. All the attempts made toward this end were frustrated, however, by the political and military successes of the Soviet Union.

In those years, when the capitalist world was faced with imminent col-

lapse, it was the leaders of the Second International who rushed to the rescue. They succeeded in diverting the peoples of Europe from the revolutionary road. Particularly in Germany and in the succession states of Austria-Hungary, it was they who filled the breach in the capitalist system and who helped to put the Versailles straitjacket on the peoples. In Europe, unlike Russia, the working class movement did not have such outstanding Marxist leaders as Lenin and Stalin at its head; the Communist parties were still young and numerically weak, and the majority of the working class followed the Social-Democratic flunkeys of the bourgeoisie—Kautsky, Vandervelde, Blum, *et al.* It is this fact that is responsible for the tragic fate that has befallen, not only the working class of Europe, but also all the nations that are now shedding their blood in the second imperialist war or are in danger of being swept into its whirlpool.

\* \* \*

As a result of the treachery of international Social-Democracy and the ebb of the revolution, capitalism succeeded, in the years 1924-29, in achieving partial, relative stabilization. In 1924, German finance capital and its "Socialist" government had come to terms with the victor states by imposing upon the German proletariat the double yoke of the Dawes Plan and the fetters of exploitation at the hand of its "own" bourgeoisie, and by delivering the bondage. Everywhere the leaders of whole German people into debt the Second International tried to

lure the working class into their nets by singing the praises of "organized capitalism," which, "tamed" with their help, would be deprived of its imperialist claws and would gradually lead the people into the kingdom of "eternal peace" and "socialism."

But in return the working class was to give up the revolutionary struggle, disband the Communist parties and all revolutionary organizations, and take upon itself all the burdens of the so-called "sanation." That was the reformists' song of resignation. The so-called "era of pacifism" was ushered in.

But beneath the surface of the partially stabilized capitalist system further profound changes and a further realignment of forces were going on. Capitalist rationalization removed none of the internal contradictions. It only rendered the class struggle more acute. The "peaceful" struggle for foreign markets was breeding new conflicts among the imperialist competitors. The imperialist bourgeoisie of the dissatisfied countries began to voice their demands ever louder. A new explosion was in preparation while the Social-Democrats were delivering lying sermons about consolidation, about the "Locarno sun of peace" that had allegedly risen over Europe and heralded the "reconciliation of erstwhile enemies." The explosion was being prepared in spite of the Kellogg Pact, by the terms of which all the states had given a solemn pledge to settle all their differences only by peaceful means.

It was Joseph Stalin who, in his historic speech at the Fifteenth

Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in December, 1927, refuted the threadbare talk of an "organized" and "peaceful" capitalism, and sounded the warning that a new frightful capitalist crisis was approaching and that new wars were imminent. It was the Communist parties which in every country mobilized the masses to defend the cause of peace. And the sound of the Communist tocsin soon blended with the last whistles which announced the closing down of thousands of factories; it blended with the wails of millions of workers who were thrown onto the streets, and of millions of ruined small and middle farmers and artisans.

The crash on the New York Stock Exchange in 1929—that was the shrill note on which the "pacifist" concert of the Second International ended. It was also the initial note of the imperialist call for war.

\* \* \*

The world economic crisis served to accentuate still further the imperialist contradictions among the capitalist countries, as well as the contradictions between the colonies and the "mother countries," between "victors" and "vanquished," between capital and labor. In his report to the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin predicted that the bourgeoisie would seek a way out of the economic crisis by setting up a reactionary dictatorship of finance capital and by launching a new imperialist war for a new redivision of the colonies and spheres of influence.

And, indeed, the world economic crisis threw into convulsions not only the economy of the capitalist countries, but also the entire political system set up in Versailles and Washington. In the Far East, Japan attacked China and, taking advantage of the disunity of the people, seized Manchuria and subsequently a number of China's Northern provinces. In South America, British and Yankee imperialism began to fight out their differences, their struggle for oil, with the hands of the Latin American nations (the Gran Chaco war, and the Peru-Colombia conflict).

In that situation the Communist International intensified its struggle against the imperialist war danger. Everywhere it opposed resolutely the chauvinist wave let loose by the imperialists and unfurled the banner of proletarian internationalism. At one of the most impressive mass demonstrations ever held by the Paris proletariat, Maurice Thorez, leader of the French working people, extended a fraternal hand to the German working class leader, Ernst Thaelmann. Both showed their peoples that the war danger could be removed and national liberation attained only as a result of their emancipation from the domination of the bourgeoisie.

Immediately before the accession to power of the National-Socialists in Germany, in January, 1933, all the burning problems were discussed at the Essen conference of the Communist parties of Germany, England, France, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The conference voiced its protest against Versailles and imperialist armaments, against

the occupation of the Saar, against the predatory policy of the Polish imperialists in Danzig, against national oppression in Upper Silesia, in the Polish Corridor and in South Tyrol, against the disfranchisement of the national minorities in Czechoslovakia, against national oppression in Western Ukraine, in Bukovina, in Bessarabia, in Macedonia and in Dobrudja. The conference showed that all these problems represented just as many powder magazines in Europe, each of which might at any time explode and kindle the flames of a world war.

At the same time, however, the Essen conference pointed out that it was possible to eliminate these hotbeds of war if the working people waged a joint struggle for the right to national self-determination, against chauvinist instigation, and for the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. Today, when we read these prophetic warnings, we can gauge all the more fully the crime committed by the Social-Democratic leaders who in Germany, for instance, rejected the last appeal made to them by the German Communist Party a few days after the Essen conference, proposing joint action along the lines of the decisions of that conference, to take a united stand against the forces of reaction and to fight the threatening danger of war.

That was how destiny took its course, soon involving one country after another in the second imperialist war.

\* \* \*

The economic world crisis accentuated the unevenness of the de-

velopment of capitalism still further, and it shook the Versailles and Washington systems. The Twelfth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International pointed out in its analysis of the international situation that "a new round of revolutions and wars" had begun. A new situation had come into being. The states which had been vanquished in the first World War had embarked upon a policy demanding revision, a policy of a new redivision of the world by means of new wars. Again the Communists pointed out the way to avert the approaching sanguinary conflict. Georgi Dimitroff declared at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935:

"It is true that imperialist wars are the product of capitalism, that only the overthrow of capitalism will put an end to all war; but it is likewise true that the masses of working people can hinder imperialist war by their militant action." (Georgi Dimitroff, "Closing Speech," see *VII Congress of the Communist International*, p. 554.)

The Communist International called for the creation of a mighty front of all forces of peace under the leadership of the united international working class—a front that would be prepared to go into action even for the elimination of the least important hotbed of war.

Italy's attack upon Ethiopia proved how right the Communists had been in pointing out that peace is indivisible. The correctness of the theses advanced by the Communist International was substan-

tiated even more strikingly during the intervention against republican Spain (1936).

The Communist parties carried on an unremitting and tireless struggle to prevent the outbreak of the second imperialist war. The Communist International spared no efforts to persuade the leaders of the Second International and of the International Federation of Trade Unions to join in the organization of an international campaign of solidarity with and assistance to the Spanish people, and to agree to united action against the war. The leaders of the Second International, however, did not want to combat the war danger, they did not want to come to the aid of the Spanish people. One of the leaders of the Second International, Leon Blum, was the initiator of the policy of "non-intervention" which led to the strangling of the Spanish Republic and hastened the outbreak of the present war.

The reasons for such action on the part of the leaders of the Second International were pointed out as far back as at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. In his report on "The Preparations for Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communist International," M. Ercoli said:

"British imperialism, and in particular the most reactionary section of the British bourgeoisie (here, too, we must treat the question relatively), considers it its 'historical' mission to deal a mortal blow to the country of socialism, or at least to weaken the Soviet Union for a long time to come by a series of

wars in Europe and in the Far East." (*Ibid.*, p. 408.)

A "big and dangerous game" (in the words of Joseph Stalin) began to be played in the capitalist world. Its substance was that the endangered imperialist powers tried—with the active assistance of international Social-Democracy—to escape the threatened redivision of the world at *their* expense by bringing about a new redivision at the expense of *other* countries. The so-called "democratic" states wanted to "switch" the second imperialist war, to direct it along different lines, more desirable to them. They pursued a policy of agreement with the revisionist states, egged them on to war against the Soviet Union and against the small nations, holding out to them the prospects of rich booty in those countries.

That political game led to the Munich pact, which was hailed wholeheartedly by the French and British "Socialists" as signifying the "pacification of Europe."

Soon after Munich the Blums and Faures disrupted the People's Front in France, thereby earning the plaudits of all the forces of reaction; for by disrupting the People's Front they removed a stronghold of peace. The Communists told the people the entire bitter truth of what Munich meant. In its appeal issued on May 1, 1939, the Communist International pointed out that, far from saving the cause of peace, the Munich pact had been instrumental in further fanning the flames of war, in accelerating and facilitating its outbreak. There was

growing indignation among the masses of the people against the Munich policy, against those who were driving toward war while professing to be safeguarding the cause of peace.

\* \* \*

The great European war has been raging for more than a year now. The deceitful game of "non-intervention," however, was foiled by the brilliant foreign policy of Joseph Stalin, as a result of which the peoples of the Soviet Union have been spared the horrors of this war, and the benefits of peace are also enjoyed by the liberated peoples of Western Ukraine, Western Byelorussia, the Baltic countries, Besarabia and Bukovina.

As a result of the collision between the two imperialist groups—the Anglo-French bloc, supported by the United States, on the one hand, and Germany, subsequently joined by Italy, on the other—hundreds of thousands of people have already lost their lives, millions have seen all the foundations of their existence shattered, inestimable values have been destroyed, famine is stalking many countries, a number of nations have lost their independence, and France, once the strongest power on the European continent, is lying prostrate in ruins. But the end of the war is not in sight. The war has brought about a new alignment of forces among the imperialist powers. France has collapsed. British imperialism has its hands full in Europe and is gradually being pushed out of its spheres of influence in Eastern Asia

and South America. The new situation created by Germany's military successes has whetted the imperialist appetites of Japan and the United States. All these factors are contributing to the further spread of the war—to its extension to the Pacific, the Near East and other regions where the interests of the imperialists clash.

The bourgeoisie is unable to offer the peoples any other prospects but those of blood, misery, destruction and, in the end, some mythical, imperialist "decisive victory" on a heap of ruins. Can such a "decisive victory"—achieved as a result of endless suffering and sacrifice, by enormous destruction and savagery—really bring the peoples peace?

The terrible results of the "victory" of 1918 furnish the answer. Every such "decisive victory" is at the same time the beginning of new complications leading to war and upheavals. The bourgeoisie is unable to establish a just and lasting system of peace. The so-called "peace" system created at Versailles has proved to be a system of small and big wars and has gradually passed into the second universal imperialist war. In the same way, every other imperialist "system of peace," which must necessarily rest on force and on social and national oppression, cannot lead to anything but more war.

Only the masses of the people themselves, under the leadership of the international working class, can put a real end to the imperialist war—in their own way and in their own interests. That is why the Communists, braving every sort of



persecution and terror, are fighting unremittingly to unite the workers and rally all the toilers to the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the imperialists and the imperialist war, in order to lay the foundations for a real, just and lasting peace.

\* \* \*

"The strength of the Communists," wrote Georgi Dimitroff, "lies in the fact that their great teachers, Lenin and Stalin, foresaw with the eye of genius where the bourgeoisie was heading for and warned the masses. . . . The strength of the Communists lies in the fact that the masses are being more and more convinced by their own experience of the truth of the great teachings of Leninism." (Georgi Dimitroff, *The Struggle Against the Imperialist War*, pp. 19-20. Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

In 1919, when the "peace system" of Versailles—the system which was fraught with the germ of the present mass slaughter—was set up, the young revolutionary vanguard of the working class still lacked the strength to counteract successfully the vast machinery of bourgeois-reformist deception and the White terror. Since then, however, it has grown into a serious force. Relying on the peace policy of the great socialist Soviet Union, on the epoch-making victories of the Bolsheviks, and on the experience of the long-suffering working people in the capitalist countries, the Communists are taking the lead in the fight against the imperialist war. This war must not end in a new Versailles; it must end in victory for the peoples.

---

## NEW LIFE BLOSSOMS FROM THE RUINS

A YEAR AFTER THE LIBERATION OF WESTERN UKRAINE  
AND WESTERN BYELORUSSIA

BY F. LEOPOLD

A FEW days before the surrender of Warsaw, during the sanguinary events of September, 1939, the famous Polish authoress Wanda Wasilewska left Warsaw on her tramp eastward. For hundreds of miles she trudged her weary way, swept along by the endless stream of refugees. It took many days to cross that ocean of suffering on her way to the "land in the East," of which the heroes of her novels had dreamed so fervently.

"I was heading towards the Soviet frontier," she related subsequently, "but the frontier came to meet me. On Ukrainian soil I came upon the Red Army—I and thousands of others who were hurrying eastward were saved." She had left in Warsaw the unfinished manuscript of her new novel, *Light in the Marshes*. Now, on Soviet soil, she has written it all anew—a gripping epic of the liberation struggle of the Volhynian peasants against the Polish gentry.

In artistic form this novel depicts the tragedy of the Ukrainian toilers under the yoke of the Polish land-

lords and capitalists. The grey-haired peasant woman Pietrukova sums it all up in the following words:

"The gentry made the laws for themselves, and not for the peasants. . . . There's no law for the muzhik. Because he is a muzhik."

The novel shows the representatives of the Polish "state idea," the sheriffs, the brutal colonizers (the *osadniks*), and the senile, but greedy, aristocrats. It shows in living characters those nameless heroes whose example, like that of Petro Iwanczuk who is serving a sentence of ten years' hard labor, stimulates the people in their struggle and maintains their firm faith in their coming liberation. "Is it possible that your day is dawning, while mine is going down into the grave with me?" asks the degenerate Count Ostrzenski, another of Wanda Wasilewska's characters, as he looks at "his" gray, sprawling village in Volhynia.

History answered that question

with a thunderous "Yes" on September 17, 1939, when the Red Army swept away the border line that divided the working people of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia from their brothers in the Land of Soviets. And it is noteworthy that it was a Polish author-ess, one of the finest representatives of the Polish people, who was hurrying toward the East on that day, sending back a curse, penned in fiery words, upon the tyrannous regime of the Rydz-Smigly and the Becks which, covered with disgrace, toppled to ruins.

\* \* \*

One year has elapsed since that historic day. One short and eventful year of work and construction. After the stillness of the cemetery that reigned there for centuries, all the towns and villages of the liberated regions are now filled with the sounds of festive rejoicing. Nor could it be otherwise. While the working people of capitalist Europe have been plunged into abject misery, the people of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, who had already been drawn into the welter of the war, have been extricated from the abyss. Today they are in a position to draw up the balance sheet of their first year of a new life full of hope.

In capitalist Europe there are many demagogues nowadays who talk glibly about socialism, about a new social order, about overcoming capitalism, and so forth. Capitalist newspapers write openly that

the people are showing ever greater insistence in their demands for real socialism, and they ascribe it to the fact that "Marxism had drummed into their heads the idea of socialization." They "explain" to their readers that "real socialism" does not mean "the introduction of a new economic system," but "practical management," in the interests of the commonweal. It happens, however, that the exploiters' idea of the "commonweal," "practical management" and "socialism" is quite different from the idea the exploited entertain of these things. Now, the one year experience of the people of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, where the "idea of socialization" which "Marxism had drummed into their heads" has been put into practice, serves as an object lesson for the working people throughout the world. It shows them what socialism really means; it shows them that what is really necessary is to build up a new economic system, while wresting all power from the hands of the representatives of big capital and the big landowners, and transferring it "to the toilers of town and country as represented by the Soviets of Toilers' Deputies." ("Article 3," *Constitution of the U.S.S.R.* p. 9, International Publishers, New York.)

Under the Polish rule the status of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia was virtually that of colonies. They were objects of exploitation for the gentry and the *osadniks*. The existing inadequate industries, mostly light industry,

remained undeveloped. Wherever some sort of large-scale industry had existed since the days of the Austrian Empire, as, for instance, the oil industry in Galicia, it was rapidly declining as a result of wasteful exploitation.

The first step taken by the Soviet Government was to *nationalize the industries*. Among others the state took over the oil industry of the Borislav-Drohobich district, which had represented a source of exorbitant profit for Polish, British, French and American stockholders as late as August, 1939. At that time 57 per cent of the oil workers had lost their jobs as a result of "rationalization" and "economy." Out of 794 oil wells, 420 had been idle for years; output had dropped from 2,076,000 tons in 1909 to 370,000 tons in 1938.

What is the position today, after one year of work under socialist conditions? All the 420 idle wells have been put in operation, 345 wells have undergone general repairs, and 57 new derricks stand where as many new oil wells have been dug. The unemployed oil workers have returned to their jobs, and many thousand more workers have found employment in the oil fields. Output is already far above last year's.

At the same time the formerly neglected extraction of ozocerite has been resumed on a large scale and the output of this valuable product has been doubled in the first year.

In Western Ukraine alone, 978 industrial establishments, which had

been idle as a result of capitalist economic anarchy, have now been reopened. Many of these had been shut down for eight or ten years. Many new bread bakeries have been organized. The Voroshilov (formerly Merkur) mechanized bakery in Lvov is being reconstructed and its daily output is to increase from 35 to 85-90 tons. Sixteen hundred men and women today work in the Kirov and Bolshevik confectionary plants in Lvov, which formerly employed 750-800 workers. The two tobacco factories of Lvov today employ 2,100 workers as against 900 before the liberation of the city. As a result of the expansion of industry, a total of 139,000 workers have received employment during the past year in Western Ukraine. This total is divided by regions as follows:

Lvov .....	50,000
Drohobich .....	24,000
Stanislav .....	20,000
Tarnopol .....	11,000
Rovno .....	19,000
Volhynia .....	15,000

Byelostok, the biggest city of Western Byelorussia, represented a veritable industrial graveyard after the Polish gentry were through with it a year ago. Today there is not a trace of unemployment in the city; on the contrary, there is already a shortage of skilled labor in the textile industry, which supplied 13,000,000 meters of cloth—largely of a higher quality than before—during its first Soviet year, as against a maximum of from

5,000,000 to 6,000,000 in the best years of capitalist prosperity. In 1941 the output of the Byelostok textile industry will reach 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 meters. Practically all the mills have been extended during the past year, and new shops are in construction everywhere.

Nor does the Soviet Government confine itself to the extension of the existing industries and plants. During the past year a number of new industries have been started in the liberated regions. Among others, in Byelostok work has started on the construction of a new big spinning and weaving mill which will be equipped with the most up-to-date machinery.

The Tarnopol Region has rich deposits of bituminous coal, peat and various valuable clays. The government of the defunct Polish state paid no attention whatever to these resources. Only with the establishment of Soviet power did the exploitation of these natural resources begin on a large scale. During the very first year 119,000 tons of peat were extracted in the Tarnopol Region and a number of big modern coal mines have been sunk, some of which are ready for operation and others about to be completed. A number of plants have been built for the working up of the valuable clays of the region. Among other plants built in the Tarnopol Region during this year are a macaroni factory, a vinegar factory, a soft drink works, a candy factory, etc. Altogether the number of industrial establishments in the Tarnopol Re-

gion has increased from 1,020 to 1,500.

Old Poland had practically no meat-packing industry of its own. There were but small slaughterhouses and sausage factories. The Soviet Government has effected a thorough reorganization of these establishments and has laid the foundations for a large-scale meat-packing industry. Meat-packing plants with departments for the production of sausage and canned meats and the working up of fat, etc., have been built, and the sanitary conditions in the slaughterhouses of Lvov, Stry, Drohobich, Stanislav, etc., have been thoroughly improved (by the introduction of modern equipment for washing, hygienic working clothes, strict observance of veterinary regulations, etc.).

Building construction has shown particularly rapid progress in the liberated regions. The devastating effects of the but few days of the German-Polish war have now been removed without a trace. Several hundred buildings has been restored in Lvov, and over two hundred families who were made homeless by aerial bombings of the city have been provided with apartments. New residential districts, sanatoriums and rest homes have sprung up in the suburbs, amid beautiful forests and parks. Plans have been drawn up for large-scale reconstruction which is to change the face of the city. Old, crooked little streets will disappear to make room for broad avenues; a new big square will be laid out in the center

of the city, in front of the Opera House, and a monument to Lenin is to be placed there.

The municipal Soviets of the Lvov Region have launched the construction of new public buildings, hotels, bath houses and apartment houses.

Pinsk, an insignificant and out-of-the-way provincial town in old Poland, has been transformed in the course of one year into an important port. New buildings have risen on the banks of the Pina—warehouses, wharves, apartment houses, schools, etc. Boats carrying oil, salt, cotton and other products come here from Kiev and from as far as Kherson.

How has this become possible? The new Pinsk River port has assumed great importance as a result of the building of the Dnieper-Bug Canal, which represents one of the first great achievements of socialist construction in the liberated regions. The canal connects the Pina, which is part of the Dnieper basin, with the Mukhovietz, which flows into the Bug. Something like a canal did exist before, too. It was called in jest the "Sparrow Canal" because of its wretched state and the fact that it could not be used. It was grown over with reed and covered with slime, and there could be no question of its being used for shipping.

The reconstruction of the canal was launched by enthusiasts in the midst of the severe winter of 1939-40, with the temperature down to 40 below zero. Today, as a result of this work, there are eight new sluices, four dams, a number of

bridges and a network of irrigation canals. The whole job of reconstructing the canal, two hundred kilometers\* long, was completed in the record period of 210 days. Today a fleet of Soviet boats is plying the waters of the new canal and the rivers it connects. Together with the Dnieper-Nieman Canal now under construction, the new water routes will connect not only the liberated regions, but the whole of Western Europe with the Southern regions of the Soviet Union.

In addition to this construction, steps have been taken to create a base for power development. The power industry of the Polish capitalists was in a backward state. In 1937 the per capita consumption of electric power in former Poland amounted to 115 kwh. as against—already at that time—215 kwh. in the Soviet Union. Capitalist competition among the owners of the few electric power plants precluded the possibility of a rational utilization of the power resources. The transmission lines of these plants ran close to one another, each naturally using its own power reserves. Hydroelectric power was practically unknown. The big manufacturer obtained electric power at a cheap rate, whereas the small consumer had to pay an exorbitant price for his electric light.

The Soviet Government proceeded at once to put an end to this antediluvian state of affairs. The Molotov Power Institute in Moscow has elaborated a far-reaching plan for

---

\* A kilometer equals 0.62137 of a mile.—Ed.

the development and utilization of the power resources of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, and steps have already been taken to put the plan into operation. The electric power plants in Lvov and Drohobich are already using natural gas as fuel, the output of which has been increased considerably. The newly sunk bituminous coal mines will also feed many electric power plants. Many dams are already being utilized to build small hydroelectric plants, and work has started on the construction of the Dniester hydroelectric plant in the Stanislav region. The completion of the new water routes will inaugurate a widespread system of electric power plants.

These facts serve as striking refutation of the wild ideas of socialization spread by the venal capitalist press and the reformist leaders. Both use the argument that the workers are not "mature," and they have been "prophesying" that if the exploiters are expropriated the workers will do as they please and anarchy will reign in the plants. The example of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia—and lately also of the Baltic countries, Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina—has proved that the very reverse is true. Except for individual acts of sabotage on the part of former owners and their agents, thousands of industrial establishments have been taken over by the workers without causing the least friction. It has been proved that Soviet power represents *the guiding and organizing force* which, invested

with the authority and confidence of the large masses of the people and relying on the advanced and class-conscious workers, safeguards the common interests of the working people in every establishment.

To begin with, the *planning principle* has been introduced in the entire economic life of the liberated regions, the establishments in the various industries have been combined under single management, and steps have been taken to utilize them to the full of their capacity. Socialization has further brought about a rise in the productivity of labor, for the workers have realized at once that they are no longer working for the exploiters, but for the people as a whole, and, hence, for themselves. They have realized that a rise in their wages and the improvement of their social and cultural standards depend primarily on their own work.

No wonder therefore that the workers were not slow in appreciating the *new role* of the trade unions as initiators and organizers of labor enthusiasm and discipline. Many workers have since shown brilliant examples of a high productivity of labor. In the night of September 8, 1940, two shock-workers of the ozocerite mine in Borislav, Vladimir Kanzelyak and Vladimir Potochnyak, set a record of ozocerite mining, producing 354 kilograms\* each as against the normal rate of 27 kilograms per worker, thus attaining an increase of

---

\* A kilogram equals 2.20 lbs.—Ed.

approximately 1,300 per cent. In the "September 17" Sewing Machine plant in Przemysl, the Stakhanovite worker Michael Olszanski, working an eight-hour shift, produced 4,000 spools as against the normal output of 480 spools. These are but a few out of thousands of examples of labor enthusiasm in every branch of industry.

Naturally, wages have risen everywhere far above the starvation standards to which the workers had been reduced in old Poland. In no case have wages risen less than 50 per cent, while in some industries the increase in wages has been even much greater than that. Thus, for instance, in Stanislav wages have risen by 168 per cent in the metal industry and by 150 per cent in the leather industry. The tremendous rise in the purchasing power of the working people is testified to by such facts as, for instance, the increase in the number of stores and consumers' cooperatives in Western Byelorussia from 2,726 on January 1, 1940, to approximately 5,000 on September 1, 1940; or the increase in the sales of the newly established Soviet stores in Western Byelorussia from 173,000,000 rubles in the first quarter to 335,000,000 rubles in the second quarter of 1940.

\* \* \*

Planned socialist economy has not only been a powerful factor giving a mighty stimulus to the development of industry and providing the workers with the conditions which make life really worth living; it has also brought real help to the middle classes,

particularly the artisans and small tradesmen. Poland was full of so-called "people living on air"—small, mostly Jewish, traders and artisans who had a precarious existence, sinking into ever deeper misery as the capitalist crisis was becoming more aggravated. The Soviet Government took steps immediately to put an end to the misery among these sections of the population by providing them with the opportunity to engage in productive activity. The small individual workshops have been combined into well-managed producers' cooperatives numbering among their members thousands of former small artisans and tradespeople who in old Poland never knew where their next meal was coming from.

In January, 1940, there were already 233 such cooperative societies organized in Western Ukraine; since then their number has increased to 475, with a membership of 19,660. These cooperative societies receive from the state unstinted assistance in the form of supplies of raw materials, credits, etc. They have opened up hundreds of new handicraft establishments, such as shoe repair shops, barber shops, tailoring shops, tool repair shops, tin-smith shops, etc. They have given rise to new home industries, as, for instance, the production of toys in the Lvov and Stanislav regions. They have also given a stimulus to the development of art handicrafts—knitting, embroidery, wood carving, etc. These artisans' producing coopera-



tives play a large part in the realization of the Stalin Five-Year Plan for the development of local industries in these regions, and they display a great deal of enterprise and initiative in organizing new establishments.

\* \* \*

In 1940 the peasants gathered in their first harvest on the liberated land. What a change in the course of one year! Only a year ago the peasants had harvested crops that did not belong to them but to the Princes Radziwil, the Counts Potocki, capitalist landowners and rich monasteries, who, in the Lvov Region, for instance, owned 53.3 per cent of the total land. Only 24 per cent of the land belonged to peasants who owned less than five hectares\* per household each, although these households accounted for 76.6 per cent of all the farms. The position was still worse in Western Byelorussia, where more than two-thirds of the land belonged to Polish landlords.

The Soviet Government put an end to this crying injustice. The big estates have been divided and land has been given to the peasants who previously had no land at all or had very little of it. After the liberation of Western Byelorussia, poor peasants and farm hands received a total of 430,982 hectares of land, 14,086 horses, 33,400 cows and thousands of pigs, sheep and other small livestock,

which has been distributed among them. This great agrarian reform was carried out with the direct participation of the peasants themselves. Everywhere the peasants organized committees which saw to it that the land and the livestock were fairly distributed and that the regulations which had been issued in the interests of the people were adhered to properly.

In addition, the peasants were given every facility to enable them to cultivate their newly-acquired land: they were given draft animals, cattle, selected seed, credits. The principal assistance, however, consisted in the organization of a wide network of machine and tractor stations, which provided the peasants with the service of tractors, harvester combines and other agricultural machinery, as well as with expert advice and assistance, on very easy terms. The 101 machine and tractor stations set up in Western Byelorussia dispose of 500 tractors, 193 motor trucks, 840 tractor-drawn plows, 438 cultivators, 300 sowing machines and 157 threshing machines. The machine and tractor stations have built 101 gasoline stations, 14 garages, 16 bath houses, and 114 apartment houses for their personnel.

In Western Ukraine 174 machine and tractor stations have been set up and 61 state farms have been organized. These have at their disposal 1,230 tractors, 72 harvester combines, 872 threshing machines, 819 sowing machines and many other machines. In the very first

---

\* A hectare equals 2.471 acres.—Ed.

months, scores of thousands of peasants, following the example of the collective farms of the Soviet Union, have taken the initiative to organize similar collective farms in the liberated regions. During the first year, 571 collective farms have been organized in Western Byelorussia and 404 in Western Ukraine.

Here is an example—one of many—of the progress made: In the village of Kuryany (Tarnopol Region, Western Ukraine) practically the whole land belonged to the Polish landlord Tuszanski; 90 peasants had no land at all, 225 peasants owned no horses, and 96 owned no cows. Today there exists in this village the Shevchenko Collective Farm which unites 165 households. During the brief period of its existence, this collective farm has organized a big dairy department, planted an orchard, organized a poultry farm, built many farm buildings and has achieved a marked improvement in the standard of living of its members. It completed its grain deliveries to the state in September, 1940.

Or, take the story of George Dudkevich—only a little more than a year ago a destitute Ukrainian farm laborer, trampled upon by the Polish gentry. Today he heads a collective farm team which has achieved a record harvest on the tract of land it cultivated, namely: 18 metric centners\* per hectare of winter wheat, 13.5 metric centners of rye, and 20 metric centners of barley.

The team headed by the former farm laborer, Akseni Grinkevich, harvested 400 metric centners of sugar beet per hectare.

The anniversary of September 17 was marked in many parts of the liberated regions by the organization of new collective farms.

The farm work was so well organized this year in the liberated regions that both Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia boast of an exceptionally high crop yield per hectare. This was achieved because there is no longer a parasite in the shape of a landlord sitting on the necks of the peasants and robbing them of the fruit of their labors. There is also every indication today of a further rapid improvement and development of agriculture in the liberated regions when the big melioration projects, which have already been launched and on which tens of thousands of collective farmers and individual peasants are working with great enthusiasm, are completed. This work is being conducted on a large scale. By September 1, 1940, 67,219 hectares of marshland had already been drained; 38,336 hectares of the drained land have been turned over to collective farms for their use. Irrigation (in connection with the big canal construction works) has materially improved 76,000 hectares of meadows, pastures and arable land.

In order to enable the peasants of Western Byelorussia to apply improved methods of cultivation on the new land acquired by them, the state supplied them with thousands of modern plows, 1,600 cultivators,

\* A metric centner equals 220.46 lbs.—Ed.

1,000 sowing machines and a great number of other agricultural machines and implements. In many villages new stores and warehouses have been opened.

At the initiative of the local population hundreds of clubs, reading rooms, amateur theatres, cinemas, etc., have been opened in the rural districts. In the space of one year the very face of the villages in Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia has changed almost beyond recognition.

The new life that has come to city and country in the liberated regions has led to an advance of the national culture of the various peoples, of which the latter could not even dream a year before. The equality of rights which Article 123 of the Soviet Constitution guarantees to all citizens "irrespective of their nationality or race" has been expressed not only in the free, direct and secret democratic elections held on March 24, 1940, at which all the nationalities of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia voted for the representatives of the people to the Soviets. It has been manifested in all spheres of public life and, particularly, in the sphere of culture and education.

In December, 1939, the registration of children in Western Ukraine in connection with the reopening of the schools, brought out the fact that 400,000 children had never attended schools, although, on paper, at least, Poland had universal compulsory elementary education. In Western Ukraine there were no Ukrainian schools. In the Tarnopol

region, 70 per cent of the Ukrainian children had to attend Polish schools. Half the population was illiterate.

Far-reaching changes, however, have taken place since the liberation of these regions. In the past year, the Soviet Government set up 1,386 new schools and effected a thorough reorganization of the entire school system. More than one thousand teachers were sent from Soviet Ukraine and hundreds of West Ukrainian students qualified as teachers for the new schools. At the same time the administration of the various industries organized vocational schools and technical colleges. In Lvov, for instance, the food industry organized a special technical college and a vocational school for 180 students each, in addition to special training courses at which 1,500 workers were given a chance to improve their qualifications.

In the beginning of the new school year, 1940-1941, hundreds of new schools opened their doors. The extension of the network of schools in Western Byelorussia has made it possible to accommodate 25 per cent more children than in the previous year. At the same time the number of teachers has increased by 50 per cent. Here, too, the interests of every nationality have been taken into account in organizing the schools.

The old University of Lvov has made great progress during the year of Soviet power. Under the Polish regime the student body was made up to 77 per cent Poles, 12.9 Ukrain-

ians and 6.7 per cent Jews. This crying injustice has now been removed and the youth of the various nationalities are admitted to the university without discrimination. Instruction is now conducted in both Ukrainian and Polish, and outstanding Ukrainian scientists, like Professor Studinsky and Peter Franko, who were unemployed under Polish rule, have now been given chairs in the university.

The Polish intelligentsia, too, has for the most part enthusiastically hailed the measures taken by the Soviet power and are working in every sphere of activity. It may be mentioned as a characteristic fact that the chair of descriptive geometry in the University of Lvov is filled by Professor Bartel, once Prime Minister under Pilsudski. Another fact which is indicative of the attitude of the Polish intelligentsia to the Soviet power is the recent visit of a number of Polish writers from Byelostok in Minsk, the capital of the Byelorussian Soviet Republic. The works of Polish writers, such as Janina Braniewska, Helena Selm, Jerzy Rawicz, and Valentin Najdus are published in large editions by the State Publishing House of the Byelorussian S.S.R. In recent months about sixty books were published in Polish, including works by Mickiewicz, Zeromski, Orzeszko and other classics of Polish literature.

The past year has given a great impetus to the development of literature and the arts in the liberated regions, particularly Ukrainian and Byelorussian literature and art,

which can now freely draw upon the social and national liberation struggle of the masses for their themes. Such are the themes dealt with in the works of the Ukrainian writers Kamensky, Voluchuk, Melnik and Pachovsky.

The new opera by the Lvov composer, Nicholas Koless, also deals with a similar theme, and its action is laid in a Hutsul mountain village. In addition to this new opera, the Ukrainian Opera Theatre in Lvov will include in its repertory for the 1940-41 season operas of the classics of Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, German and French music. The newly organized jazz orchestra of the Lvov Philharmonic Society, with its folk song chorus and new compositions by its director, Heinrich Wars, has gained recognition not only in Western Ukraine but throughout the U.S.S.R. A number of new Ukrainian and Byelorussian professional theatres have been organized, as well as numerous amateur dramatic art and singing circles.

The old Ukrainian painter, Ivan Trush, has created marvelous pictures depicting the liberation march of the Red Army.

The Ukrainian Film Studios are completing the filming of a full length picture dealing with the struggles of the oil workers of the Borislav oil fields. The picture will show also the new life of the oil workers, both at work and at rest, at home and in the health resorts of the Carpathian Mountains where thousands of Borislav oil workers have already spent their vacations.—the first time in their lives.

And, indeed, the figures of the State budget of the U.S.S.R. for 1940 provide a graphic idea of the extent to which the whole Soviet Union has made it its concern to provide for the needs of the new Soviet citizens. The budget provides for the following special expenditures in the liberated regions:

	<i>Western Ukraine</i>	<i>Western Byelorussia</i>
	<i>(Thousands of rubles)</i>	
For economic construction	235,400	220,600
For cultural purposes (education and public health) .....	742,400	399,300
Local government expenses .....	196,000	95,800
Miscellaneous expenses ....	29,800	10,700
Total .....	1,203,600	726,400

Thus the budget provides for a total of nearly two billion rubles to be expended in 1940 in the liberated regions of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia. Here again we see the manifestation of the principles of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, according to which the equality of the rights of the nations of the U.S.S.R. is translated into living reality by rendering the backward nationalities material assistance for their economic and cultural development.

The very first steps taken by the Soviet Government in the various spheres of activity showed the liberated people of Western Ukraine

and Western Byelorussia that, unlike the bourgeois "democratic" constitutions which exist only on paper, the provisions of the Stalin Constitution are applied in real life. Unemployment has been abolished, and the right to work has thus been fully realized. The right to rest and leisure has been realized by the creation of hundreds of new rest homes and the socialization of the numerous private sanatoria and health resorts, which accommodated scores of thousands of working people during the very first summer after the liberation of these regions. Six thousand workers, peasants and working intellectuals spent their summer vacations this year in Truskaviets, the Carlsbad of Western Ukraine, picturesquely situated in the foothills of the Carpathians. In Western Ukraine alone 26 health resorts with sanatoria accommodating 50,000 patients have been nationalized and placed at the disposal of the working people.

The days when physicians were unemployed while epidemics were raging and the working people were in need of medical assistance are past forever. In the Lvov region alone 912 physicians received employment in the very first days after its liberation. The number of hospitals increased more than twice; besides there were created numerous polyclinics, dispensaries, consultation centers for mothers, and creches. Hospitals and sanatoria are being built everywhere for the peasant population as well. In the Baranovichi Region (Western Byelorussia), for instance, a modern

sanatorium has been organized for peasants suffering from various forms of tuberculosis, with a special department for children. In Lvov, an airplane ambulance service has been organized for the transportation of patients from the villages to the polyclinics in the city. In this way many peasants have been given timely medical assistance and saved from death.

The Stalinist principle of concern for the human being, as distinguished from the hypocrisy of bourgeois charity, is expressed in numerous, sometimes seemingly insignificant, details. Thus, for instance, the luxurious bath house in Lvov, which formerly only members of the bourgeoisie could afford to visit, has now been made accessible to the masses, and as a result it has been used by five times as many people in the past year than in previous years. Similarly, the streetcar fares have been reduced in Lvov, and as result the number of passengers carried in the first half of 1940 amounted to 49,300,000 as against 20,500,000 in the first half of 1939.

The right to education is being realized. In the past year 10,000 new students, children of workers, peasants and intellectuals, have been accepted in thirteen institutions of higher learning, and 19,000 new students have been accepted in 78 technical colleges. At the same time almost half a million of illiterate adults were taught to read and write at special courses.

Every article of the Soviet Constitution could thus be mentioned

and numerous examples cited showing how it is being put into effect in the liberated regions. The most patent achievement, however, which Soviet democracy has brought the liberated peoples of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, is expressed in the fact that today the working people have themselves become masters of their destiny, and that the tens of thousands of leading posts in government bodies, municipal enterprises and industrial and economic establishments are held by workers, peasants and members of the working intelligentsia. Thus, the machinist, Schepanik, is today director of one of the biggest industrial establishments in Borislav and member of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.; the former beer truck driver, Karmazin, holds the post of Vice Chairman of the Lvov City Soviet—in other words, he is vice-mayor of a city of over 300,000 population. These are but two out of thousands of similar examples.

\* \* \*

Much has already been created. But the real work, of construction in the liberated regions has barely begun. There are still many difficulties that have to be overcome—difficulties arising out of the cursed legacy of the past under the rule of the Polish gentry. The class struggle is still acute, despite the fact that the exploitation of man by man has been abolished. The Soviet Union is still surrounded by capitalist countries, and the bankrupt and utterly disgraced Polish

gentry who have been ousted by the people, together with their "Socialist" flunkeys of the P.P.S. (the Polish Socialist Party) who have joined them on their flight to London, still dream of the restoration of their regime. Many of their agents have remained in the country, donning for the time being the mask of "loyalty" to the Soviet Government in order to have an opportunity to carry on their pernicious activities. The people of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia are therefore constantly on the alert. They display exceptional vigilance in defending their gains which are as dear to them as the apple of their eye.

The first anniversary of the liberation of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia coincided with the first enrolment of the youth of these regions into the ranks of the Red Army, and it was with indescribable enthusiasm that the youth

left for their units. The whole people took part in the festivities, signifying their resolve to defend their newly-won real fatherland against any attack, from whatever quarter.

In the past year the capitalist world had to retreat in a number of places in Europe, making room for the world of socialism. The liberation of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia was followed by the liberation of the Baltic countries and of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina from the yoke of capitalist exploitation. These latter countries, too, have entered upon the road of the new life. The experience of a year of Soviet power in Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia shows them, as well as the hundreds of millions of toilers in all the capitalist countries, what great creative forces are latent in liberated peoples, what great creative forces are inherent in socialism.

---

## THE ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK UNDER THE SOVIETS

BY M. LODE

**A**LL human social development has been due to labor. It was labor that gave man his human attributes, wrested him from the animal world; and labor is the foundation of human society. In the process of human development the instruments and methods of labor underwent constant change and attained a high degree of perfection. And man's feeling about his work has also undergone modifications in the process.

In slave society man's tools were still very primitive and, judging by present-day standards, their improvement proceeded very slowly. The slaves were the absolute chattels of their owners, they belonged to them as much as did the tools; and their lot was one of constant enforced toil, their work devoid of all joy or interest.

Under feudalism the means of production also developed very slowly. Feudal economy was largely self-sufficing, natural economy: the serf produced for his lord's immediate consumption and exchange was a factor of small importance. The serf villein, most of whose produce in any case went to his overload, had no incentive to improve

his farm; his work was a weary drudgery that he was compelled to perform to keep body and soul together.

Things changed somewhat when handicrafts began to develop, and more towns sprang up, for this brought it a livelier exchange of agricultural produce for handicraft wares. And when at the turn of the fifteenth century new continents met the eye of the European merchant and young bourgeois class saw its chance to sell more, productive forces too began to develop faster. The leading crafts were gradually replaced by manufacture, and this in time by large-scale industry, inaugurated by the invention of the steam engine and other machinery. In the course of this process, social wealth and power became concentrated more and more in the hands of the bourgeoisie, until finally it mastered political power too and constituted itself the ruling class.

The age of capitalism thus set in. Productive forces had already developed to such an extent that the feudal relations of production no longer answered. Accordingly, serfdom was abolished in one way or



another and made way for "free" labor. Since capitalism meant organized work, collective effort, since the workers had to handle complex machinery and tools, since a certain daily output was required of them, and since, lastly, method and precision are indispensable attributes of machine production, capitalism brought with it a new and more intelligent attitude to labor.

But this new attitude was not a voluntary product, it did not spring spontaneously from the depths of the worker's mind, but was forced on him by the new relations of production, which compelled him to sell his labor power if he wanted to keep alive, and enabled the capitalist to enrich himself at the worker's expense. Like the slave-owners of feudal lords of bygone days, the capitalists of today appropriate the unpaid labor of others; the difference is only in the method of its extraction. Accordingly, in capitalist society, in which the vast majority of the people are exploited by a small minority, there can be no question of a universal community of interests, nor of equal rights and duties for all members of society.

Today capitalism, which has reached its highest stage, imperialism, has already performed its historical mission. It is:

"... no longer capable of the leadership of society and has even become a hindrance to the development of production. . . . Historical leadership has passed to the proletariat, a class which owing to its whole position in society can only

free itself by abolishing altogether all class rule, all servitude and all exploitation." (Frederick Engels, "Karl Marx"; see Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol I, pp. 12-13, International Publishers, New York.)

The full truth of this basic view of Marx and Engels has been proved by the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, led by Lenin and Stalin, in the great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

\* \* \*

The great October Socialist Revolution overthrew the rule of the capitalists and landlords and made the enslaved workers and peasants of Russia the masters of their land.

This victory was, relatively speaking, easy. A far more difficult task was to retain and consolidate the position won; for even after its defeat the bourgeoisie refused to yield its place. From every nook and cranny it had to be driven by force. To maintain the position they had won, the workers and peasants had to defeat their enemies both in the civil war started by the Russian counter-revolutionaries and in their resistance to the intervention forces dispatched by the imperialist powers against the young Soviet state.

But even that was only one-half of the job, the military half. The other half was the fight on the home front, which meant restoring the country's economic life, disrupted by the imperialist war and civil war, governing the country, consolidating the young Soviet system and

transforming Russia from a destitute, backward agrarian country into a strong and wealthy power. The only way to cope with this job, to achieve this goal, was for all the people of Russia to act as Lenin called upon them to act—to set their teeth, summon up every ounce of grit, strain every nerve and muscle, and by sustained and enduring effort build up a firm foundation for socialist society.

This was an undertaking of enormous difficulty. Half of the Russian people were illiterate; yet they had to shoulder this responsibility, to set the chimneys smoking again, get the trains running, see that the fields were sown and reaped in time and that every wheel of the huge and complex economic machine ran in unison with the others. They had a lot to learn. The workers, and most of all the Communists, had to learn from the intelligentsia, from the bourgeoisie, from its experience in management, in running industry, in technology and science. Theirs was no long apprenticeship of years; they had to grasp the essentials at once, for this apprenticeship was an unceasing struggle against the avowed and covert enemies of the young Soviet state; more, it was a struggle for the building of socialism, for new social relations, for a new discipline of social labor. It was a struggle that, Lenin said,

“. . . involves the very remolding of habits and customs, which will long remain polluted and perverted by accursed private property in the means of production and by the atmosphere of enmity and mistrust,

of hostility, disunion and mutual intrigue.” (V. I. Lenin, “From the First Subbotnik on the Moscow-Kazan Railway to the All-Russian May Day Subbotnik,”\* *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 245, International Publishers, New York.

The way to this goal had yet to be blazed—a job requiring every ounce of strength, hard and persevering effort, energy and endurance, and, above all, initiative on the part of the workers themselves, the liberation and employment of the creative faculties of the working people, blighted and repressed under tsarism. And initiative of this kind did indeed surge forth, and that while the civil war was still at its height. On May 7, 1919, a general meeting of Communists and sympathizers of the sub-district of the Moscow-Kazan Railway inaugurated a new movement by adopting the following resolution:

“In view of the serious internal and external situation, the Communists and sympathizers, in order to defeat the class enemy, must spur themselves on again and deduct an extra hour from their rest, *i.e.*, lengthen their work-day by one hour, put these extra hours together and on Saturday perform six continuous extra hours of manual labor for the purpose of creating an immediate material value. Being of the opinion that Communists should not stint their health and life for the gains of the revolution, this work should be performed gratis. *Communist Saturdays* are to be introduced throughout the sub-district

\* This article was first printed in a one-day newspaper, *The May-Day Subbotnik*, composed and printed at the subbotnik of May 1, 1920.

and to continue until complete victory over Kolchak has been achieved."

Three days later, on Saturday, May 10, 1919, 205 workers on this railway organized their first *subbotnik* (Communist Saturday). They worked a total of 1,014 hours, during which they repaired four locomotives and sixteen cars and loaded 146 tons of freight. Labor productivity in the loading was 270 per cent of the normal average. Ten days later, *Pravda* reported that others had followed suit. The Communists and sympathizers of the Alexandrov Railway had fixed their first *Subbotnik* for May 17 and had resolved:

"To organize the Communists and sympathizers in exemplary brigades which must show the workers how to work and what can really be done with the present materials and tools, and in the present food situation."

The workers on this railway had thus gone a step further, for they had attempted efficient organization of the work and maximum utilization of available materials and tools. The food situation in Russia at this time was very bad, which made the record productivity of these Communists and sympathizers the more remarkable, since, as Lenin said, they lived under "ordinary, i.e., very hard, conditions." Lenin attached such enormous importance to the *subbotniks* because they displayed the class-conscious and voluntary initiative of the workers in developing the produc-

tivity of labor, in adopting the new labor discipline, in creating socialist conditions of economy and life. Labor productivity had dropped very low during the long years of the imperialist and civil war, undermined by the general chaos and disruption in the country. Other factors were the general destitution and want, weariness and bitterness, illness and underfeeding.

"Hunger," said Lenin, "that is the cause. And in order to abolish hunger, the productivity of labor must be raised in agriculture, in transport and in industry. Thus we get a sort of vicious circle: in order to raise the productivity of labor we must save ourselves from hunger, and in order to save ourselves from hunger we must raise the productivity of labor." (V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning," *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 438, International Publishers, New York.)

This would appear to be almost impossible; and small wonder that not only the enemies of the young Soviet Republic, but millions and millions of other people did not believe that this seeming contradiction could ever be resolved.

But since those days the Soviet people have proved to the world that they were capable of overcoming not these difficulties alone, but others, seeming equally insuperable, which arose later.

\* \* \*

In 1920 the Communist Party and the Soviet Government first began the systematic planning of the na-

tion's economic life. A State Planning Commission was set up, which drew up a single economic plan for the whole country. It was clear to the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin and Stalin, that the output of large-scale industry, which in 1920 was only about one-seventh of the pre-war output, had to be increased not only by raising labor productivity, but also, and mainly, by the employment of up-to-date machinery. The same thing applied to agriculture, the total output of which in 1920 came only to about half the pre-war figure.

If the single economic plan which had been decided on was to be realized, every Communist and sympathizer, regardless of what his position in the work of restoration—whether an executive, plant director, foreman or worker at the bench—had to make it his business to complete the job given him in the time assigned. Ever broader masses of people had to be drawn into the work of restoring the country; what was more, they had to be made to understand the need for the plan, had to be convinced of its correctness. For, as one of the resolutions of the Ninth Congress of the Russian Communist Party stated,

“Success in such progressively extending mobilization and training in labor can be secured only if persistent efforts are made to bring home to the broadest masses in town and country the inner essence of the economic plan, its inner continuity, whose fruits can only become generally apparent after the passage of a considerable period of time

calling for the utmost exertion of energy and a heavy toll of sacrifice.”

The Communists thus had to conduct constant and extensive propaganda among the masses, to fire them with enthusiasm for the plan in spite of the difficult conditions of life, and get them to work for its realization by the side of the Party members and sympathizers.

The Communist Party had already achieved a great deal. As Lenin wrote on the occasion of the anniversary of the first *subbotnik*, it had “dislodged a boulder of tremendous weight, the boulder of inertia, ignorance, and stubborn adherence to the habit of freedom of trade, the freedom to purchase and sell labor power, human power, like any other commodity.” (“From the First Subbotnik on the Moscow-Kazan Railway to the All-Russian May-Day Subbotnik,” *Cited Place*, p. 245.)

But much more still remained to be done. Old usage and custom were still deeply rooted, the difficulties were still there, only a small section of the workers were conscientiously disciplined. The rest had still to be trained to a sense of discipline. They did not realize that only if everybody put his shoulder to the wheel and did his utmost, could the foundations of socialism be laid and capitalism finally eradicated. Organization of work was also defective, and its art had yet to be mastered.

In all these respects the *subbotniks* were a serious factor in educating the masses. The Party was

aware of this, and its Ninth Congress devoted much time to the matter. It was the Communists' duty to see that the work supplied at the *subbotniks* was of a nature to kindle the enthusiasm of the people involved; moreover, the assignments were to be given publicly beforehand. The purpose of these measures was to attract to the *subbotniks*, not only the Communists and sympathizers but the entire population, both men and women. Another no less important thing was to draw up detailed technical plans for the *subbotniks*, providing for the most efficient and rational utilization of labor power. It was only if the *subbotniks* were properly prepared for and conducted that they could gain a strong foothold and attract new sections of the people. In this way the *subbotniks* could bring a stream of new initiative and enthusiasm into the daily work of the masses.

This work required by the Party of its members called for patience and perseverance; it also required every Communist himself to be a first-rate worker and to have never-failing contact with the masses. The work was complicated by the propaganda and deliberate sabotage launched by the counter-revolutionaries. The latter did all they could to undermine the Communist Party, the main pillar of the young Soviet state, to disrupt its power and influence in the Soviet institutions preparatory to attacking their main objective and demolishing the Soviet regime itself.

What the counter-revolutionaries

tried to do from outside, Trotsky and other traitors to the people attempted to achieve within the Party. They too did their best to undermine the Party's contacts with the working masses. At this very time, when everything depended on convincing the people of the truth of socialism by constant educational and explanatory work, Trotsky called for the "militarization" of the trade unions. In the trade unions, the Party's truest assistants in the restoration of economic life and its surest link with the masses of the workers, this enemy of the Party and traitor to the people wanted to replace methods of moral suasion by steamrolling and domineering so as to antagonize the trade union membership and isolate the Bolshevik Party. But neither the avowed counter-revolutionaries nor the Trotskyites succeeded in their dastardly plans.

\* \* \*

The year, 1921, was a year of big changes. The days of War Communism were over and peaceful constructive work had to be begun. The Soviet Government held all the key positions in the country's economic life—large-scale industry, the transport facilities, the banks, the land, home and foreign trade—but it still lacked experience and trained forces to get this whole system into full swing. The peasants, who during the foreign intervention and the Civil War had been obliged to surrender all grain surpluses, had to be given an economic incentive in the form of a certain

amount of freedom of trade; they had to be stimulated to increase their output of produce with a view to more rapid general improvement of agriculture. Forces and resources had to be mustered to restore the state-owned industries. The previous swift advance had to be slowed down somewhat, for it was clear that it would be impossible to pass from capitalism to socialism without a certain period of transition.

It was these considerations that prompted the Party to introduce the New Economic Policy, under which the Soviet Government would in its own interests make certain concessions to the capitalists in order to use them for a further development of the state industries. This temporary retreat was no easy matter, but it was an essential preliminary for a correspondingly more powerful and better prepared renewed attack on capital. However, it was still an open question as to whether the Bolsheviks' bold plan would succeed.

"Who will win? Who will be the victor, capitalism or the Soviet system?"—Lenin asked, for this struggle, the struggle for the final victory of the Russian people, was a very hard one. It was a struggle unprecedented in history, "a war waged by the state against the bourgeoisie of its own country and against the united bourgeoisie of all countries." (V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Political Education Departments," *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 264, International Publishers, New York.)

This struggle could only be won

if all the people knew what it was about, what was its issue. And Lenin told the workers very plainly:

"You have worked for the capitalist, for the exploiter, and of course you worked badly. But now you are working for yourself, for the workers' and peasants' state. Remember that the question at issue is: Shall we be able to work for ourselves? If we are not, I repeat, our republic must perish. . . .

"The capitalists will be by your side, and so will the foreign capitalists, concessionaires and leaseholders; they will knock hundreds per cent of profit out of you, they will enrich themselves by your side. Let them. Meanwhile, learn from them the art of managing, and only when you do that will you be able to build up a communist republic. From the point of view of the necessity of learning quickly, any slowing down would be a great crime. And we must serve this apprenticeship, this severe, stern, and sometimes even cruel, apprenticeship, because there is no other path open to us." (*Ibid.*, p. 267.)

The Soviet people entered this apprenticeship and thereby succeeded in restoring, enlarging and considerably advancing their industry from the technical point of view. They then launched an offensive against capitalism, completely abolished the capitalist class in their own country and sent away the foreign capitalists and concessionaires, for they had learned to manage for themselves. They closely followed Lenin's recommendations and, after Lenin had passed away, the Soviet people, under the brilliant leader-

ship of Joseph Stalin and the entire Bolshevik Party, completed the work Lenin had begun, the work of building socialism.

The workers of the Soviet Union had learned to work "for their own state, for their own class." They know that "the factories and workshops in the U.S.S.R. belong to the whole people and not to capitalists, that the factories and workshops are managed not by appointees of capitalists, but by representatives of the working class" (J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, pp. 377-78) and this realization is a factor of extraordinary moment in the development and further perfection of Soviet industry.

Fired with the will to lay the foundations of socialism, whatever the cost, the masses displayed the utmost enthusiasm and endurance in their work, and as a result the Soviet Union's large-scale industries in 1925 produced nearly three-quarters of the pre-war output. The output of agriculture had also considerably increased, and in the fiscal year 1924-25 reached 87 per cent of the output of 1913.

\* \* \*

The period of restoration was now drawing to a close. But the Soviet Union could never rest satisfied with merely having reached the pre-war level of output, for tsarist Russia had been a backward, destitute, agrarian country. If the Soviet Union wanted to hold its own against capitalism, it had to make itself a wealthy and powerful country, with modern industry as well

as up-to-date agriculture. But to build up socialist economy, the Soviet Government and the Bolshevik Party had to make certain preparations. The main thing for an all-around construction of socialist economic life was the socialist industrialization of the country. At the Fourteenth Party Congress Joseph Stalin said:

"To transform our country from an agrarian into an industrial country, capable of producing by its own efforts the equipment necessary for production—that is the essence, the foundation of our general line."

But what had to be done if the country was to produce "the equipment necessary for production by its own efforts"? First and foremost, it was necessary that the main stress in industrial construction be placed on heavy industry; it was necessary to build a number of new industries—engineering and machine tool, automobile and chemical; to start home production of engines and power-station equipment; to build iron and steel mills; increase the output of coal and iron, etc. It was necessary to build tractor plants and factories producing up-to-date agricultural machinery which would form a basis for replacing the individual peasant's small-scale production by large collective farms. Moreover, a munitions industry had to be built up to arm the country against possible assaults by the imperialist powers.

This was a vast plan, and it was loudly acclaimed by the people of the Soviet Union. But to carry out

this plan large sums of money were required. No outside help could be expected; the Soviet Government had to find resources within the country. And these resources were found and tapped. A strenuous economy regime was introduced. Every kopek counted; every kopek saved went to build up industry. The industrial directors, most of whom had quite recently themselves been workers at the bench, now had to see how they could economize and rationalize production in the plants under their charge. Production costs had to be lowered and unproductive overhead reduced to a minimum. For most of the executives this was far from easy. But because in the Soviet Union the factories and workshops "are managed not by appointees of capitalists, but by representatives of the working class," because in the Soviet Union rationalization does not mean wholesale dismissals and intensified exploitation, the workers themselves pitched in and helped the managers to cope with these tasks.

"Necessity is the mother of invention," the proverb says. And here, too, it proved true. Plain workers, feeling themselves responsible for the factories they worked in, and anxious to help in solving the problems that confronted their various factories and their whole state, the state of the workers and peasants—these workers become "inventors." There is hardly a factory in the Soviet Union in which the workers have not made suggestions to improve the working process. Work-

ers turned inventors! They competed among themselves for the best suggestions, the best innovations for raising productivity and rationalizing production. In some of the factories so many suggestions were submitted that the managing and engineering personnel could scarcely cope with the task of examining them all.

This new initiative on the part of the workers, spreading wide among the masses, helped to carry out the industrialization of the country. In 1927, the first year after the period of restoration had been completed, socialist large-scale industry increased its output 18 per cent over that of the previous year. Industrial production had reached the pre-war level. The socialist sector in industry was growing at the expense of private enterprise, whose share in production had dropped from 19 per cent of the total in 1924-25 to 14 per cent in 1926-27; the share of the socialist sector had during the same period risen from 81 per cent to 86. This meant that as regards industry the question of "Who would win?" had already been settled in favor of the Soviet system and against the capitalists.

The development of agriculture, particularly of grain farming, was less successful. In 1927 the total output of grain amounted to only 91 per cent of the pre-war output, while the marketable portion, available for supplying the cities, amounted to scarcely 37 per cent of the pre-war marketable surplus. Rapid changes were essential. The peasants had to be convinced of



the inexpediency of small-scale, individual farming and induced to replace it by collective, large-scale agricultural production. The Party accordingly resolved at its Fifteenth Congress, held in December, 1927, to further to the utmost the collectivization of farming and to assume the offensive against the kulaks (rich peasants, rural capitalists). This resolution, which was of far-reaching importance in the development of agriculture, paved the way for socialism in the countryside.

The Fifteenth Congress also instructed the Soviet Government to draw up a five-year plan of national economy.

\* \* \*

The First Five-Year Plan was endorsed by the Sixteenth Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in April, 1929. Capitalism was entering a time of world economic crisis; large numbers of capitalist enterprises were closing their gates, leaving millions of people jobless; the living standard of the working people in all capitalist countries was sinking; competition was raging keener than ever not only among the employers, but among the workers as well, and each was out to keep his job and his pay at his neighbor's expense.

This miserable competition, this humiliating product of capitalism, had already largely been overcome in the Soviet Union. Competition for the sake of selfish personal advantage had given place to socialist competition for the common weal;

and now that the First Five-Year Plan was being launched it was important to develop this socialist competition to the utmost. The Party appealed to the masses:

“Workers and laboring peasants! To overcome the difficulties of socialist construction, to develop the further offensive against the capitalist elements in town and country, to fulfil the Five-Year Plan, organize competition in all spheres of construction. Organize competition between factories and mills, between mines and railways, between state and collective farms, between state institutions, schools and hospitals! Organize competition in the lowering of production costs, in increasing labor productivity, in tightening labor discipline, extending the sown area, increasing the yield, attracting the peasants into the collective farms and cooperative societies, in simplifying the state apparatus and multiplying its contacts with the masses and in improving the work of the cultural and social institutions.”

This appeal met with a warm response among the masses. The competition that now began throughout the country was a living embodiment of Lenin's idea of organizing competition on a socialist basis. The shock brigades formed in all the factories and mills, all the mines and collective farms carried on the finest traditions of the *subbotnik*. Socialist competition was a splendid means for imbuing the workers with a socialist view of labor, for focusing the creative energy and initiative of the masses on the fulfilment of the First Five-Year

Plan. A year later (at the Sixteenth Party Congress) Comrade Stalin was already in a position to say that socialist competition had embraced at least 2,000,000 workers and that over a million were members of shock brigades.

"The most remarkable feature of competition," he went on to say, "is the radical revolution it effects in men's views of labor because it transforms labor from the disgraceful and painful burden it was reckoned before, into a matter of *honor*, a matter of *glory*, a matter of *valor* and *heroism*." (J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 303, International Publishers, New York.)

Socialist competition helped to increase the productivity of individual workers and whole plants. Not merely individuals, but whole factories exceeded the standards and production program drawn up for them. The foremost workers in the country, who could serve as an example for all the rest, were accorded general recognition at meetings and made known all over the country in the press. Everywhere they were met with respect and affection. The loafers and good-for-nothings, on the other hand, were looked down on, publicly criticized and warned, and frequently made objects of scorn and ridicule; they were held up to censure in the wall newspapers of the factories and in the regular press. In many of the factories the shock brigaders' daily performance was posted on the red roll of honor, while the names of the loafers who had not fulfilled their daily assignments were posted

on the blackboard of disgrace. By these and other methods, public criticism and self-criticism greatly contributed to the education of the backward elements among the workers.

The foremost shock brigaders were not merely honored and respected; they received active encouragement and support from the trade unions and were promoted to positions of greater responsibility. Good workers were made foremen, good foremen—shop superintendents, and so on up the scale. Many of them were also enlisted for the functions of government.

As the appeal of the Sixteenth Conference stated, the First Five-Year Plan was:

"... a plan of working class struggle to overcome the capitalist elements, a plan for the socialist re-education of the masses, a plan for laying the foundation of socialist society."

It is an open secret that this Five-Year Plan was ridiculed and laughed at by all enemies of socialism and met with doubtful shrugs by all kinds of unbelieving sceptics. But the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government knew what heroism the people are capable of when they take their own cause in their hands and fight their own battle. And the people of the Soviet Union knew that their Party and their Government were not asking for something impossible, they knew that all their plans were based on the wishes of the people and dictated solely by the people's inter-

ests. Because the Soviet people and their Government are one integral whole, because there is no conflict of interests between the people and the Government, but, on the contrary, the Government is made up of the foremost representatives of the people, because the people and the Government are moved by the same will, the same spirit, this vast plan for laying the foundations of socialism was duly fulfilled, and not in five years, but in four. And at the Seventeenth Party Congress, held in January, 1934, Comrade Stalin had every justification for saying with pride:

“During this period [between the Sixteenth and the Seventeenth Party Congress.—*Ed.*], the U.S.S.R. has become radically transformed and has cast off the features of backwardness and medievalism. From an agrarian country it has become an industrial country. From a land of small individual agriculture it has become a land of collective, large-scale, mechanized agriculture. From an ignorant, illiterate and uncultured country it has become—or rather it be becoming—a literate and cultured country.” (J. V. Stalin, *Socialism Victorious*, p. 24, International Publishers, New York.)

And again:

“New industries have been created: machine-tool construction, automobile, tractor, chemical, motor construction, aircraft, harvester combines, the construction of powerful turbines and generators, high-grade steel, ferro-alloys, syn-

thetic rubber, nitrates, artificial fiber, etc., etc.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.)

These statements were met with acclamation not only by the delegates at the Party Congress, but by all the people throughout the vast expanses of the Soviet Union, and by many far beyond its borders, for the proletarian masses of every country joined the peoples of the Soviet Union in celebrating this outstanding victory of socialism.

But this victory could never have been achieved had it not been that vast new forces—thousands of new executives, whole armies of new engineers and technicians, hundreds of thousands of young skilled workers—had been educated and trained. During this period industry was supplied with 800,000 skilled workers from the factory schools and over 180,000 engineers and technicians who had graduated from the universities and training schools. Agriculture, which during this period was completely reorganized, was also supplied with new forces. While in 1929 the collective farms included only 3.9 per cent of all the peasant households, in 1933 the figure had risen to 65 per cent. They and the state farms were reinforced with 111,000 new engineers, technicians and agronomists, while 1,900,000 persons were trained to be tractor drivers, harvester-combine operators, engine men and chauffeurs and were sent by the People's Commissariat of Agriculture to work on the farms. Over 1,600,000 persons received training as chairmen or members of the collective

farm boards, brigade leaders and farm accountants.

Such remarkable progress in industry and agriculture and the final victory of the socialist economic system over capitalism, leading to the abolition of the parasite classes and of the exploitation of man by man, also made possible great progress and the material and cultural standards of the working people.

Unemployment was a thing of the past, abolished once and for all. The total of workers and office employees, amounting to 14,530,000 in 1930, had increased to 21,883,000 by 1933. During the same period the total payroll of the workers and employees had increased from 13,597,000 rubles to 34,280,000 rubles. The average worker's yearly earnings had increased in the space of these three years from 991 to 1,519 rubles. Large appropriations had been made for the benefit of the peasants. Everyone in the Soviet Union who worked conscientiously and did not loaf had a sufficient income to lead a normal existence.

\* \* \*

The First Stalin Five-Year Plan had laid the foundations of socialism. The purpose of the Second Five-Year Plan was to overcome the survivals of capitalism in economics and in the minds of men.

Under the First Five-Year Plan reconstruction had been started in all the leading branches of economic life. The Second Five-Year Plan envisaged the complete reconstruction of the whole national economy, the establishment of a new technical

basis for all its branches. An essential factor if this was to be accomplished was the mastery of technique, the training of a technical intelligentsia from among the workers and peasants themselves and a considerable rise in the cultural level of all working people.

"We have entered a new period," Comrade Stalin said in May, 1935, in a speech to the graduates from the Red Army Academies, "a period, I would say, of a dearth in people, in cadres, in workers capable of harnessing technique and advancing it. . . . Without people who have mastered technique, technique is dead. In the charge of people who have mastered technique, technique can and should perform miracles. . . . That is why the old slogan, 'Technique decides everything,' which is a reflection of a period already passed, a period in which we suffered from a dearth in technique, must now be replaced by a new slogan, the slogan 'Cadres decide everything.'" (J. V. Stalin, *The Soviets and the Individual*, p. 9, International Publishers, New York.

This slogan—"Cadres decide everything"—released a world of creative energy among the working masses. Human beings who under tsardom had been rated lower than cattle saw the revolution that the Soviet Union had wrought in the attitude towards the working man; they grasped all it meant and were proud to think that "of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people, cadres." (*Ibid.*, p. 12.)

"Cadres decide everything"—this slogan filled the hearts of the masses and spurred them on to new achievements, new studies, new feats of heroism in their work.

At the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites in November, 1935, Alexei Stakhanov, the initiator of a tremendous new movement for higher productivity, said in his speech:

"When I read Comrade Stalin's speech to the graduates from the Red Army Academies on May 4, I pondered a lot over what should be done to raise productivity of labor and to make full use of the equipment."

And his words did but express the innermost thought of hundreds of thousands of Soviet people.

Stakhanov was a coal miner in the Donetz Basin. His aim was to secure the greatest possible efficiency and utilization of equipment, in his particular case the pneumatic drill. Formerly, a drill would work only about five or six hours out of every twenty-four, while the rest of the time the miners had to spend in propping. Now Stakhanov organized his work so that the drill was in action all the time, and succeeded in hewing 102 tons of coal in a single shift of five hours and forty-five minutes, as against a previous average performance of only thirteen or fourteen tons. After a while, the whole colliery adopted this new method, with the result that the output increased enormously in every section. Stakhanov and his fellows saw to it that it was not

merely a couple of dozens hewers that made record performances, but, as he went on to say in his speech,

". . . that the high output achieved by individual shock workers on the coal front should become the average output in all the mines, and in all the coalfields. The chief thing in my opinion is to pass on the experience of the best coal hewers to all the miners."

These words of Comrade Stakhanov's, few though they are, are indicative of the remarkable metamorphosis the human mentality is undergoing in the Land of Socialism. The petty selfishness that is the rule under capitalism has in the Soviet Union been replaced by a unique spirit of collectivism. The paramount criterion is no longer the individual self, but the benefit of the entire nation. In the Soviet Union new inventions and methods of rationalization are no "trade secrets"; they are applied on the largest scale throughout the industry in question.

The Stakhanov movement whose essence is the mastery and full utilization of machinery, coupled with efficient organization of labor, spread from the mining industry to all the other branches of economic life, and its having thus helped to raise productivity in every sphere is what lends to this movement such far-reaching importance. For the Stakhanov movement sets out to discard the existing technical standards, the existing maximum rates of output and production plans and re-

place them by new and higher standards, higher rates of output, higher plans. Still, the efforts of the Stakhanovites could not find understanding and sympathy overnight among all sections of the population, and in order to explain the significance and the importance of the Stakhanov movement to the masses it was essential for the Party to take the lead in organizing the movement and paving its way to become a real movement of the masses. The leading bodies of the Party had immediately recognized the importance of the Stakhanov movement, and Joseph Stalin declared at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites:

“That the Stakhanovites are innovators in our industry, that the Stakhanov movement represent the future of our industry, that it contains the seed of the future rise in the cultural and technical level of the working class, that it opens to us the path by which alone can be achieved those high indices of productivity of labor which are essential for the transition from socialism to communism and for the elimination of the distinction between mental labor and manual labor.” (Joseph Stalin, *The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union*, p. 8, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

Of course, at that time—and today, for that matter—it was not everybody in the Soviet Union that realized that the utmost productivity must be achieved for the country to ascend to the next stage in socialism, and that they too had a

share to contribute in achieving it. Accordingly, the Stakhanov movement, supported by the Party, had to combat the backwardness of some of the workers. Another fight it had to put up was against the backwardness and routine of some of the old intellectuals and against various manifestations of bureaucracy. Some of the engineers and scientists were of the opinion that they alone were qualified to suggest innovations in production, to fix rates of output and production plans, and that no one could tell them anything about such matters. Thus some of them opposed the Stakhanovites' perfectly obvious suggestions for increasing productivity, and in a number of cases actually attempted to sabotage the introduction of Stakhanovite methods.

Moreover, quite a number of wreckers had entrenched themselves in the economic institutions and industrial plants, and these deliberately tried to set the backward workers and the old intellectuals against the incipient Stakhanov movement. They tried to fill the other workers with resentment against the Stakhanovites because the latter, with their much larger output, naturally had larger earnings; while in their efforts to get the old intellectuals to resist the Stakhanov methods, they played on their sense of dignity and position and insinuated that the Stakhanov movement would endanger the position of the intellectual. But with the aid of the Party organizations and of the workers themselves, who enthusiastically caught up the move-

ment, all these attempts at resistance were overcome in a relatively short space of time. The Stakhanov movement grew into a genuine mass movement and was one of the most remarkable features of the period of the Second Five-Year Plan.

"But their high labor productivity based on improved organization, the Stakhanovites have pointed the road to new successes in industry." (V. M. Molotov, see *The Land of Socialism Today and Tomorrow*, p. 112.)

How great were the successes achieved by Soviet industry, both absolutely and in comparison with the capitalist world, may be seen from the following statistics:

*Growth of Industry in the U.S.S.R. and the Principal Capitalist Countries, 1913-38\**

	1913	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
U.S.S.R.	100	380.5	457.0	562.6	732.7	816.4	908.8
U.S.A.	100	108.7	112.9	128.6	149.8	156.9	120.0
Gt. Britain	100	87.0	97.1	104.0	114.2	121.9	113.3
Germany	100	75.4	90.4	105.9	118.1	129.3	131.6
France	100	107.0	99.0	94.0	98.0	101.0	93.2

\* *Ibid.*, p. 21.

Hand in hand with this huge increase in industrial output in the U.S.S.R. between 1933 and 1938, the number of workers and other employees increase from a little over 22,000,000 to 28,000,000; the total annual payroll, on the other hand, increased from 34,953,000,000 rubles in 1933 to 96,425,000,000 in 1938. These few figures are enough to bring out how enormously the material conditions of the working

people in the Soviet Union improve with progress in industry and national economic life as a whole.

\* \* \*

But the Soviet Union could not rest content even with the achievements of the Second Five-Year Plan. The Party and the Government drew up a Third Five-Year Plan of development, which set before the people another great goal: to outstrip the leading capitalist countries, which the Soviet Union had already outstripped in technique of production and rate of development of industry, economically, i.e., in output per head of population.

"We can do it," Comrade Stalin

declared, "and we must do it. Only if we outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country being fully saturated with consumers' goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase." (J. V. Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 23, International Publishers, New York.)

The fulfilment of this big task, which will require a period of ten or even fifteen years and in which the entire Soviet nation is now engaged, involves a number of important factors. Industry must be expanded and its equipment further improved, agricultural and industrial output must be greatly enlarged, and so on. All this work requires forces, people boundlessly devoted to the cause of socialism, giving it every ounce of energy and capable of running industry and agriculture. That means that the Party and the Soviet Government must conduct a very well considered and effective cadre policy and choose their forces carefully. Cadres are "the gold reserve of the Party and the state." They must be given patient care, their development encouraged and furthered, and every man put in the place he is best fitted for, in the place where he "may contribute to our common cause the maximum his personal capacities enable him to contribute." (Stalin.)

The Soviet Union needs huge numbers of qualified workers. Where are these to be found? At the Eighteenth Party Congress Comrade Stalin appealed to the collective farmers to supply annually about one and a half million people for industry. But that by itself is not enough. The technical and cultural level of the entire Soviet nation must be raised, the whole nation must serve as a reserve from which to recruit forces for further training.

To achieve this, it is essential to educate backward people, those who, while working under socialist con-

ditions and enjoying all the benefits of the socialist system, themselves have not yet developed a socialist attitude to work; to achieve this:

"It is necessary to fight for the interests of the state and for the strengthening of labor discipline in our offices and factories, to fight against loafers, good-for-nothings and those who flit from job to job." (V. M. Molotov, *Cited place*, p. 111.)

The overwhelming majority of the workers and peasants are following in the wake of the foremost people of our time, working in common with them to consolidate the Soviet state and build communism; but many petty-bourgeois customs and traditions are still alive among the workers and particularly the intellectuals, and these must be rooted out. As Comrade Molotov declared at the Eighteenth Party Congress:

"Energetic steps must be taken to improve discipline and educational work. If such steps are not taken and intensive work is not carried on to bring up the working people in the spirit of consolidating socialist property and the state, it will be impossible to change backward people into conscious and active builders of communism." (*Ibid.*)

What has so far been achieved in this direction and what was done to achieve it?

At the instance of the workers in the Krasny Proletary Plant, socialist emulation was launched in honor of the Eighteenth Party Congress. Soon after the Congress this emulation developed into a nationwide



competition in honor of the third Stalin Five-Year Plan, whose underlying idea is to overtake and outstrip the leading capitalist countries of Europe and America economically. Millions of workers, collective farmers and intellectuals are taking part in this emulation. They have undertaken to exceed the state plans of increasing output, and many of them overfulfilled their obligations for 1939.

Mass socialist emulation is not limited to industry; it has taken firm root in agriculture, too. The Soviet Union's Agricultural Exhibition, which first opened in 1939, is a tremendous factor in Soviet farming. The splendid exhibits in every branch of agriculture on view in its pavilions spurred on the visitors from the collective farms to achieve similar exemplary results on their own farms. The number of collective farms whose work entitled them to exhibit their produce in the 1940 Exhibition totaled 411,600, more than double the number of the year before. In the Soviet Union agriculture is based on collective labor and it is only natural that the collectives should support the leading workers in agriculture and compete among themselves for the achievement of their aims—high crop yields, early completion of harvesting, completion of the state deliveries before the time limit fixed, and so on.

The outstanding achievements of the past two years include the construction of a number of new irrigation projects originated by the population of the Ferghana Valley

(Uzbekistan), who on their own initiative launched a fight against drought and themselves built the great Ferghana Canal. In the course of this work, the will with which the people set about working for the water they so badly needed produced results that far outdistanced all conjectures and completed the canal in record time.

This great popular movement for irrigating and opening up new areas of the country, originating in Ferghana, soon spread to Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Buryat-Mongolia and other parts of the Union. Large sections of the vast Soviet land have been transected by new canals and irrigation ditches; rivers have been made to change their course and huge areas reclaimed; the crops, particularly of cotton, have increased enormously.

The Russian village and the Russian peasant have changed out of all recognition. Science and technique, modern agricultural machinery and collective effort have largely overcome the backwardness and inertia of the old Russian peasant. The difference between town and country, between the worker and the collective farmer is diminishing every year. The year, 1939, brought great successes. The Stakhanov movement and mass competition have carried the day both in industry and in agriculture. Still greater success is to be expected in 1940.

But in order to increase the country's aggregate output still faster, to create still better conditions for the Stakhanov movement, to lay the foundations for a further rise in the

technical and cultural standards of the entire nation, to strengthen the Soviet Union's defenses in the face of imperialist war, to tighten up labor discipline and thus ensure the fulfillment of the third Stalin Five-Year Plan, the Government found it necessary to supplement educational measures by a number of organizational measures. Thus, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet issued an edict replacing the seven-hour working day by an eight-hour day in most industries and introducing the seven-day week in place of the former six-day week, forbidding workers and office employees to leave their jobs without the consent of the management and ordering proceedings against persons guilty of violating labor discipline.

What reception the masses of the workers accorded to this new law may be seen by the response it evoked among the miners in the Central Irmino colliery, where the Stakhanov movement was born. The men in this colliery, which in its competition agreement with the Kochegarka colliery had undertaken to fulfil its annual program of output by December 12, revised their obligations after the introduction of the new law and found that the obligations undertaken by the individual workers, engineers and other employees in their emulation among themselves were now obsolete and out of date. They accordingly issued a public appeal to all workers in socialist industry to revise and extend their obligations. For their part, they undertook to compete their 1940 program by No-

vember 20 and proposed that the fifth anniversary of the initiation of the Stakhanov movement be made a nationwide review of the way the mines, mills, factories and individual workers were fulfilling their new obligations. In their appeal the Irmino miners said:

"Let us demonstrate in this review worthy achievements in the field of production: thousands of tons of coal, metal, and coke produced over and above the plan, thousands of new machines, tanks, aircraft and cannon."

And this appeal found a ready response throughout the country. For the Soviet people realized that the introduction of the eight-hour working day was necessary to further strengthen the country's defenses and increase its economic power, in order that the Soviet people might not be taken unawares by any "accidents" or any machinations of the enemy abroad.

The capitalist countries, including those which so far are not directly involved in the imperialist war, are arming as they never armed before. The governments of the capitalist states and the capitalists themselves leave nothing undone to force up labor productivity, particularly in the munitions industry and other industries important for war purposes. They have extended the working day to ten, twelve and even longer hours. The workers are made to slave day in, day out, without Sundays or holidays, without ever getting a vacation. The intensity of labor is constantly being increased. But the workers in these countries

are not working for themselves, for the benefit of the laboring nation, they are working for the capitalists, for the interests of the ruling classes, for the imperialist war. The workers themselves have no interest in increasing labor productivity; they are driven to do it by compulsion, by the force of the ruling class. For this reason, if no other, labor productivity under capitalism is nearing its limits. The productive forces cannot develop as they should, because the relations of production stand in their way, because the relations of production are lagging behind the development of the productive forces.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the relations of production are in harmony with the productive forces and favor their fullest development. That is why the Soviet Union, although it has in so short a space of time overtaken and in part outstripped the capitalist countries

in point of technical equipment, although it can show such unprecedentedly rapid progress in industry and agriculture, refuses to rest content with what it has achieved; that is why it is in a position to set itself a new and greater goal. By now it is clear enough that the socialist economic system is superior to capitalism, that, unlike the latter, it does not come into conflict with modern productive forces, but, on the contrary, fully accords with them. If the Soviet Union continues to strengthen its defenses and develop its economic might, if it goes on consolidating labor discipline among the working masses and increasing productivity, if it holds its entire nation in a state of mobilization and preparedness in face of the danger of a military attack, it will never be taken unawares by any turn of events and will achieve successes even greater and more glorious than heretofore.

---

## DECLARATION OF THE LITHUANIAN SEJM ON THE JOINING OF LITHUANIA TO THE U.S.S.R.

**O**N July 21, 1940, declarations regarding the joining of their republics to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were adopted by the Lithuanian Sejm, the Lettish Sejm and the Estonian Duma. The following declaration was adopted by the Lithuanian Sejm.

At its sitting held on July 21, 1940, the Sejm adopted the following declaration:

The Lithuanian people, which had been ruthlessly oppressed by the exploiters, subjected to plunder and violence and doomed to poverty and extinction, established in Lithuania a new state system, a system making the people the sovereign masters of the country. This system is the Soviet system. Lithuania has been transformed into a Soviet Socialist Republic.

For many years the Lithuanian workers and toiling intelligentsia suffered from unemployment, were in the grip of poverty and arbitrary rule.

The Lithuanian peasantry was choked by the lack of insufficiency of land, since the greater part of the land had been seized by landed proprietors and other large landowners.

The only ones who lived well in old Lithuania were the exploiters:

businessmen, factory owners, bankers, landed proprietors and high government officials, who, in their quest for exorbitant profits and incomes, enslaved the toilers of Lithuania. The venal Smetona rulers fostered the penetration of foreign capital into Lithuania, capital which insatiably plundered, clawed and tore the living body of the Lithuanian people. The economic and political dependence of Lithuania upon imperialist vultures, upon foreign capitalists and bankers, was constantly growing.

Now the people, with the aid of the mighty Red Army, have cast off the yoke of the Smetona enslavers and established Soviet power in their state. The existing Soviet Socialist Republics are not isolated states, are not separate from one another, but constitute an indissoluble union. They belong to a union formed on the basis of the voluntary association of Soviet Socialist Republics, having equal rights. Life has shown that the collaboration of the Soviet republics brought them unprecedented development, a rapid advance of their economy and culture. In a historically brief period they have been turned into politically, economically, and culturally advanced republics.

Never could a republic have achieved this by itself.

Life has shown that only the united Soviet republics can withstand the onslaught of the imperialist powers which aim at the conquest and subjugation of small nations. Without a Union of Soviet Republics in the form of a state, without their consolidation into a single military and economic power, it would have been impossible for them to have held out against the combined forces of world capitalism, either on the military or on the economic front.

The Lithuanian people are aware that all these years the Soviet Union has pursued a most friendly policy towards them. It is due to the Soviet Union that Lithuania was not subjugated by Poland of the gentry; that the city of Vilno, her ancient capital, was returned to Lithuania; that Lithuania was kept out of the raging conflagration of war; that the Lithuanian people have thrown off the yoke of the landed proprietors and capitalists and received the opportunity of establishing in their country the only just state system, Soviet power. That is why the Lithuanian people have always regarded a close accord with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a requisite for a better future.

The criminal reactionary clique of Lithuania's former rulers impeded in every way the fraternal rapprochement between the U.S.S.R.

and Lithuania, and strove by all means to hinder the establishment of a firm, inviolable alliance between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania.

Having put an end to oppression and deprivation of rights, and having established a new state and social order, the Lithuanian people now must secure by law the firm union and friendship between the Lithuanian Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The People's Sejm of Lithuania is confident that only admission into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will insure the real sovereignty of the Lithuania state, the real prosperity in industry and agriculture, the real advancement of national culture, the real development of the material and spiritual forces of the people.

In accordance with the will of the people, who have overthrown the old regime—a regime of oppression and lawlessness, a regime of exploitation of man by man—the People's Sejm resolves:

To request the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to admit the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic into the Soviet Union as a Union Republic on the same basis as the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other Union Republics of the U.S.S.R.

Long live the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic!

Long live the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics!



In a new improved edition

## **THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE**

By Frederick Engels

The publication of this new edition of Engels' celebrated classic constitutes a valuable addition to the growing arsenal of authoritative Marxist-Leninist translations available in the English language.

In this work, Engels traces the universal transition, among peoples in all parts of the globe, from primitive savagery through the various stages of barbarism to civilization—and indicates the point in the development of peoples when the state first comes into existence, on the heels of the appearance of private property.

Price \$1.00



Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

**"... all really well-informed people  
read the Daily Worker"**

**...EARL BROWDER**

Published at 35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

Ask for it at your newsstand or local Workers' and  
Progressive Bookshop

# NEW PAMPHLETS

## *On International Events*

---

**The Trial of the Communist Deputies in France,**  
by Gaston Richard . . . . . \$ .10

A detailed account of the trial, the events leading up to it, and its international significance, as well as an expose of the real criminals who betrayed the French nation.

**A History of Soviet Foreign Policy,**  
by M. Ross . . . . . .15

The development of Soviet foreign policy and relations from the time of the establishment of Soviet power in 1917 up to the present day.

**Saga of the Karelo-Finnish Republic . . . . . .10**

A comprehensive study of the history and background of the Northern region which recently became the twelfth republic of the U.S.S.R., together with material on its natural resources and climate, and the struggles of the people who inhabit it.

**The New Lithuania,**  
by Anna Louise Strong . . . . . .10

An eye-witness account by a world famous traveler and writer on how the people of Lithuania swept aside the reactionary regime which had ruled them, and joined the U.S.S.R.

**October Days 1917,**  
by I. Mintz . . . . . .15

A day-to-day narrative of how Soviet power was established under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party.

Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.