

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. No. 8.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

May 1st, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
INTERNATIONAL MENSHEVISM IN THE DOCK By A. Martynov	218
WORKERS, BEWARE OF THE THIEVES AT HOME! By A. Martynov	222
THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS By V. Motylev	226
THE BREAK-UP OF STABILISATION, THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND THE POLITICAL CRISIS By V. Knorin	235
ORGANISATIONAL TASKS AT A NEW STAGE By O. Bever	241
THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT AND ITS METHODS OF WORK AMONG THE MASSES By L. Alfred	246

TEN CENTS

INTERNATIONAL MENSHEVISM IN THE DOCK

By A. MARTYNOV.

THE trial is at an end. The Menshevik Central Committee abroad and the leaders of the Second International, exposed by the depositions of the defendants, disown them and deny their connection with them, in spite of the intercepted correspondence, and even say that the defendants are not genuine Mensheviks. This rascally manœuvre is not succeeding.

Before the tribunal appeared *fourteen of the most prominent representatives of Menshevism*, who had been active on the territory of the U.S.S.R. Most of them have a Menshevik status dating from 1905 or even longer. There are among them Mensheviks of all shades, Right "defence-of-the-Fatherland" liquidators, and "Lefts," as well as Mensheviks from the Menshevik centre. There are among them activists (Sher and Yakubovitch) and learned specialists and philosophers. Only one of them is a working man (Volkov); among them he is a white raven. However, Volkov succeeded in drawing into sabotaging work a very prominent working-class "Defence-of-the-Fatherland" Menshevik—Gvozdev, Labour Minister under Kerensky, and through him ten other old working-class Mensheviks. This was their entire active element in the working-class. Of all the workers, even among the backward and petty bourgeois elements, who formerly followed the Mensheviks, only these twelve had remained loyal to them in the U.S.S.R.!

All the defendants, as one man, caught red-handed, admitted their crimes already at the preliminary examination, and designated them as shameful and contemptible acts. Why did not a single one of them, when in the dock, dare defend what he had done? Because the G.P.U. has "specially trained" them, and has forced them to make "ready-made" false depositions, say the leaders of the Second International; but this rascally manœuvre of the Second International is also not meeting with success. Why do Communists, when they get into prison in a capitalist country where they are frequently ill-treated and tortured, proudly accept long sentences of imprisonment or even the death sentence? Why wasn't there a single one among the fourteen arrested Mensheviks with a long-standing Menshevik status who, in the face of the sentence hanging over him, did not condemn what he had committed, in spite of the fact of being well treated when in custody, as they publicly acknowledged and as was evidenced by their outward appearance?

Two of the defendants—Sher and Yakubovitch—gave the key to this. With regard to these two activists, the Public Prosecutor of the High Court demanded the highest penalty. In answer to this,

Sher said in his concluding speech: "I was an active participant in the 1905 insurrection. I was arrested at that time, and it was entirely due to chance that I was not sentenced to death. (The documents which incriminated him were destroyed.—A.M.) I was not afraid of death then. But now, my career of crime leaves me without any feeling of courage and boldness in the face of the highest penalty."

Yakubovitch said that he was prepared to bear the penalty, but only after he had entirely dissociated himself from his past. In his last address he said: "I do not consider the highest penalty too high a price to pay for my misdeeds, but in the hour of my death it will be a consolation to me to know that my last political act was participation in the political struggle on this side of the barricade, together with the proletariat."

These declarations give the key to a proper understanding of the conduct of the Mensheviks at their trial. Before the eyes of these people were millions of proletarians who build up Socialism with enthusiasm and great success, overcoming all obstacles and all difficulties, in spite of the prophecies of the wreckers, in spite of their entire wrecking work. *Behind* them was the path of their treachery and systematic deception of the class on behalf of which they spoke. Whence could they get the sorry courage to defend their cause to the end?

* * *

The trial has laid bare the whole mechanism of sabotage and preparation for intervention through the instrumentality of the Mensheviks under the leadership and instructions of the foreign C.C. of the Mensheviks, and under the directives of the leaders of the Second International. The trial has exposed the distribution of parts in the preparations for intervention. The trial has demonstrated the nature of the smoke-screen which veiled these black deeds. The defendant Ikov said in his last address: "I tried to put into practice that which our official Party laid down in its slippery and ambiguous resolutions." The trial decoded these slippery and ambiguous resolutions. The trial showed with the utmost clarity how, on the one hand, the foreign delegation of the Menshevik Central Committee, in agreement with the leaders of the Second International, secretly instructed the "All-Union bureau" of the Mensheviks regarding the methods of sabotage and the forms of preparation for intervention. It has shown, on the other hand, how these secret oral or written instructions were accompanied by corresponding public statements in the foreign Press, where the same preparation for intervention was going on in a Jesuitical, veiled,

slippery and ambiguous form, for the purpose of deceiving the working-class.

As early as 1927, Dan gave instructions, through Petunin, to the Russian Mensheviks to resort to wrecking methods. In 1928, Abramovitch came to the U.S.S.R. for the special purpose of reorganising the work of the Mensheviks, so as to adapt it to the preparation of the intervention. Two written instructions were given to this effect ; and the Menshevik agent, Braunstein, spoke about the same time. But how did Dan and Abramovitch write in the German Social Democratic press and in the *Sozialistichesky Vesnik (Socialist Messenger)*?

They would not have anything to do with sabotage, yet, at the same time, Dan in 1930, two years after the Russian Mensheviks employed in the Soviet apparatus had gone, at his instruction, from sabotaging the general line of the C.P.S.U., to direct sabotage and wrecking work, wrote in apparent innocence that the alleged "sabotage" was merely a rectification of the line, and that

"Internal resistance and the endeavour to utilise high positions in the Soviet apparatus in order to prevent at least what seemed to be most Utopian and most insane, this is what constituted the famous "sabotage activity."

And with regard to the wrecking activity of the "Industrial Party," fully exposed during its trial, he and those who shared his views declared in the "Socialist Messenger" that this was "examination-delirium" and "the product of Cheka methods of investigation." Thus, they disassociated themselves from the wrecking activity, and at the same time screened this wrecking activity in the Press, transparently enough to be understood by those who are supposed to be in the know. This was a directive expressed in a form unintelligible to the masses, but very intelligible to the active Mensheviks, according to the old Menshevik, the defendant Ikov.

They expressed themselves publicly in a similar manner with regard to intervention. On the one hand, of course, in concert with the official hypocritical resolution of the Second International, they would have nothing to do with intervention, but at the same time, they systematically prepared in the Press the ground for the success of intervention. And it was "proved" in the columns of the "Socialist Messenger" that neither British nor French imperialism, nor even fascist Poland are contemplating intervention. At the same time, it was proved in the same columns that the only menace to the cause of peace in the East comes from the Soviet Power :

"evidently, the highest bearers of dictatorship who hitherto hesitated and were not prone to military plans, are now preparing to stake everything on a new card—the card of sanguinary war and military-political catastrophe."

The inference is clear : hit the instigator.

* * *

The trial has exposed not only the role of the Russian Mensheviks in the preparation of inter-

vention, but also the role of the whole Second International in this respect. Vandervelde, in his manifesto to the Council of People's Commissars, declares that the Second International "is attentively following the whole activity of the Menshevik Party." This is true, but it isn't the whole truth, only half of it. The Second International is not only attentively following the activity of the Russian Mensheviks, it is also directing this activity. Abramovitch told the defendants that on the eve of his visit to Russia he and Dan had a secret consultation with Breitscheid and Hilferding when the foundations of the "new tactic" of the Russian Mensheviks were worked out, i.e., the foundations of the sabotaging tactic in preparation for intervention. This found material expression, as established by the depositions at the trial, in the form of an assignation of half-a-million marks by the German Social Democratic Party to the Menshevik wreckers for their wrecking activity.

Such were the secret deeds of the Second International, certainly not registered in the file of incoming and outgoing documents. And what was its open conduct ? Officially, the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Second International on the struggle for disarmament spoke of "unshakable determination to counteract all warlike attempts or any other form of intervention against the Soviet Union." But in reality, all the Parties of the Second International, without exception, were raising a hue and cry in the Press about "Red imperialism," "Soviet Dumping," and "Forced Labour" in the U.S.S.R., precisely for the purpose of paving the way for intervention. And, to prepare the workers of the Soviet Union for this intervention just at the time originally fixed for the intervention, the E.C. of the Second International issued a special address to the Soviet workers (dated May 13th, 1930), which is full of lies, and by the nature of its contents, could only pursue one aim : to break the resistance of the Soviet proletariat to intervention, and to paralyse its will to defend itself.

Such was the famous *double-dealing* policy of the Second International with regard to the preparation of intervention, a policy which does not in the least differ from the usual method of the bourgeoisie in the direct preparation of any kind of war, with, however, the only distinction, that the bourgeoisie, without the cloak of any kind of "Socialism," tries by this method to deceive the class exploited by it, whereas the Second International has been constantly deceiving by these methods the same class calling itself falsely its leader and representative.

But the Parties of the Second International were not always consistent in their application of this double-dealing method. They occasionally indulged in open calls to intervention. For instance, *Vorwärts*, on June 3rd, 1929, discarded the mask and

openly declared: "it would be a guarantee for world peace if an international regime were established in the oil region." This is already an avowed defence of Deterding's "programme" for the seizure of the Soviet oilfields by the imperialists.

* * *

The trial has divulged the division of labour between the Right and the "Left" Social Democrats with regard to the preparation of intervention. According to the defendants, the primary divergences between the Right Garvy and the "Left" Dan and Abramovitch with regard to intervention were gradually liquidated, they all united on this platform in 1928 in concert with the leaders of the Second International. This did not prevent the "Left" Dan and Abramovitch from carrying on *two years later* friendly polemics with the Right Kautsky regarding the methods of the overthrow of the Soviet power, polemics which were in the nature of a smoke-screen. The true value of this hypocritical polemics was exposed by Kautsky who declared: "the whole activity of my friends, Abramovitch and Dan, up till now is a guarantee that they will not be the last, but the first." To these words of Kautsky we would like to introduce only one correction: he prophesied that Dan and Abramovitch *will be* the first. His prophecy was belated (intentionally). When they argued with him and set against his tactic their own "vegetating" tactic, they had been already a long time initiators of sabotage preparatory to intervention. It is just because they had already taken this initiative upon themselves that they entered into polemic with Kautsky, in order to draw a red herring across their infamous activity. . . .

* * *

The trial has exposed the means by which the Russian Mensheviks, in concert with the whole Second International, intended to establish in the Soviet Union a "democratic" regime as the result of the intervention prepared by them. The Menshevik wreckers said at the trial that they represented a mere handful of Soviet experts without the least support either in proletarian or peasant ranks. Nevertheless the "leaders" assured their body of active workers that, having participated in the intervention, they would by this very fact guarantee the prevention of black reaction and the establishment of a democratic regime in the "liberated Russia" after the intervention for—so they said—we do not stand alone, "behind us is the whole Second International, which in concert with us will participate in the intervention."

This was precisely "the guarantee" for the establishment of a "democratic order" after the *physical extermination* by the intervention of a millions strong proletariat and of an enormous body of active peasants drawn into Socialist construction! This "guarantee" is all the more reliable as all the Parties of the Second International in the

capitalist countries are—as it is common knowledge—paving everywhere the way for fascism, and are themselves resorting more and more quite unashamedly to fascist methods for the suppression of the Labour movement. This guarantee is all the more reliable as the Russian Mensheviks, social-fascists, started their preparation for intervention by establishing "contact" with the fascist Industrial Party, the close alliance with which they strengthened by accepting from it 200,000 roubles. It must be borne in mind that during the negotiations the Industrial Party frankly told them that after the intervention it contemplated establishing in Russia not a democratic order, but a military dictatorship. Besides, Ramzin is a man of deeds, and not a babbler. Called to the trial as a witness, he remarked with biting sarcasm:

"These divergencies concerning the future order did not interest us. Our chief concern was that the Mensheviks should give themselves up to wrecking activity. As to the future, time will show."

* * *

The trial has shown clearly what actuated the Russian Mensheviks when they entered upon the path of sabotage and intervention. The defendants told the court that they were completely dissociated from the working-class which is permeated with great socialist enthusiasm, that their intercourse was entirely with the old petty bourgeois experts, that every stride in the Socialist offensive of the proletariat called forth panic in this petty bourgeois milieu, that they, the Mensheviks, were also infected by this panic, and that consequently every stride in the Socialist offensive was interpreted by them as a return of the "military communism" which they dreaded, and that this would inevitably lead in the near future to a "catastrophe," to a peasant uprising and a "blood bath."

Under such circumstances, they deemed it their duty to accelerate the advent of the "historically inevitable," to "ease the birth pangs of history."* That is why they gladly accepted the instruction of the foreign Menshevik C.C. regarding sabotage and acceleration of the preparation of intervention. True, they saw the dates of the "catastrophe" which they had fixed many a time during the last three years, come and go, and yet no "catastrophe." On the contrary, the economy of the country rapidly developed, overcoming all difficulties and making good all breaches. This worried them and aroused doubts in their minds. But the foreign delegation of the Menshevik C.C. strengthened their wavering "faith in the catastrophe." Abramovitch listened to their reports on the economic situation drawn up on not very "catastrophic" lines, and accused them of "departmental blindness."

* According to the Menshevik interpretation of Marx, the task of the Social-Democrats is, to ease not the birth pangs of the revolution, but those of the counter-revolution (A.M.).

In accordance with his instruction—to prove at any cost that the U.S.S.R. is heading for an economic catastrophe—they, on Ikov's and Yakubovitch's evidence, sent "tendencious," i.e., false, communiques to the "Socialist Messenger," the editorial board of which, in its turn, remodelled and supplemented them, and presented them to the whole world as reliable evidence of the "beginning of the end" from the Soviet Union itself! This amounted to a competition between the U.S.S.R. Mensheviks and the "Socialist Messenger," between the latter and "Vorwärts" and other organs of the Social Democratic Press, with regard to an infamous misrepresentation of the state of affairs in the U.S.S.R., for the purpose of preparing public opinion for intervention.

* * *

Finally, the trial has once more thrown light on the historical roots of the counter-revolutionary activity of the present saboteur-Mensheviks. One after the other the defendants stood up in court, old Social Democrats, and related the whole history extending over many years, of their downfall. Every one of them demonstrated before the court that the foundations of their present treacherous policy were already laid in the tactics of Menshevism in the epoch of the first bourgeois revolution. "No matter as long as the bourgeoisie do not shrink from us"—such was the leitmotiv of Menshevism already in the epoch of 1905. At that time they could not visualise the proletariat being able to achieve a *bourgeois* revolution without a close alliance with the Liberal *bourgeoisie*.

Already in 1893 Lenin said in his first book :

"Who are the Friends of the People ?

"The Russian worker, having placed himself at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and will lead the Russian proletariat (shoulder to shoulder with the proletariat of all countries) along the straight path of open political struggle to the successful Communist revolution."

In accordance with this, Lenin brought forward already in 1903 the proposition that "a Jacobin connected with the workers' organisation is precisely a revolutionary Social Democrat." In accordance with this, Lenin brought forward in 1905 the slogan "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" under the hegemony of the proletariat. But the petty bourgeois "Socialists"—Mensheviks—afraid of Jacobin dictatorship as of the devil, interpreted the task of the proletariat in the bourgeois revolution in the sense that it must push along the Liberal bourgeoisie, helping it to get into power for the development of capitalism in Russia. Therefore, they were always trudging behind the Cadets, hanging on to their coat-tails.

The defendants explained that in this standpoint of 1905 lay already the embryo of their whole future treacherous activity. They said that this led them after the defeat of the revolution of 1905 to liquida-

tionism and adaptation to the Stolypin policy, to social-patriotism and alliance with the bourgeoisie during the imperialist war, to voluntary transfer of the Soviet power to the bourgeois Provisional Government in the epoch of the February revolution ; to coalition with the capitalist ministers and to constant fear that the Cadets might resign owing to the "excesses" of the Bolsheviks. This led them also to the non-acceptance of the October revolution and to struggle against it ; in a word, it led them to the present shameful end, when the *entire* proletariat of the U.S.S.R. was found on one side of the barricade, and they, a small insignificant handful of Mensheviks, allied to the kulak Kondratiev Party and to the fascist big-bourgeois Industrial Party, on the other side.

* * *

This shameful path pursued *to the end* by the Russian Mensheviks was also pursued by all the Parties of the Second International, and by the Second International as a whole. The only distinction between the Parties of the Second International and the Russian Mensheviks is : that the former have still in their following a section of the working-class befooled by them, whereas the Russian Mensheviks, as admitted by the wreckers in the dock, were already, in 1921, finally thrown out of the ranks of the working-class and were now unable to get any access to the workers, in spite of all their efforts. But this is due to the fact that the U.S.S.R. is the country of proletarian dictatorship and successful construction of Socialism, whereas in the capitalist countries the Social Democrats are still able to maintain to a certain extent their influence on the workers with the *help of the bourgeois apparatus of coercion and ideological demoralisation*. But the same end as that of Russian Menshevism awaits also all the Parties of the Second International after the victory of the revolution.

The Moscow trial is one more clear confirmation of the prophecy regarding the fate of Social Democracy in the country of the victorious proletarian revolution, made by Lenin already in 1918, and subsequently at the Second Congress of the Communist International. However, we cannot rest content with the conviction that the parties of the Second International will be wiped off the face of the earth *after the victory of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries*. For *to make this victory possible*, there must be already *on the eve of the proletarian revolution* mass desertion of the Social Democratic Party by the workers, such as the mass desertion of the Mensheviks by the workers in Russia already on the eve of October. But what we witness at present in a number of capitalist countries is only the beginning of this mass desertion, the beginning of the disintegration of the Social Democratic Parties.

The Moscow trial which has shed such a bright light on the criminal role of the entire international Social Democracy with regard to war preparations against the U.S.S.R., on the infamous double dealing tactic it makes use of for these preparations, on the systematic deception of the working-class to which it resorts at every step in the process of the preparation of intervention—can be and must be utilised by all the sections of the Communist International for ruthless exposure of the Second International with the object of accelerating its disintegration, and of drawing wide proletarian masses into the anti-intervention move-

ment, into defence of their sole fatherland—the country of proletarian dictatorship.

At the same time, all the sections of the Communist International, profiting by the lessons of the Moscow trial, must strengthen the struggle against the opportunists in their own ranks, who, as eloquently related by the defendants, helped them to establish themselves firmly for a time in the Soviet apparatus, on whom the wreckers depended and whom they systematically enmeshed, trying to carry out their own programme through them.

WORKERS, BEWARE OF THE THIEVES AT HOME!

By A. MARTYNOV.

WHEN all the work of wrecking and intervention became known during the Industrial Party and Menshevik trials, the parties of the Second International, with Dan and Abramovitch, caught red-handed, took refuge in the idea that the accusation was based exclusively upon the evidence of the accused themselves, that no written documents were brought forward. "Not a single line of writing . . . wrote Dan, during the Industrial Party trial. Abramovitch played the same tune during the Menshevik trial: "Where can one find even one written document, one single resolution of our Party organs of this nature, i.e., with instructions concerning sabotage, intervention, etc.?"

It is clear to everyone that when the ringleaders of a gang of robbers orders his partner to commit a theft by burglary, he avoids giving him written instructions, for this might form documentary evidence against him. However, if Dan and Abramovitch demand written proof, we can satisfy them. We have such proofs. They are not kept in the files of the O.G.P.U., they are published in the official organ of the Second International—in the "International Information" Bulletin. Social democracy cannot possibly deny the authenticity of these official documents. Yet they show most clearly how the parties of the Second International, organising wrecking-intervention work, prepared an alibi for themselves in advance; how when shown up, they were compelled to deny self-evident facts; how when they were still further unmasked they were compelled to refute what they themselves had written only yesterday; how they are getting more and more involved in their own web of lies.

These documents prove still more. They demonstrate with undoubted clarity that the parties of the Second International adopt a policy of double dealing, of wrecking and covering up of traces of wrecking, not only in their fight against the U.S.S.R., but in their efforts to save the capitalist countries from the revolutionary consequences of the crisis.

To begin with their double dealing in the fight against the U.S.S.R. On May 17, 1930, the very date fixed for the beginning of intervention against the U.S.S.R., the "International Information" Bulletin published the Second International appeal to the U.S.S.R. workers, which aimed at undermining the resistance of the Soviet proletariat against intervention. In the same number, it published a resolution of the Executive Bureau of the Second International on the national question in the U.S.S.R. The second point runs as follows:

"Socialist parties, representing the non-Russian nationalities of the U.S.S.R., build their plans for the fulfilment of their national aims, not on economic disorganisation (i.e., on wrecking.—A.M.) even less on civil war or an alliance with counter-revolution, or foreign forces, but, on the contrary, on the progress of democracy, which they are endeavouring to instal."

This document is unique of its kind even in the history of Social Democratic literature, which contains enough foul dealing and treachery. People calling themselves "socialists" think it necessary for no obvious objective reason, to declare publicly that they are not wreckers, that they are not in coalition with counter-revolutionary forces, but intend calling up foreign troops to destroy socialist countries. They make this declaration on May 17, 1930, six months before the opening of the Industrial Party trial, nine months before the Menshevik trial. They make this declaration long before they were found to be involved at these trials, in the same crimes, as those from which they so timely dissociated themselves in this document, when preparing their alibi. What was the meaning of this astounding document of the Second International? . . . If the cap fits, wear it!

Four months later, after this resolution was published, on September 22, 1930, the "Pravda" printed the O.G.P.U. declaration concerning the discovery of counter-revolutionary, wrecking, spying organisations inside the work of supplying necessities to the population (meat, fish, tinned foods, vegetables), which aimed at creating an artificial

famine in the land. The "Pravda" published the evidence of these wreckers. Their chief, the late General of the Imperial War Supplies, Riazantsev, gave evidence as follows :

"It was my work to prove that the proletariat cannot restore and raise the economic life of the country ; and I could prove this only with the help of a counter-revolutionary organisation, which would spoil all measures taken to raise the refrigerating works and supply of meat, so as to facilitate, having deprived the country of meat and reduced it to a state of famine, the possibility of changing the existing Government in the direction of one more suited to my own political convictions."

The evidence of the other accused was in the same strain. The social composition of this organisation was also published in "Pravda." The majority of its members were from among the landed gentry, ex-tsarist officers, one-time fish merchants, Constitutional Democrats . . . the ex-Menshevik Voiloshnikov. The "Pravda" published the fact that the present case had been passed by the Central Executive Committee and the Soviet of People's Commissaries for investigation to the O.G.P.U. Collegium (which subsequently sentenced them all to be shot).

The publication of this material in the "Pravda" was met by a fiery protest on the part of the Second International, which was published in the "International Information" Bulletin. The protest against the case not being dealt with in the usual way by the Supreme Court, but by the extraordinary powers, the O.G.P.U. Collegium, was just what could be expected from the Second International ; for the Second International denies in principle all methods of revolutionary dictatorship against enemies of the people, and recognises only, as expressed by Wells in Magdeburg, dictatorial methods against the revolutionary proletariat.

But the Second International this time did not limit itself to a demand that the accused be tried by the ordinary court. Despite the monstrous self-revelation in the evidence of the accused, it brought in, in advance, a sentence of exoneration. The resolution of the Second International runs :

"The general meeting of the Presidium of the International Amalgamated Trade Unions and Bureau of the Second International draws the attention of the workers of all countries to the mass condemnations, which the Soviet Government proposes bringing in without any court trial against Russian intellectuals, peasants and workers (!). The general meeting appeals to the conscience of the civilised world, to use all the influence at its disposal, to prevent these *entirely innocent persons, against whom false accusations of economic sabotage, or alleged plots, have been brought forward, from being handed over to the executioner.*"

Why was it necessary for the Second International, despite the obvious, to rechristen the landed gentry, ex-tsarist officers, army supply officers, adjutants and so on, and make them "intellectuals, peasants and workers"? Why had the Second International to call these people in advance "entirely innocent"

persons, when they themselves in their evidence confessed the monstrous picture of their crimes ?

Because the Second International was a participator in these crimes ; because their *accomplices* were sitting on the accused bench. Because the information of the O.G.P.U. stated :

"This organisation is a branch of the wrecking organisation of Kondratiev and Groman, and is now completely discovered."

Because the Second International already then saw the possibility, nay, the probability, of an open trial against the Mensheviks Groman and Co., because . . . 'the cap fitted.'

Two months afterwards began the open public trial of the Industrial Party. The accused told in detail how they had gone from "legal" sabotage of the Bolshevik Party's general line to underhand, destructive, disorganising work in 1927, to underground wrecking ; how they had made contact with the Torgprom and the French General Staff ; and how they had adapted all their wrecking work to the ultimate aim of intervention. The accused in considerable detail related how they had carried on wrecking work in various institutions, in various branches of industry, in various undertakings.

Tens and hundreds of thousands of workers and Soviet employees working in these undertakings and institutions were fully able there, on the spot, to prove the authenticity of this evidence, and they verified and confirmed it.

How did the Second International react ? In its "International Information" Bulletin, No. 62, of December 24, 1930, it published an article by Theodore Dan in which it was stated that "it was impossible to prove the existence of the fantastic plot," that all the wrecking work of the accused amounted to their not carrying out the "general line of the C.P.S.U." a hundred per cent. ; that they "used their high positions in the Soviet bureaucracy" in order "at the most to remove that which they imagined to be too utopian and insane."

The wreckers showed the court that they engaged in removing what they considered to be utopian up to 1927 ; that since 1927, they had turned to new tactics, those of destruction ; and their lawyer Dan tries to cover up their crimes since 1927, which prove to the hilt the crimes they did before 1927 ; just as the same Dan denied his own wrecking instructions of 1927, given by him through Petunin, and his position and that of Martov in 1920. Why has Dan lowered himself to do such artful trickery, which any fool can see through ? and why does the official organ of the Second International print them ? Because they all saw and foresaw (and Dan in his article was preparing public opinion for it) that on the heels of the Industrial Party would come the open public trial of the Mensheviks and their inspirers—the leaders of the Second International. They were

compelled to make obvious lies and trickery, *because the cap fitted.*

Finally, what they feared worst of all came to pass. The Soviet Telegraph Agency published the fact that soon members of the "Union Bureau" of the Menshevik Party would stand before the Supreme Court, and a list of names were given. This telegraphic information was received during the session of the Executive Committee of the Second International which took place on the 17th to 22nd February, 1931, and in which Abramovitch took part as the official representative of the Russian Socialist Democratic Workers' Party (Menshevik).

Steps had to be taken quickly. So in the "International Information" Bulletin a protest is published, which is sent by the President of the Executive Committee, Vandervelde, to the Soviet of People's Commissars, on the basis of an "*unanimous* decision of the Executive Committee" (presumably also with the agreement of Abramovitch, who is let into all the secrets of Menshevik business). The protest mentions that

"very serious information is to hand concerning the horrible conditions in which the accused are kept in prison"

and that

"in these circumstances it is shameful abuse of power, when persons are handed over to the revolutionary tribunal, all of whose previous behaviour and openly spoken opinions are in open contradiction to the accusations made against them now. This fits into the system of terror and calumnious campaigning which is being waged against Russian Social Democracy and *its representatives* for the sole purpose of discrediting them in the eyes of the proletariat."

Thus, it should be remembered that in the first protest of the Executive Committee of the Second International, *in the drawing up of which Abramovitch took part*, we find: first, that the Mensheviks accused were horribly treated in prison; secondly, that the whole of their work and their confessions contradict the accusations made against them; thirdly, that the accused are "representatives of Russian social-democracy." This was written before the trial opened.

When at the trial the accused openly admitted that they were well treated during their imprisonment, when they confirmed all the accusations against them and revealed in absolute detail the connection between their crimes and the instructions they had received from the Central Committee of the Mensheviks abroad and from the leaders of the Second International, the latter made a sharp turn in their tactics and began insolently to deny what they had written in the protest mentioned, began to prove that the accused are in no way representative of social-democracy, that none of them with the exception of Ikov had any connection whatever with the Central Committee of the Mensheviks abroad, that none of

the conversations with the foreign delegation, referred to by the accused, had ever taken place, and that Dan and Abramovitch had given no instructions, that Abramovitch had never travelled to Moscow, that the accused are not representatives of Russian social-democracy, but, as "Vorwärts" writes, are "tricksters and trained animals."

In this flood of demented "refutations," both sworn and unsworn, they have let out many new points, to reveal the falseness of which it is enough to compare them with what they wrote themselves earlier, in the "Socialist Vestnik," in "Vorwärts," in the "Wiener Arbeiterzeitung." For example, Dan hurried to announce that the editorial board of the "Socialist Vestnik" has no connection whatever with the "Vorwärts" and that they are to be found in different houses in different streets; whereas, by the way, the German Social-Democrat press had written in black and white that the files of the "Socialist Vestnik" are to be found on an upper floor of the "Vorwärts" offices.

Again, the most compromised of all, Garvey, in order to save his friends declared in "Vorwärts" on March 6: "I was never a member of the foreign delegation of the Party in Berlin"; whereas, in the "Socialist Vestnik" itself on September 5, 1928, it was published that Garvey participated in the Brussels Congress of the Second International in 1928 in the Disarmament Commission *as the representative of the Russian Socialist Democratic Labour Party.*

This is a very important point. The accused at the Menshevik trial, it should be remembered, showed that up till 1928, between Garvey on the one hand and Dan and Abramovitch on the other, there were differences of opinion concerning the question of intervention. Garvey was for intervention and Dan and Abramovitch against. In 1928, said the accused, these differences disappeared, since Dan and Abramovitch shared the opinion of Garvey and became supporters of intervention. And here we find that just at this time, in 1928, Garvey, who actually before had never been a member of the Menshevik delegation, is sent to the Brussels Congress, to participate at it as the representative of the Russian Socialist Democratic Workers' Party, as it turns out, in the Disarmament Commission, where questions connected with intervention against the U.S.S.R. were discussed.

A short summary of Garvey's speech which was given in that same number of the "Socialist Vestnik" (on page 15), shows that Garvey very skilfully defended the hitherto general platform of the Mensheviks of all shades, the platform of intervention. Having laid on record that the "Labour and Socialist International" had always energetically fought against intervention in the U.S.S.R." Garvey goes on carefully to develop the theme of the necessity of

bringing in a new tactic to prepare the masses for intervention, by inbuing them with the idea that the Soviet Government will provoke the next war, and says :

"It is just for this reason that it (the "Labour and Socialist International") should not close its eyes to the danger which may arise to the cause of peace, not only in capitalist countries, but also because of the strengthening of Soviet militarism, which hides, as all militarism, behind the ideology of 'defence.' Even more dangerous is the universal militarisation of the population, the cultivating of war psychology among the masses, which found its deepest expression in the military staging of the Comintern Congress." (*Socialist Vestnik*, September 5, 1928, page 15.)

Thus, the "Socialist Vestnik" itself, with its careless description of the work of the Commission, most unfortunately for its editors, gave still further confirmation of the correctness of those revelations which were made at the trial by the Mensheviks.

Summing up, we find that the official documents of the Second International itself prove that it tried, by organising wrecking and intervention work in the U.S.S.R., to cover up the traces of its crimes ; that it created for itself *in advance* all kinds of alibis, that it lied when its smoke screen burst ; that, finally, it is compelled to-day, with its back to the wall, to refute all that it wrote yesterday. But this double dealing is not only carried on in regard to the U.S.S.R. The Second International carried on this work at home in its attitude to the proletariat of the capitalist countries. In this respect *also* the official organ of the Second International "International Information" Bulletin, gives extraordinarily clear, exclusive material against it. We shall deal here with only one fact, which at the present moment is of enormous significance, since it reveals the treacherous, double-dealing line of the Second International towards tens of millions of unemployed workers, who are at present on the edge of despair in capitalist countries.

It is well known that on January 21 and 22, 1931, a Commission of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals met in Zürich, to work out a platform of struggle against unemployment in connection with the crisis which is sweeping through the capitalist world. We shall not make a criticism here of this platform, which is a cunningly worked out demagogic manoeuvre towards the working-class. We would mention here only two of the more essential practical measures put forward in this document and which are directed, apparently, against unemployment. In one chapter, under the heading, "Wages Policy," we find :

"The struggle against lowered wages and for increased wages is therefore, even in a period of economic crisis, a most essential task of the working-class."

In another chapter, called "Shorter Hours," we read :

"In order that shortened hours should aim at considerably relieving the present labour market, it is

essential that hours should be shortened by a minimum of one whole working day. The introduction of the five-day week (40 hours), which is also good from the economic point of view, should become the chief demand of the trade unions of all countries."

In reading this document one most suspicious point becomes immediately obvious. Why in this document is the raising of wages brought up in one chapter, and the lowering of hours in another chapter? Why are these two demands not linked up? Why is it not said clearly, that a shortening of the working week must be conditional upon the maintenance or increase of wages? The question answers itself. Because the Second International and the Amsterdam International is first of all concerned with putting into practice the very measure which the capitalists themselves put forward, i.e., the shortened working week without maintenance of the previous wages ; that is, they are interested in transferring the burden of unemployment from the State and capitalists to the shoulders of the employed workers and at their expense. And when they have fulfilled this social demand of the bourgeoisie, it will be quite possible, entirely independent of that, to make triumphant declarations of the necessity of raising wages, with a previously decided resolution not to fight for these demands and to sabotage the fight of the workers for them.

This divorcing of the question of wages from the question of shorter hours must be obvious to every worker. Therefore the Second International has begun a new manoeuvre. At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Second International on February 17 to 22, 1931, a resolution proposed by Otto Bauer was passed unanimously. The "International Information" Bulletin, which is intended for the close circle of initiated readers, for the Social-Democratic and trade union leaders, published this resolution in full. One paragraph reads as follows :

"The Labour Socialist International demands a prolonged decrease in working hours to 40 hours a week, with a simultaneous increase in wages per hour, so that the weekly earnings of the workers will not be decreased as a result of the decreased hours."

This paragraph of the resolution, it would seem, corrects the "mistake" made in the January memorandum, and therefore it gets through to the Social-Democratic press, although in veiled form (since it is too "left"). But these double-dealers hide from the masses and publish neither in "Vorwärts" nor in the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" the following two paragraphs of the resolution, printed in the "International Information" Bulletin, which reduce to nothing all that was said in the *first paragraph*. Following upon this paragraph, in the complete text of the resolution, we read the following paragraph :

"International competitive relations make it impossible to reach this aim in separate countries. This can be achieved only by international action (activities)."

Thus the social-democrats will defend the platform of linking up decreased working hours with a maintenance of previous wages only if it is possible in the same sense to develop at the same time international action ; for otherwise, it seems, the capitalists of one or another country will suffer from it, and will be beaten by the international war of competition. In the third paragraph the resolution makes a further explanation :

“ ‘The Socialist Labour International’ ‘does not deceive itself concerning the obstacles in the way of such action, while the international economic crisis continues. But it considers it necessary now by energetic propaganda, to strengthen the will of the workers of all countries, etc., etc.’ ”

Thus we see the real idea of the resolution. For an actual fight against the crisis, we must link up the decreased working time with the maintenance of the previous wages, but on no account must the interests of individual capitalists of individual countries be damaged ; it must be done on an international scale. On an international scale it is impossible to achieve this, while the crisis continues. Consequently, the struggle against the heavy consequences of the crisis must be put off until the crisis has passed over. And in the meantime ? Meanwhile we must help the

capitalists to shift the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the working-class.

This is how the leaders of the Second International day by day betray and deceive the working-class, in whose midst they have set themselves, as agents of a foreign class, as thieves in the house. When the social-democratic workers realise all the foulness of their treachery, all the trickery, all the intriguing, they will curse them and send them to the devil. The task of the Communist Party is to help the social-democratic workers to understand all this as quickly as possible.

Messrs. Dan and Abramovitch shout : “Don’t touch us ; we’re not the thieves ! Bring forward the documents which prove the Second International engaged in wrecking.” There are such documents. Side by side with the acts of the Second International, we have their own official documents, in their own files, concerning their wrecking work. The task of the Communist Party is to spread widely and to explain among the proletarian masses these documents, so that the workers may examine their thieves at home, who are far more dangerous than the bourgeoisie, for they live in the home of the working-class.

THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS

By V. MOTYLEV.

I. CHARACTERISATION OF THE DEPTH OF THE CRISIS.

OVER two years have passed since the time of sharpened world agrarian crisis ; over one-and-a-half years since the sudden change towards a crisis in the economic situation in the United States of America and Germany ; and over a year since the rapid development of the world economic crisis. During this period the crisis has already attained a degree of universality and depth hitherto unprecedented. Since the middle of 1930, there is no longer a country in the capitalist world which is not drawn in a greater or lesser degree into the crisis. Despite the fact, as we shall prove later, that the crisis has in no country yet reached its climax, the depth of the crisis is already now extraordinarily apparent.

“On the eve of 1930,” we read in the leading article of the “Magazin der Wirtschaft,” No. 1, 1931,

“World economy is in a state of deep crisis. For the first time since the conclusion of war, the fate of the world depends once more upon the world economic situation. There exists no country which can avoid the unfavourable situation. The sickness which has seized world economy cannot be defined by *one* name ; various sicknesses come at various times, in various parts of the organism ; the old wounds open ; the scars begin to ache ; a fever results ; which so shakes the system that many see not only the sickness to come, but a crisis in the very nature of world economy, a crisis in the capitalist system.”

In the United States of America, the index of economic activity, reflecting the volume of industrial production and railway transport, according to the “Annalist,” fell in January, 1931, to 74.8 as against 109.9 in July, 1929. Thus the decrease in the volume of industry and railway transport reached 32 per cent. Simultaneously the production of steel in December, 1930, was 59 per cent. below that of June, 1929 ; and the production of automobiles 55 per cent. lower.

In Germany the index of industrial production, according to data from the Konjunktur Institute, fell in December, 1930, to 78.9 as against 109.8 in June, 1929. Thus industrial production dropped 28 per cent. in that period. Moreover, in January the output of cast iron and steel was twice as low as in July, 1929. Even in comparison with January, 1930 (a month of crisis) the steel production in January, 1931, dropped by 39 per cent., and that of cast iron 45 per cent.

In Britain, the index of industrial production for the last quarter of 1930 (calculated by the “London and Cambridge Economic Service”) was 93.5 as against 114.8 for the last quarter of 1929. Thus, industrial production fell by 19 per cent. Moreover, the output of steel in January, 1931, was lower than in January, 1930, by 49 per cent., and the output of cast iron also fell by the same amount.

In Poland, which entered the crisis at the end of 1928, the index of industrial production fell in December, 1930, to 87.9 as against 105.8 in January, 1929, thus reaching its lowest point since the beginning of the crisis. Thus, in the course of two years, industrial output has decreased by 25 per cent. Further, the output of the textile industry during the same period, fell by 35 per cent.

Even in France, where the crisis began to be felt only in the middle of 1930, the index of industrial output fell to 105.5 in December, 1930, as against 113.4 in June, 1930. i.e., production dropped by 7 per cent. Moreover, the index in the metallurgical industry fell in December to 118 as against 124 in July; the automobile industry index fell to 583 as against 652 in July.

To sum up, there is no country in the world in which industrial production has not, to a more or less degree, decreased as a result of the crisis.

The crisis is felt most particularly in the *metallurgical* industry. The following table, giving figures concerning the production of cast iron and steel in the most important countries, shows that the decrease in production in the metallurgical industry of capitalist countries is universal. The table shows that in only one country, despite the world economic crisis, has the output of both cast iron and steel increased to any considerable extent. This is in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The advantage of the Soviet economic system over the capitalist system is manifest here with particular clearness. The waves of crisis, sweeping the borders of the U.S.S.R., has dashed itself in vain against the solid socialist structure of the Soviet system of economy.

WORLD PRODUCTION OF CAST IRON AND STEEL

(in million tons).

	1913	1929	1930	1930 in % to 1929
CAST IRON :				(rise or fall)
Great Britain ..	10.26	7.58	6.20	- 18.3
Germany ..	10.73	13.19	9.54	- 27.7
France ..	8.93	10.20	9.85	- 3.4
Belgium ..	2.45	4.03	3.35	- 16.9
Luxembourg ..	2.51	2.86	2.44	- 14.7
Saar ..	1.35	2.07	1.88	- 9.2
U.S.S.R. ..		4.24	4.88	+ 15.1
Poland ..	4.55	0.69	0.48	- 30.4
Italy ..	0.42	0.71	0.52	- 26.8
U.S.A. ..	30.97	42.61	31.40	- 26.3
Canada ..	1.02	1.16	0.82	- 29.3
Other countries	4.71	7.88	7.29	- 7.5
TOTAL ..	77.90	97.23	78.65	- 19.1

WORLD PRODUCTION OF CAST IRON AND STEEL

(continued)

(In Million Tons)

	1913	1929	1930	1930 in % to 1929
STEEL :				
Great Britain ..	7.66	9.64	7.30	- 24.5
Germany ..	11.99	15.99	11.16	- 30.1
France ..	6.86	9.55	9.15	- 4.2
Belgium ..	2.43	4.07	3.32	- 18.5
Luxembourg ..	1.31	2.66	2.23	- 16.2
Saar ..	2.05	2.17	1.89	- 12.9
U.S.S.R. ..		4.76	5.50	+ 15.1
Poland ..	4.75	1.36	1.23	- 9.5
Italy ..	0.92	2.11	1.75	- 17.1
U.S.A. ..	31.30	56.43	41.20	- 26.9
Canada ..	1.04	1.39	1.01	- 27.3
Other countries	4.84	8.30	7.26	- 12.5
TOTAL ..	75.15	118.43	93.00	- 21.5

Figures taken from "The Economist" of 7/2/31. Percentages calculated by me.

THE AGRARIAN CRISIS.

One of the most important features of the present crisis, as is well known, is the organic *combination and interlacing of the economic and agrarian crises*. This is no accident. In post-war capitalism, because of the organic disproportion of the epoch of general capitalist crisis, the mutual dependence of the industrial situation upon the agrarian situation is much closer than during the earlier capitalist days. Unlike industry, in agriculture the crisis has not developed on the lines of curtailed production. The prolonged nature of the period of production in agriculture and the predominance of small commodity farms have played therein a decisive role. In conditions of almost universal over-production of almost all agricultural products and the simultaneous development of the industrial crisis, the peasantry are deprived of all possibility of turning to other crops, or of going to the towns. This means that the peasant is obliged to hold on to his piece of land, is compelled to sow even more crops, in order to obtain, with the ever-falling prices, some sort of income.

As a result of this, and of the favourable natural conditions last year, the world harvest of the overwhelming majority of crops in 1930 either approached the 1929 volume, or exceeded it. According to figures from the "Revue Internationale d'Agriculture" the organ of the International Agricultural Institute in Rome, in January, 1931, the world area under wheat increased by 2.8 per cent. last year and the world wheat harvest by 8.8 per cent. (excluding the U.S.S.R. and certain smaller countries). At the same time in the U.S.A. the wheat harvest was 5.5 per cent. higher than that of the preceding year, and in Canada 30 per cent. higher, Argentine 67 per cent. higher and Australia 62 per cent. higher. Thus, in the largest producing countries this year, the harvest

increased very considerably. True, side by side with this in several other primarily consuming countries (France, Finland, Spain, Switzerland, Morocco, Tunis, and so on) the harvest was lower than for the previous year. But the crisis reduced the purchasing power in these countries. As a result, over-production became a very critical factor in the largest producing countries. The world harvest of rye, oats, barley, last year was very slightly lower than that of the previous year. However, in several of the most important producing countries, the harvest of these crops was considerably higher than last year. The world rice harvest was 14 per cent. higher than the previous year, beet sugar 30 per cent. higher, cotton 0.6 per cent. and tobacco 4.9 per cent. higher.

Thus, after two years of agrarian crisis, the production of agriculture for the majority of crops has either increased or remained approximately at the same level. It is quite obvious that this must extremely increase the over-production. And if even in 1929, before the development of the crisis, in the most important industrial countries the volume of agricultural production brought about increased over-production and further crisis, then the more so must this be this year with the considerably lowered purchasing power of the consumers in industrial countries.

The development of the agrarian crisis finds special reflection in the unprecedented, catastrophic decrease of prices. The fall in wholesale prices of a number of agricultural products is truly catastrophic. The wholesale prices of several of the most important world agricultural products, which determine the incomes of hundreds of millions of peasants throughout the whole capitalist world, have fallen this year to one-half or even one-third of their previous figure. For instance, the price of wheat fell in 1930 by 48 per cent., that of rye by 54 per cent., and so on. As compared with the high level prices during the previous years, the prices of silk, jute, sugar, wool, fell by 70 to 75 per cent.; the price of rubber by 90 per cent.; that of coffee, lead, zinc, tin, cocoa, cotton, flax, leather by 50 to 60 per cent. At the present time, wholesale prices apparently very frequently stand lower than the cost of production. This level of prices is a considerable blow for *hundreds of millions* of peasant farms throughout the world, and brings about enormous poverty among the peasant masses and hastens the process of devastation among peasant farms. Especially devastating must be the influence of these fallen prices upon the farms of land-tenants and those heavily indebted to the banks. At the same time, the influence of the crisis is especially ruinous in colonial countries, whose economy is undermined by predatory exploitation of the imperialist powers.

FALL IN FOREIGN TRADE.

The development of the world economic crisis is also clearly manifest in the decreased volume of *foreign trade*. The crisis has evoked in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries a fall both of imports and exports. In this direction we find the "national" crises mutually influencing and multiplying each other. The mutual curtailing of imports in countries hit by the crisis has called forth a natural mutual curtailment of exports. The following table giving the percentage of decreased exports and imports in several of the most important countries, shows that the size of the decrease is not equal. It should be noted that in this table the percentage of decrease is calculated on the basis of figures concerning the value of exports and imports. As in 1930 a sharp fall in prices took place, this sharp decrease in the value of foreign trade partially expressed this fall in prices. However, even having in mind this circumstance, the decrease of foreign trade was, apparently, very inconsiderable in the majority of countries. As the decrease in imports expresses the development of the crisis inside the given countries, and a decrease in export—the influence of the world economic crisis on the given country, then the greater or less decrease in imports or exports in one or another country expresses the specific weight of the internal and external factors in the development of the crisis.

FALL IN THE VOLUME OF FOREIGN TRADE. (1930 compared with 1929; fall in percentages).

Country.	Import.	Export.
U.S.A.	-28.8	-26.7
Great Britain	-14.4	-21.6
Germany	-22.7	-10.7
France	-10.9	-14.6
Poland	-28.0	-14.0
India	-26.0	-26.0
Japan	-30.7	-31.7

Figures taken from "The Economist" of 24/1/31 and 14/2/31.

DECREASED FOREIGN TRADE IN JANUARY, 1931 AS COMPARED WITH JANUARY, 1930 (in percentages)

Country.	Import.	Export.
U.S.A.	-41	-39
Germany	-52	-30
Great Britain	-26	-35
France	-20	-30

Figures calculated on the basis of statistics in the economic journals of the corresponding countries.

The January figures are interesting in that they confirm the increased rate at which foreign trade is decreasing. The export and import figures for the U.S.A., Germany and France are the lowest since the beginning of the crisis. Moreover, the decrease in foreign trade in Germany and France is particularly significant. *Germany*, despite the extremely heavy industrial crisis inside the country, was able during 1930 to keep her exports on a comparatively high level.

The sharp fall of exports in January indicate the ever-increasing influence of the world crisis upon Germany. *France* in January suffered an exceedingly sharp curtailment of both exports and imports. The export of manufactured goods decreased 15 per cent. as against December, and 20 per cent. as against January, 1930. The import of raw materials in volume was 12 per cent. less than in December and 20 per cent. less than in January 1930. This curtailed import of raw materials clearly shows the deepening of the crisis in France.

CIRCULATION OF MONEY.

The development of the crisis is already beginning to exert a definite influence on currency circulation. In the first place, this is apparent in agricultural countries. The enormous fall in prices on agricultural products and the sharp curtailment of the sale of products has resulted in an adverse balance of trade and payments. As a result of this there is an outward flow of gold and a fall in the rate of exchange. During 1930 the rate of exchange in several agrarian countries began to drop. For example, the Australian rate of exchange on January 15, 1931, dropped 14.5 per cent. below the figure at the end of 1929; the Argentine rate of exchange was 25.7 lower; Brazil 18.1 per cent.; Peru 25.7 per cent.; Uruguay 29.5 per cent.; China 39.7 per cent.; Hong-Kong 42.6 per cent.; Venezuela 6.6 per cent.; New Zealand 6.1 per cent. lower, etc. Moreover, the fall in the rate of exchange in all these countries during the last month has been considerably more rapid. The outward flow of gold is beginning to menace the rate of exchange of the largest capitalist countries, England, Japan, etc. During 1930, there was a still greater increase of gold in the U.S.A. and in France. Out of the world gold reserve of 2,500 million pounds at the end of 1930, U.S.A. held 960 million pounds, or 38 per cent., and France 440 million pounds, or 17.6 per cent.

This unequal distribution of the gold reserve corresponds to the unequal distribution of free loan capital. One of the characteristic peculiarities of the present crisis, as compared with previous crises, is the existence of a surplus of free investment capital and lowered interest. This phenomena is linked up with the tardiness of the development of the wave of bankruptcy of large enterprises up till autumn, 1930. This peculiarity of the present crisis is a result, on the one hand, of the fact that the previous rise was not sufficiently prolonged or universal to exhaust the free investment capital and, on the other hand, of the fact that the growth of monopoly and finance capital made it easier for the large undertakings to resist the force of the crisis. Thanks to these circumstances, it has become possible from time to time to bring new blood into those large enterprises which were on the verge

of bankruptcy. This process took place either in the form of the amalgamation of these enterprises with others, or by mobilising additional capital.

It should, however, be emphasised that this abundance of investment capital is to be found only in parts of the capitalist countries. In Germany and certain agrarian countries there is no surplus of investment capital on the market, although there is also no extreme tension, as is usually the case in time of crisis.

It is inevitable that in the future there will be an increase in the wave of bankruptcy and the credit crisis. The crisis strikes so hard even against the large enterprises, that sooner or later they will inevitably capitulate. For example, since the autumn of 1930 a turning point in the direction of an increased wave of bankruptcies among the largest enterprises has taken place in the United States and Japan.

In *Japan* in the last quarter of 1930, nineteen banks with deposits of 120 million yen became bankrupt. At the same time, in 1930 there was a considerable increase in the amalgamation of banks, which, in the majority of cases apparently, was used as a form of improving the financial position of insolvent banks. The number of banks in Japan dropped in 1930 from 1,006 to 897.

In the United States the number of bankruptcies has increased, beginning with November.

In November the largest bank in Kentucky went bankrupt; this bank was founded in 1834 and became a national bank in 1900. In December one of the biggest New York banks went bankrupt—the so-called United States Bank, which had 400,000 depositors, 203 million dollars in deposits, 59 branches and 23,000 shareholders. During 1930, 1,326 banks went bankrupt as against 642 in 1929. The amount of deposits affected in this way amounted in 1930 to 904 million dollars as against 234 million in 1929. The largest number of bankruptcies—328 with a total deposit of 407 million dollars—were to be found in December, 1930. In January, 1931, bankruptcies increased. According to preliminary data 3,316 undertakings broke as against 2,759 in January and 2,525 in December, 1930. Although the financial-monopolist groups in the United States are introducing multifarious measures to hold back this wave of bankruptcy, they are unable to prevent it. The force of the crisis inevitably will result, in 1931, in a further increase in the number of bankruptcies among the largest enterprises in several capitalist countries,—and this will bring about an increased credit crisis and higher interests. This is the direction in which the growth of the adverse balance of payments, mentioned above, in various countries, will proceed, together with the resulting inevitable increase of the rate of interest.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY.

The depth of the present crisis causes *devastating impoverishment among the masses of the population*. The following factors work in this direction: the gigantic growth of unemployment; lowered wages; unusually high, for a crisis period, level of retail prices; the sharp fall in the incomes of peasants and farmers.

The present crisis has brought about such a state of unemployment, as has never been the case in any of the previous crises in capitalist economy.

According to the figure of the German reformist Federation of Trade Unions in January, 1931, the percentage of entirely unemployed members of trade unions was 34.5 and the percentage of half-time workers 18.8. Thus, *among the organised proletariat, every third worker was entirely unemployed and every second worker either completely or partially unemployed*.

In the U.S.A. according to the statistics of the American Federation of Labour, which combines, as is known, only the upper strata of skilled workers, the percentage of totally unemployed trade union members in January, 1931, was 27. However, other statistics show a much larger figure of unemployment. For example, according to the German journal, "Magazin der Wirtschaft," of February 13, 1931, the American insurance company, "Metropolitan Life Insurance," made an investigation of 214,000 families holding policies, with a total number of members amounting to 887,000, in 46 American towns. Among this number there were 24 per cent. totally unemployed and 21 per cent. working short time. Moreover, in Detroit, the percentage of totally unemployed has risen to 30, partially unemployed to 36; in New York there are 23 per cent. totally unemployed and 15 per cent. partially. If consideration is taken of the fact that insured workers are, obviously, the better provided for section of the proletariat, it becomes clear that actually the percentage both of totally unemployed and partially unemployed workers is considerably higher. Most probably the extent of unemployment in the U.S.A. is no less than that given of the unemployment in Germany.

Approximately, there is the same proportion of employed and unemployed workers in a number of other industrial countries in the grip of the crisis at the end of 1929 and beginning of 1930 (Britain, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and so on.)

On the whole, according to data of the R.I.L.U., the absolute number of unemployed in the U.S.A. at present is already 12 to 13 million; in Germany 5.5 million; in Britain 4.5 million and so on. On a world scale, with the exception of, however, India, China, Indonesia, Africa, and so on, where the unemployment cannot be calculated, the number of unemployed exceeds 35 million.

This enormous scale of unemployment is the result not only of the excessive depth of the crisis and the ensuing enormous rate of curtailed production, but also of the way in which the unemployment resulting upon the crisis is bound up with the chronic, permanent unemployment which existed in post-war capitalism even before the crisis and which is the result of the conditions of the universal crisis of capitalism. At the same time the size of this unemployment is explained by the combination of the industrial and agrarian crises, which creates unemployment simultaneously among the industrial and agricultural workers, and excludes the possibility of a temporary influx of unemployed into other spheres of national economy.

The growth of unemployment is accompanied by decreased wages. The decrease in wages in European countries is not denied even by official statistics, although they belittle the extent of the decrease. Actually the wages of European workers according to statistics of the R.I.L.U. have fallen by between 20 and 30 per cent. Even in the U.S.A., where we are assured by Hoover and the American Federation of Labour, wages are said not to have fallen, indirect statistical indicators undeniably bear witness to the contrary. For example, the index of the number of workers engaged in industry of the "Annalist" in December, 1930, was lower by 21.7 per cent. than the figure for July, 1929; but the index of the total amount of wages paid fell during that period by 33.5 per cent. It is quite obvious that *the difference in the drop in these two indices proves, side by side with the decrease in the number of workers employed, that a decrease in the wages of employed workers has taken place*.

Further, the unprecedented high level of retail prices during such a period of crisis has a big influence on the position of the working masses. From December, 1929, to December, 1930, wholesale prices fell in the U.S.A. by 16 per cent., and retail only by 6 per cent.; in Germany wholesale by 12 per cent., retail by 7 per cent.; in Britain, wholesale by 21 per cent., retail 8 per cent.; in France, side by side with a 14 per cent. drop in wholesale prices in December, 1930, as compared with the average in 1929, retail prices have increased by 7 per cent. in Paris and even by 12 per cent. for the rest of the country. In general, the same picture of wholesale and retail prices is seen in other countries; side by side with an enormous drop in wholesale prices, retail prices either drop very slightly or even tend to grow higher.

The drop in wholesale prices is a great blow to hundreds of millions of small producers and considerably reduces their incomes and impoverishes a section of them entirely; whereas insignificant reductions or a growth in the retail prices sharpens the crisis for millions of consumers, already suffering from unemployment, reduced wages, etc.

With regard to the influence of the crisis upon the position of the farmers and peasants, we may add that even a growth of production on their farms is accompanied, in circumstances of agrarian crisis, by a lowering of their incomes. For instance, according to official statistics of the American Ministry of Agriculture, the incomes of American farmers this year were 20 per cent. lower than those of the previous year, despite the fact that the wheat harvest was higher than that of last year, and the harvest of other crops approximated to last year's. According to figures of the American agricultural journals, the incomes of farmers have fallen by one-third. According to the Japanese Minister of Agriculture, the incomes of Japanese peasants have fallen by 700 million yen this year, despite the fact that the rice harvest exceeded that of last year by 9.7 per cent. and the output of silk was approximately equal to that of last year. According to the Canadian Minister of Agriculture the total value of the wheat harvest this year was 174.8 million dollars as against 319.7 million dollars in 1929, despite the fact that the wheat harvest increased by 30 per cent. as against the previous year. Thus, the connection which exists between the increased over-production and falling prices creates a deadlock for the peasant farms. *Even increased production does not guarantee increased incomes, and may, on the contrary, be accompanied by lowered incomes.*

All this creates devastating poverty for the masses of the people, an enormous rise in the number of cases of death by starvation, and suicides resultant upon misery and starvation. The leaders of the democratic party of the U.S.A. in their fight against the republican Government of Hoover were compelled to recognise that no fewer than 1,000 persons die each day of hunger.

At the same time the crisis has not yet reached its culmination; it is inevitable that the crisis will deepen, as we indicate, and this means that the masses will become even more impoverished in the future.

II. PROSPECTS OF THE GROWING CRISIS.

THE UNIVERSAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM.

The great peculiarity of the present world economic crisis lies in the fact that it develops on the basis and within the framework of the general crisis of capitalism. The whole post-war period is, as is known, the period of the general crisis of capitalism, beginning from the time of the world imperialist war. The cyclic fluctuations, which capitalism experienced during the post-war period, the partial rises which took place in separate countries, in no way destroy or weaken the chief estimate given by us of the whole post-war epoch as the epoch of the universal crisis of capitalism.

The roots of the universal capitalist crisis are to be found in the nature of imperialism. Lenin made an examination of imperialism as monopolistic, decaying, dying capitalism. This conception of imperialism is developed by him not only in his well-known work "Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism," but also in several articles, where in one connection or another, he has given the theoretical characteristics of imperialism. Thus, for instance, in his article "Imperialism and the Socialist Split," published in 1916, Lenin wrote: "Imperialism is a special historical stage of capitalism. Its peculiarities are threefold: imperialism is (1), monopolist capitalism; (2) parasitic and decaying capitalism; (3) dying capitalism." Thus, in his definition of imperialism, Lenin included the characterisation of this period as decaying and dying capitalism. In his work "Socialism and War," published in 1915, Lenin wrote the following: "Capitalism from being progressive has become reactionary, it has developed the productive forces so much that mankind has either to go forward to socialism or for years and even tens of years, to suffer armed warfare between the 'great' Powers for the artificial maintenance of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and all kinds of national oppression."

The universal crisis of capitalism began, as everybody knows, with war. In his report to the Second Congress of the Communist International, characterising the crisis of capitalism, Lenin asserted: "War has brought about an unprecedented sharpening of all the capitalist contradictions." Examining a little later on the contradictions brought about by the war, he concludes: "Thus a world crisis has come about. These economic roots of the crisis are the chief reason why the Communist International is obtaining brilliant results."

The war, which "let loose," as the programme of the Communist International states, the universal capitalist crisis, was, however, itself the index of its inevitability. It expressed such a degree of sharpened contradictions, characteristic of the monopolist stage of capitalism, as made the outbreak of war inevitable and, at the same time, made it impossible, by means of warfare, to solve these contradictions. Thus, the origin of the universal crisis of capitalism is intrinsically connected with the peculiarities of imperialism as the monopolist stage of capitalism. The tendency to decay and death, characteristic of his stage has as a result of war so increased and deepened that capitalism has now entered the period of universal crisis.

From our treatment of the question it follows that *the essence of the universal capitalist crisis is to be found in the extreme sharpening of all contradictions and*

features peculiar to imperialism, as monopolistic, decaying, dying capitalism. This sharpening of the position not only reflects the immanent development of these contradictions and features of imperialism, which is hastened by war, but also the influence of the changes brought about by war and its consequences. The existence of the U.S.S.R. and victorious socialist construction therein; the growth of industry in the colonies and semi-colonies and the development of capitalism therein; the development of the national-revolutionary movements in colonies and semi-colonies; the enormous growth of the industrial apparatus in certain imperialist States; the increase of international and internal indebtedness etc.—all these events and changes are factors in the further deepening of the universal crisis of capitalism, i.e., of the extreme sharpening of all contradictions and features characteristic of monopolist, decaying, dying capitalism.

The present crisis differs enormously from other crises experienced by capitalism, in that it is taking place on the basis and within the framework of the universal crisis of capitalism. Previous crises were the "real combination and forcible equalling of all contradictions of bourgeois economy" (Marx). While causing a high tide of bankruptcies among a section of the enterprises, a sharp curtailment of production, a rapid fall in wholesale and retail prices and so on, previous crises re-established to a certain extent the necessary proportion and thus created the basis for the following transition to depression, revival, rise.

The present crisis, in view of the peculiarities described above, cannot forcibly overcome the ensuing disproportions and contradictions. It has not been able to do and cannot do the "salubrious" work done by previous crises. This is due to the fact that deep organic disproportions and contradictions, characterising the epoch of universal crisis, not only deepen the present crisis, but are also deepened by it. This makes the present crisis unprecedentedly deep and prolonged.

OVER-PRODUCTION CONTINUES.

All this finds expression in the fact that over-production, despite the prolonged development of the crisis, has not only not slackened down, but has considerably increased. The following table shows the growth of visible reserves of several agrarian raw material commodities in the last quarter of 1930, as compared with the corresponding period in 1929, indicating that at the end of a year of steadily developing crisis, the capitalist world finds itself up against the same problem of over-production in a much sharper form than at the beginning of the crisis.

GROWTH OF VISIBLE RESERVES.* (Increase in percentages in the last quarter of 1930 as against the corresponding period in 1929).

Wheat	..	7.8%	(in U.S.A., Canada, Argentine, Australia, Great Britain and reserves in transport)
Sugar	..	29.5%	(in Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Poland, U.S.A., Cuba, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Canada, Philippines, Java and reserves in transport)
Coffee	..	80.0%	(in Europe, U.S.A., Brazil, reserves in transport)
Cotton	..	50.0%	(in U.S.A., Europe, Egypt, British India and reserves in transport)
Raw silk	..	384.8%	(in U.S.A. and Japan)
Jute	..	117.4%	(in British India)
Rubber	..	38.0%	(in U.S.A., Europe most important productive districts, reserves in transport)
Coal	..	226.6%	(in Germany, Belgium, Saar, Poland)
Benzine	..	15%	(in U.S.A.)
Copper	..	116.1%	(in North and South America)
Zinc	..	77.3%	(in U.S.A. and Great Britain)
Tin	..	43.2%	(world reserves, including those in transport)

* The figures above are calculated by us on the basis of absolute figures given in the "Wochenbericht des Instituts für Konjunkturforschung," 24/12/1930.

Other official sources bear witness to the sharpening over-production. For instance, the "Survey of Current Business"—the official organ of the American Ministry of Trade—in the Jan., 1931, number, gives the following indices concerning commodity reserves.

INDICES OF COMMODITY RESERVES.

	Total 1929	Reserves. 1930	Manufactured Goods.	
			1929	1930
September	.. 139.4	147.8	114.2	117.7
October	.. 115.1	157.2	114.4	119.0
November	.. 156.5	161.7	116.2	119.5

Thus, reserves at the end of 1930 in the United States, also, exceeded those of the corresponding period in 1929. Further, it is significant that the growth of reserves is to be observed in manufactured goods.

This sharpening of over-production, which expresses the peculiarities of the present crisis, proves, obviously, the inevitability of its further deepening. While over-production continues, wholesale prices are inevitably bound to fall. The process of falling prices, while it lasts, becomes in its turn a factor making for the further sharpening of over-production, since both producer and consumer, in anticipation of reduced prices, limit their purchases to the extent of essential requirements.

THE PRICE "SCISSORS."

Side by side with the fact of falling prices, the peculiarities of this drop deeply influence the crisis. With an exceedingly sharp drop in wholesale prices of agrarian products and partly of minerals, the prices of manufactured goods and especially retail

prices, either fall much more slowly, or even tend to increase. At the same time that the catastrophic drop in wholesale prices of agricultural raw products sharply reduces the purchasing power of the world peasantry and decreases thereby the volume of the market for industry—the insignificant lowering or even raising of retail prices holds back the process of exhausting the commodity surplus. The “scissors” formed between the lowering of wholesale and retail prices are to be explained by the existing conditions of the universal crisis of monopolist capitalism: by the growth of monopolies, their influence on the sphere of circulation, protectionism, taxation, cost of circulation and so on. Although as the crisis continues, it will probably influence these “scissors” in the direction of bringing them together—the “scissors” as a result of these reasons cannot disappear and this will be a retarding influence on the overcoming of the disproportions called forth by the crisis.

EFFECT OF UNEQUAL DEVELOPMENT.

The unequal development is a factor which further deepens the crisis. The very fact that several capitalist countries—France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Ireland—entered the crisis only in the second half of 1930, makes the further development of the crisis in these countries inevitable, and this strongly influences the world economic crisis. This is emphasised by the annual review of the German Konjunktur Institute (“Wochenbericht,” of 24/12/30):

“Enormous sections of world economy,” writes this review, “hitherto ‘konjunktur islands’ like France, Scandinavia, New Zealand, Ireland, Switzerland, Netherlands are at present heavily involved in the general depression. The contraction of these markets, which has already begun, will result in further worsening the economic position of both Germany and other countries.”

We noted above that the present world crisis until autumn, 1930, was not accompanied by a wave of bankruptcy of the largest enterprises. This complicated the forcible liquidation of the ripened disproportions and thus deepened the crisis. Since the tardiness of the development of this wave of bankruptcies can be observed in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries, this continues to prevent the clearing up of these disproportions. On the other hand, the inevitable increase in the wave of bankruptcies among large enterprises in 1931 will, in the course of a certain period of time, extremely strongly influence the crisis. Thus from this point of view also a deepening of the crisis is inevitable in the coming period.

CAPITALIST MEASURES FOR ALLEVIATION.

On the whole, in the present crisis, thanks to the extraordinary depth of disproportion, the extent of curtailment of production even in the United States, Germany and several other countries, is not sufficient

to reduce the extent of over-production. In previous crises capitalism was never brought up against such overwhelming unemployment, such a close combination between the industrial and agrarian crises, such an unprecedented drop in the purchasing power of the nation and so on. All this in conjunction with the conditions indicated above lead to the fact that over-production has not vanished, despite the gigantic extent of curtailed production.

Attempts of the ruling classes to fight the crisis, reflecting the interests and efforts of the finance-monopolist groups, inevitably go in a direction which not only fails to hold back the crisis, but tend to increase it. For example, the majority of monopolist countries reacted to the crisis by raising import duties. At the same time the growth of protectionism in circumstances of a severe world crisis still further breaks down world economic ties, still more tends to deepen the crisis. The measures taken to fight the agrarian crisis affect the situation in this way. Propaganda for reducing the sown area can bring no positive results, both because the peasants have no other way of using their labour power, and because the rising competition on the world market considerably hinders the attainment of the corresponding agreements. For example, the agreement between the Dutch and English owners on rubber plantations concerning organised reduction of production by means of stopping the output of rubber in May, 1930, brought no results because of the gigantic scale of over-production and also because of the non-participation in this agreement of the producers of almost half the total rubber produced. This will probably be the outcome of the recently concluded agreement to regulate the sale of sugar.

Further, attempts of the bourgeoisie in each individual country to lower the cost of production by lowering wages objectively brings about a still greater drop in the purchasing power of the nation, to a still greater sharpening of over-production. A similar effect is produced by the effort of bourgeois governments to reduce the budget deficit brought about by the crisis by reducing the so-called social expenditure. In a word, all the measures of which the monopolist groups of capital are capable, are unable to solve the present contradictions for the simple reason that they reflect the peculiarities and interests of these monopolist groups. At the same time, all the peculiarities of the present crisis are linked up, as is known, with the universal crisis of monopolist, dying capitalism.

The depth of the present crisis was clearly characterised by Lloyd George in one of his recent speeches:

“One should recognise the fact,” he declares, “that the whole world is suffering from a depression such as our generation has hitherto not seen. It is doubtful whether there has been anything of the kind since the time of the period which followed the Napoleonic wars . . . If we

had no insurance benefits for the unemployed . . . a revolution would take place in the country.”*

GROWTH OF POLITICAL CRISIS.

On the foundation of the economic crisis in several countries in 1930, elements of a political crisis grew up. Now the development of the economic crisis into a political crisis has considerably increased. The deepening of the economic crisis results not only in the development of a “crisis from below,” but also a rapid ripening of the elements of a “crisis from above.” The growing budget deficit raises sharply the question of methods to reduce or liquidate the deficit. All attempts of the bourgeois Governments to reduce expenditure by means of a reduction in so-called social expenditure, and to increase revenue by means of a heavier load of taxation, inevitably lead to a sharpening of the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and proletariat. At the same time, these efforts sharpen the struggle among the bourgeoisie itself in connection with methods to be used for liquidating the budget deficit. There is a sharpening of contradictions both between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and to a certain extent also inside the ruling classes around the question of protectionism. Further, there is inevitably considerable disagreement among the bourgeoisie on the question of methods of struggle against the growing dissatisfaction of the masses. All this, in individual countries, brings about a ripening of elements of a “crisis from above,” which is one of the chief objective changes, characterising a revolutionary situation. If we remember that two other objective changes, forming, according to Lenin, a revolutionary situation are also ripening in certain capitalist countries very rapidly (unprecedented growth of poverty and misery of the exploited classes and considerably increased activity on the part of the masses—Lenin’s “Collapse of the Second International”) then it becomes clear that in individual countries a tendency is being created towards a broad political crisis; in other words, a revolutionary situation exists.

The political crisis, a result of the economic crisis, becomes, however, a factor pushing forward a further deepening of the latter crisis. This is especially clearly seen in the example of those countries where the political crisis has considerably developed.

It is quite obvious that the development of the political crisis in certain of the largest countries of the capitalist world must bring about both a deepening of

the economic crisis in these countries and a deepening of the world economic crisis.

THE CRISIS WILL DEEPEN.

This makes it possible for us to confirm that the world economic crisis must inevitably deepen still further. Of course, curtailed production cannot, generally speaking, be unlimited. However, it becomes clear from the above, that the culmination has not yet been reached in any of the capitalist countries, and will hardly be reached in the course of 1931. Even the American “Annalist” of January 15, 1931, on the question of the New Year prospects, was compelled to admit that “it is absolutely unlikely that commercial America could attain so-called prosperity before 1932.”

It is extremely significant that January, 1931, brought a severe sharpening of the crisis in all countries, whereas in January last year an improvement in the situation was observed in several countries (including the U.S.A.). But even if, in separate countries during the second half of 1931, the further curtailment of production ceased, *nevertheless at a definite period this would have meant only the stabilisation of the crisis at the level arrived at. Any stabilisation on such a scale of curtailed production, of the growth of unemployment and so on, in other words, their prolonged existence, would of necessity increase their significance and influence.* For this reason we may assert that the whole of 1931 will bring an increase in the political crisis even in the event of an even greater economic crisis being attained in separate countries during this year.

As for the question of future economic prospects of capitalism, it is impossible to assert, from the narrow economic viewpoint, that there is no hope of a possible resuscitation or favourable rise in the position in capitalist countries. While capitalism lives, cyclic fluctuations within definite limits are inevitable. From the narrow economic point of view, one can only assert that the present crisis is producing such a deepening of the universal crisis of capitalism, that a favourable situation and a change for the better cannot in the future reach the stage of intensity or continue for such a long period of time, as in the case of post-war capitalism before the present crisis. However, a narrow economic viewpoint is permissible in this case only conditionally, at a definite stage of abstraction. *Actually the question of further economic prospects of capitalism is indissolubly linked up with the question of the prospects of the revolutionary crisis developing in several countries.*

* From the “Manchester Guardian” of January 7, 1931.

THE BREAK-UP OF STABILISATION, THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND THE POLITICAL CRISIS

By V. KNORIN.

THE crisis is raging throughout the capitalist world. All the weakness, the instability, the corruption of post-war capitalism is creeping to the surface and "exposing itself" in the eyes of hundreds of millions of workers.

We see, before our eyes, a fresh breach in the capitalist system—after the temporary and unstable stabilisation.

The fact that capitalism is no longer the only system of economy, that the world economy is no longer only a capitalist economy, that there already exists, together with the capitalist system, a socialist system of economy which, by the very fact of its existence, as well as by its growth, the successful fulfilment and surpassing of the Five Year Plan, the liquidation of unemployment, the successful collectivisation of agriculture and the liquidation of the kulak as a class shows up more and more the weakness and instability of post-war capitalism, breaks down the foundation of capitalism and undermines its political authority.

This weakness and instability of post-war capitalism has been strengthened by the fact that the war and the November revolution aroused the oppressed and enslaved colonial and dependent nations and brought them into action, that it undermined the authority of imperialist rule in the colonies, by the fact that colonial revolutions and uprisings have shown an example of successful struggle with armies of occupation, the result of which is that former methods of colonial rule are becoming more and more impossible. The basis of this weakness, instability and corruption of post-war capitalism, lies in the fact that capitalism came out of the war with a *breach*, that the growth of technique and production was overloaded with the inheritance of the imperialist war, with a considerable share of the productive power of the enterprises remaining chronically unused, with an abnormal army of unemployed, with a dreadful impoverishment of the masses in the majority of countries, with a struggle for markets which becomes more complex by the presence of the Versailles system, the separation of the foremost technically developed and cultured countries into conquerors and conquered, and the undermining of the authority of the Government, of parliamentary "democracy," and the whole system of capitalist oppression.

The economic crisis, developing on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism, inevitably grows to such dimensions as would shake the foundations of the capitalist system and, according to the degree of its growth, lead to a political aggravation of the situation,

and in a number of countries, to a maturing of the revolutionary crisis.

The Sixth Congress of the Communist International in 1928, foresaw such a prospect of development clearly enough, and on the basis of a general analysis of the development of capitalism, characterised the approaching period as the third period of the post-war crisis of capitalism, as the period of the aggravation of the capitalist crisis, the growth of all contradictions which, more and more, breaks down the stabilisation of capitalism and causes a leftward turn among the masses. The Tenth Plenum in July, 1929, and later the Enlarged Presidium of the E.C.C.I. in February, 1930, on the basis of the further development of these signs of the third period, pointed out that the most important feature of the *third* period was the *growing new revolutionary upsurge*, which the Communist Parties must organise.

The Communist International thus gave, with this analysis of the leading instances, a completely clear picture of the development of the present economic crisis and pointed to the inevitable growth of the condition of an extreme political revolutionary crisis in a number of countries. The Communist Parties were then given the basic, tactical task for the third period—the period of the break-up of stabilisation and the growing revolutionary upsurge—not of the simple accumulation of strength, but the task of preparing the masses for the coming great, and possibly, for a number of countries, decisive battles.

The Communist International did not think it essential to give for an evaluation of the present political situation any other characteristic besides this dynamic one. And this was absolutely correct. No other characteristic could have expressed the peculiarities of the process of the ripening of the elements of the revolutionary situation so clearly, under the given conditions, as did this one.

At the same time, in a number of speeches, particularly those of Comrade Molotov and Comrade Stalin, the relation between the given stage of development and the direct revolutionary situation, was, in addition, very clearly pointed out.

At the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. Comrade Molotov said :

"What does the sharpening of the crisis of capitalism mean? It can only mean one thing—that in the womb of capitalism the forces for the explosion of capitalist stabilisation are growing greater and greater. Scholasticism, in its arguments on the third period comes to the conclusion that this is the period, in the development of the post-war crisis of capitalism, which they try to separate by some kind of wall, the period of the explosion

of capitalist stabilisation, from the period of the new upsurge of the international proletarian revolution. But as a matter of fact . . . the third period is not separated by any wall from the direct-revolutionary situation."

This was even more clearly emphasised by Comrade Stalin who said, in February of last year, in answer to the question of the Sverdlov students: "What is your opinion on the possibility of a transition of the present revolutionary upsurge in capitalist countries into a direct revolutionary situation :

"It is impossible to construct an impassable boundary line between 'revolutionary upsurge' and 'direct revolutionary situation.' It is impossible to say: 'Up to this point we have a 'revolutionary upsurge,' beyond this point—a jump into a 'direct revolutionary situation.' Only academicians can formulate the question in this manner. The first, ordinarily, merges imperceptibly into the second. The task now consists in preparing the proletariat *now* for decisive revolutionary battle, *not of waiting* for the moment of the 'appearance' of the so-called revolutionary situation." (*Pravda*, No. 40, 1930).

All the basic questions on the evaluation of the international situation must be decided by this. Therefore debates on the "nature" of the political crisis to-day are nothing other than *scholastic* deviations from the fulfilment of the tasks set by the Communist International and an attempt to substitute the work of winning the majority of the working-class and the preparation of the masses for the decisive battle, by discussions of the wording of one or other quotation from Marx and Lenin, which frequently relates to another setting and other conditions.

Two things determine the growth of the political revolutionary crisis under the present conditions : the breakdown of stabilisation and the growth of the revolutionary upsurge. It is perfectly clear that the growing revolutionary upsurge now, when "stabilisation approaches its end" (Stalin), is nothing else but the accumulation of the most important conditions for a revolutionary crisis, i.e., a direct revolutionary situation. The Enlarged Presidium of the E.C.C.I. of February, 1930, gave the same analysis, but in other words, for countries in which at that time stabilisation was most upset, when it said, in its resolution that "In a number of countries of Eastern and Central Europe (Poland, Baltic States, Austria, the Balkans) . . . the ground for a general political crisis is more and more being created.

In general, this completely correct outlook, from the report given by the E.C.C.I. of the economic and political setting at the beginning of the world economic crisis, should have, under the growing economic crisis and the sharpening of the contradictions of capitalism, depended on the growth of the revolutionary upsurge. However, some comrades applied it without taking the whole combination of circumstances and the degree of the revolutionary upsurge in the majority of countries into account,

The fact that not all the circumstances were taken into account led to the abuse of the term "political crisis" and to a careless treatment of the conception of the "transition" of an economic crisis into a political one.

* * *

The economic crisis struck the U.S.A. hardest of all, and then, of the large countries, Poland and Germany. But the break-up of stabilisation and the emergence of the revolutionary upsurge—consequently, of both basic conditions for a political revolutionary crisis does not, and will not, take place in the countries in this order. The tendency of a revolutionary crisis is most clearly noted in Germany. It is clear that the political, revolutionary crisis does not simply result from the acuteness of a given economic crisis. It does not only depend on the per cent. decline in production, the stock exchange index, the number of bankruptcies, the quantity of unemployed. It is clear that the growth of the conditions of the general political crisis is the consequence of the economic crisis of capitalism plus the degree of the acuteness of all international and internal contradictions of the given country with the calculation of the strength and the ability of the Communist Parties to mobilise the masses, to organise the repulse to the offensive of capital and to lead the revolutionary upsurge of the masses.

Many comrades do not take into account the fact that the approaching political crisis to the onset of which the Communist International adapts itself, will be a revolutionary crisis. Those comrades who speak of "the growing over of the economic crisis into a political crisis" in general are employing a completely inaccurate formula. Those comrades who speak of the "growing over of the world economic crisis into a world political crisis" (Varga), of "the world political crisis," etc., are making a completely inadmissible mistake.

Such statements and formulae suffer, above all, from the defect that they deduce *mechanically* a political crisis from the definite acuteness of a given economic crisis of over-production. Such statements and formulae suffer from the defect that they forget about the law of uneven development under imperialism formulated by Lenin. Such statements see *only* the tendency toward the internationalisation of all the processes in the development of capitalism, "the transformation of local and national crises into crises which envelop an ever greater number of countries—into a world crisis," but they do not see, at the same time, the tendencies to a specific local character of the crisis in every country separately, its internal and external political peculiarities, the whole sum of foreign and internal contradictions which shake up the given country, all the elements weakening or strengthening the power of its imperialism, its ability

to withstand the "illness" of the economic crisis without a dislocation of the whole system or its "disposition" to political dislocation.

Not to see this—is to over-simplify the international setting in each individual capitalist country, to lose from the field of vision the internal capitalist contradictions and, finally, not to understand that now also the proletarian revolution will move forward by breaking through the imperialist front in separate countries. *We cannot maintain such a point of view.*

The growth of the revolutionary crisis takes place much more unevenly than does the development of the world economic crisis. The world economic crisis first undermined the stabilisation of the weakest capitalist countries, the weakest links of the capitalist system. The tendency toward a revolutionary crisis was first noticed in Poland. As the Fifth Congress of the C.P. of Poland said :

"Poland, one of the weakest links in the chain of decaying capitalist stabilisation. The impoverishment of the peasant masses, the liberation movement of the occupied and oppressed nationalities, its nearness to the State of the proletarian dictatorship where gigantic socialist construction is going on, means that the Polish proletariat finds itself face to face with a revolutionary situation sooner than the proletariat of other capitalist countries."

But, owing to the influence of the growing economic crisis, Germany quickly came on a level with Poland, and, in spite of its advanced technique and culture, became a no less weak link of capitalist stabilisation. How did this happen? In the period after the war, the process of the economic levelling was such that Poland remained behind, and Germany raised herself more quickly. The question of markets is equally important for both Polish and German capitalism, but, while this question was more acute before the crisis for Poland, the crisis has sharpened the problem of a market for Germany at a much faster rate.

Poland, moreover, belongs to the first category of European States, i.e., to States to which the Versailles system dispensed all the earthly goods, while Germany belongs to the second category, i.e., to the countries conquered in the world war, stripped and robbed and forced to pay according to the Young Plan. Naturally, the presence of such external-political conditions sharpened the economic crisis in Germany extremely, placed the problem of the revision of the intra-imperialist relations, the problem of the Versailles system, on the order of the day of Europe, as well as the question of the change of the established "balance of power."

The crisis, beginning with the Versailles system, pregnant with war, could not but sharpen the contradictions and the growth of the revolutionary upsurge of the masses. Moreover, Germany is the country which came out of the revolution of 1918 with a *breach* in the system of the bourgeois rule. All this, taken together, showed itself in the form of a

more rapid breakdown of German capitalism and, incidentally, in the tendency of the political revolutionary crisis there, growing more rapidly than elsewhere.

In a number of countries (e.g., Britain and others), where the general crisis of capitalism, although it has taken on the form of depression and decay of economy, has not developed so stormily as in Germany, the tendency of a political revolutionary crisis only develops considerably later.

If in Germany, Poland or in any other country, the crisis does not lead quickly to decisive battles, then this delay may give countries of such type as England a respite and a way out of the economic crisis into a depression, although with a considerable *breach* in their economy, with aggravated contradictions, with a more acute threat of war between imperialists, with growing signs of a general crisis of capitalism.

It follows, therefore, that the question of the conditions of the growth of the tendency of a revolutionary crisis is of great significance for the tactics of the Communist International.

* * *

What must and *can one understand by the economic and political crisis which is developing on the basis of a general crisis of capitalism?*

Lenin spoke repeatedly of the political crisis in the sense of a crisis of the bourgeois parties, for example, in connection with the presidential elections of 1912. But at that time there was neither a general crisis of capitalism, nor an economic crisis. Lenin also spoke of the "small" crises of capitalist society in the sense of "small" political crises, "of little crises of capitalist society."

"Is, for example, any strike anything else but a small crisis of capitalist society? Was not the Prussian Minister of Internal Affairs, Mr. Von Puttkammer, right when he pronounced his famous maxim—'The hydra of revolution peers out of every strike.'" (Lenin, V. xix., p. 352.)

These words refer to the present time even more than to the period when they were written, for now, more than ever before,

"every 'little' crisis opens up before us in miniature the elements and the seeds of the struggles which, in a period of great crisis, inevitably repeats itself on a large scale." (Lenin, V. XIX., p. 351)

Is this not true in regard to the textile strike of 1928, of May 1, 1929, in Berlin, the Mansfeld, Ruhr, Lancashire, South Wales and other strikes of 1930?

But we are not speaking now of these "small" crises. We have a more accurate answer to our question, in Lenin's opinions on the war crisis. In the Basle manifesto of 1912, it was written that war "creates an economic and political crisis."

"The question arises," says Lenin, "what was meant by this, in the Basle manifesto of 1912 and what actually took place in 1914-1915?"

“There was meant a revolutionary situation, briefly described as an ‘economic and political crisis.’” (Lenin, *VXVI. II.*, p. 245.)

This formula, given under conditions approaching the present, explains most clearly what one *should* understand by the conception of an economic and political crisis. However, in order to apply it we must remember that we live under conditions of a general crisis of capitalism which is already a general crisis of the whole system, i.e., an economic and political crisis.

What was meant by the Communist International when, in the face of the growing contradictions of capitalism, the growing shakiness of stabilisation and the growth of the leftward movement of the masses, and foreseeing the inevitability of an economic crisis, it spoke of the growing revolutionary upsurge?

There was meant a perspective of such a nature as that in which the masses become more and more revolutionary, the “small” crises become more and more frequent, and in which, with the collapse of stabilisation, a great political crisis of capitalism would “imperceptibly” set in—a revolutionary crisis, a revolutionary situation.

Consequently, *an economic and political crisis*, on the basis of a general crisis of capitalism—is also a revolutionary crisis, is also a direct revolutionary situation, i.e., such a situation when a revolution is *possible*, when the basic conditions for the victory of the revolution exist, although a revolutionary situation does not always lead to a revolution (for example, 1923 in Germany), and even more so, to a *successful* revolution (1918 in Germany and Austria). Consequently,

“*the growing over of an economic crisis into a political crisis is nothing other than the process of growth of a revolutionary crisis, i.e., a direct revolutionary situation, i.e., such a situation when the ‘upper strata’ can not, and the ‘lower strata’ will not live as formerly, when ‘changes’ have become imperative.*”

The ripening of a political crisis in the epoch of imperialist war, of course occurred differently from now. None the less, the characteristics of that political crisis are important for us to-day:

“A political crisis is present; not a single Government is *certain of to-morrow*, not a single one is free from the danger of a financial crash, the confiscation of territory, expulsion from their country (as the Government was banished from Belgium). All the Governments are living on a volcano, everyone appeals to the heroism of the masses.” (Lenin Works, Russian Edit., Vol. XVIII., p. 245.)

This formula of Lenin sets two questions before us: firstly, what forces are responsible for the creation then and to-day of a political crisis, and secondly, in which countries are present to-day those signs of a political crisis which were pointed to by Lenin in 1915?

The important characteristic feature of capitalism in a situation of its general crisis is that it has already

lost “authority,” that it has begun to feel uncertain of itself and is beginning to feel itself more and more as historically doomed. But the consciousness of its historical doom and the lack of faith in to-morrow are qualitatively different things: a revolutionary situation cannot exist unless the Government is uncertain of *to-morrow*.

Is such uncertainty of the Government in the morrow already present in Germany, Poland, Austria, not to speak of a number of other countries? Is such a threat of a financial crash present in the German, Polish and other Governments? Is such a situation present in which the Governments live as if on top of a volcano and themselves appeal to the masses?

It is clear that such a situation is growing in Poland and Germany, but it is equally clear that such a situation still does not exist yet in Germany, Poland, or any other *European* country, with the exception of *Spain*. Therefore, the statement of Comrade I. Kraus that there can be no controversy about the fact that an “economic and political crisis” and a “revolutionary situation” is already present (“Communist International,” Russian edition, No. 2, 1931) is incorrect. The statement of Comrade A. Martynov, in which, while correcting the mistake of those who said that a political crisis was present in *all* countries, he said that we already have a *political crisis* in Germany and Poland is also incorrect, although Comrade Martynov, in distinction from Comrade Kraus, does not imply thereby a revolutionary situation. Haste in “declaring” political crises actually means decreasing the significance of these crises, and belittling the prospects of the growth of a revolutionary crisis.

Comrade Kraus accepts without proof the formula that in Germany, besides the economic crisis, there is already a *political crisis*, and consequently a revolutionary situation, a formula which he should have proven in his article, while Comrade Martynov, presenting the regrouping of the class forces of the bourgeoisie in these countries, as a crisis of the upper strata in the presence of the elements of a crisis of the lower strata, comes to the conclusion that a ‘political crisis is already present in Germany and Poland.

But this does not conform with Lenin’s propositions which they cite in their articles.

Lenin’s formulae must not be dismembered. They must be taken as they are. For Lenin, in his two formulae on the signs of a revolutionary situation (Vol. XVIII., p. 244, and Vol. XXV., p. 224) the crises of the “upper” strata and the “lower” strata are inseparable (they are separable only by the scalpel of the anatomist-sociologist on paper, but not in actuality) and taken in isolation do not yet constitute a political crisis. According to Lenin, although there can be a “scissors” between the ripeness of the objective situation and the activity of the masses, the crisis of the “upper” strata can only set in when

through the breach, formed as a result of the policy of the ruling class, there bursts out the dissatisfaction and rebellion of the masses. A crisis of the "upper" strata can set in only when the "exploited and oppressed masses understand the impossibility of living in the old way and demand changes." Only then is created a situation in which the "upper" strata cannot live as of old, "can not hold sway as of old."

Some comrades think that if the bourgeoisie pass from democratic methods to fascist ones, that already denotes a crisis of the "upper" strata because it proves the "impossibility of the ruling class maintaining their rule unchanged," that it is already a situation when the "upper" strata can not live as of old." But this is a parliamentary-democratic approach to the question.

Certainly, the approaching crisis forces the bourgeoisie to change the methods and forms of their dictatorship, but it is only under the condition that the masses, by their offensive, by their growing activity "do not permit themselves to be robbed passively" that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is undermined, is shaken. The increase of fascist methods, is not yet such a "crisis" which would signify, first of all, in view of the approaching crisis, a change in the methods of ruling and a regrouping of the forces of the ruling classes, in order to avert the development of a revolutionary upsurge and a growing revolutionary crisis. But there is one feature already present in the growth of fascism which testifies to the accumulation of a political revolutionary crisis—it is the fact that the ruling classes have *themselves* been forced to draw in a definite part of the petty bourgeoisie into politics, it is the fact that these strata, formerly uninterested in politics, begin to participate in political life, even though it is with the help of the fascist parties.

Only through such an understanding of the question of the crisis does the significance of the growing revolutionary upsurge, of the organised repulse to capitalists and the work of the Communist Parties become understandable.

A political crisis is, above all, a crisis in the relation between the ruling and oppressed and signifies *the weakening of the ruling classes and the strengthening of the oppressed classes.*

The tremendous significance of the elections to the German Reichstag consists in the fact that they illuminated the re-alignment of forces which had begun in Germany and thus became an actual factor in increasing the rate of drawing into politics of those layers of the whole population which had until now been passive and apathetic. If the elections showed also that this activation is not yet going on completely in the interests of the proletariat, that, together with the mobilisation of the forces of the revolution, there is also a rapid mobilisation of the forces of counter-

revolution, there can, nevertheless, be but one conclusion for the Communist Parties: to increase their work in the mobilisation of the masses. The preparedness of the masses for struggle does not come simply out of the objective setting—this lesson the Communist Party of Germany learned from the elections.

The proletariat can create a desperate situation for the ruling classes only when a majority of them have been lifted to such a stage of revolutionary consciousness that they are ready to go to their death in order to overthrow capitalism.

In order to corroborate our idea, we turn to two basic formulas of Lenin. The first relates to 1921:

"For the revolution it is not sufficient that the exploited and oppressed masses understand the impossibility of living in the old way and demand changes; for the revolution it is necessary that the exploiters should not be allowed to live and rule as of old. Only when the 'lower classes' do not want the old order, and when the 'upper classes' cannot hold sway as of old, then only can the revolution succeed. This truth may be expressed in other words: revolution is impossible without a general national crisis, i.e., affecting both the exploited and the exploiters. Consequently, for the revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or, at any rate, a majority of the class-conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for a revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes be undergoing a governmental crisis which attracts even the most backward masses into politics (the sign of every real revolution is: a rapid tenfold, or even hundredfold, increase in the number of representatives of the toiling and oppressed masses, heretofore apathetic, who are capable of carrying on a political struggle), weakens the Government, and makes possible its sudden overthrow by the revolutionists." (Lenin, Collected Works, Russ. edit., Vol. XXV., pp. 223-224.)

Lenin formulates the question similarly on the relation of the subjective factor to the objective setting in his earlier formulation (1915):

"What are, generally speaking, the characteristics of a revolutionary situation? We will hardly be mistaken if we point to the following three main signs: (1) the impossibility for the ruling classes to maintain their power unchanged; a crisis of the 'upper strata' in one form or another, a crisis in the policy of the ruling classes resulting in a breach through which the dissatisfaction and the revolt of the oppressed classes breaks through. It is ordinarily not enough that the 'lower classes' merely desire, for a revolution to take place, they must demand, if the 'upper classes' are no longer to be able to live as of old. (2) The sharpening beyond normal of the want and misery of the oppressed classes. (3) A significant increase in the force of the causes pointed out, of the activity of the masses, in the 'peaceful' epoch which allows itself to be robbed passively, and in a stormy period drawing to an independent historical attack both the entire setting of the crisis as well as the 'upper classes' themselves." (Lenin, Vol. XVIII., p. 244.)

Lenin speaks with equal positiveness of the role of the subjective factor: the victory of the revolution is *impossible* if the revolutionary class, under the leader-

ship of the revolutionary power, proves unable to *act*, not strong enough to overthrow the old Government.

But these acts are possible, however, only on the basis of objective conditions, independent of the consciousness of a change in the setting, a change whose totality is defined by the words—a revolutionary situation.

In our time, when such a collapse as that in the first after-war period does not yet exist, but in which the contradictions of capitalism have grown extraordinarily and the hopelessness of the outlook of capitalism is even greater than in that period, it is already essential to move the preparation of the subjective factor incomparably further. The revolutionary upsurge opens up the possibility of developing the activity of the Party widely along the lines of the organisation of the masses for the revolution.

Stabilisation does not collapse by itself. The economic crisis does not grow over into a political crisis by itself. The revolutionary upsurge, driven by the economic crisis and calling forth a sharpening of the ordinary needs and poverty of the oppressed classes, disorganises stabilisation, leads to a political crisis, to a revolutionary crisis, to a revolutionary situation.

* * *

The after-war epoch is an epoch of a terrible increase of armies. War and preparation for war has become an inalienable part of the policy of capitalists. Weapons have become the steadfast support of the ruling classes against the oppressed, armies have become the chief apparatus of the bourgeois governing machine. At the same time, the after-war epoch is one of the fusion of Social Democratic and reformist trade unions with the bourgeois State apparatus and the epoch of the growth of fascism.

While the increasing of armies only signifies a quantitative change in the bourgeois State machine, the fusion of the Social Democrat and reformist trade unions with the bourgeois State apparatus, introduces something new in principle, something which had not existed before the war.

Due to this fusion to-day, the bourgeois State apparatus cannot be broken down without the influence of the Social Democrats over the masses first being liquidated. Unless the influence of the Social Democrats over the masses in the foremost imperialist countries is liquidated, a serious crisis of the policy of the ruling classes, of a crisis of the "upper strata" is impossible. It is equally true that the decay of Social Democracy, the liquidation of its mass influence leads inevitably to a decay of the power of the bourgeoisie, because "Social Democracy is the bulwark of imperialism." Consequently, the crisis of the mass influence of Social Democracy is an absolutely necessary condition for the crisis of the

bourgeois policy of oppression, for the crisis of the "upper strata" and a political crisis as a whole.

What leads to a crisis of the mass influence of Social Democracy, i.e., to a crisis in Social Democracy?

The economic crisis, the break-up of stabilisation, the growth of the revolutionary upsurge breaks down Social Democracy, exposes the Social Democratic theory of socialisation on the basis of stabilisation, rationalisation, and parliamentary "democracy." The sharpening crisis, the impoverishment of the masses beyond its normal state, destroys democratic illusions. But the collapse, the crash, the crisis in Social Democracy can not spring up "spontaneously." It must be organised. The manoeuvres of Social Democracy by which it attempts to retain its mass influence, must be exposed. Social Democracy helps the bourgeoisie to pass on the burden of the crisis on to the working-class, to lower wages, dismiss "superfluous" workers, impose new taxes, in order to save themselves from financial crash. We can not say that so far it has not been successful in spite of the growing opposition of the masses,—because we cannot yet speak of a crisis in Social Democracy. But the failure of such measures will show that Social Democracy is losing its mass influence, that this bulwark is falling away from the bourgeois, that a crisis of Social Democracy is present.

Such a crisis of Social Democracy exists neither in Poland nor in Germany, but it is already beginning there, is growing, is drawing near. The strike of the Ruhr miners gains, therefore, great significance in principle, because it developed apart from Social Democracy and against it, because it heralds the beginning of a crisis in Social Democracy.

The sign of the approach of the revolutionary crisis generally, of the crisis of Social Democracy in particular, is the growth of mass fascist organisations. It is not enough to say that this growth signifies a regrouping of the forces of the bourgeoisie. It signifies that the ruling classes *themselves* have been forced to appeal to the masses for the preservation of their regime of oppression and for overcoming the differences within the ruling classes, forced to draw into politics new layers which had, until now, not participated in it, to make the old staff of the bourgeois parties more active.

The growth of fascism is the product of the break-up of stabilisation and the growth of the tendency of a revolutionary crisis, but it is a means, for the bourgeoisie, of overcoming these tendencies as well. The growth of fascism signifies that the most backward, petty-bourgeois layers of the nation are "driven" into politics by the growth of need—the task of the Communists is to direct them away from the path of counter-revolution on to the path of revolution. Only when the crisis of Social Democ-

racy is present, and when the work of the Communist Parties will have closed the possibility for the bourgeoisie to mobilise new masses of the workers into the fascist organisations, only then will it be possible to say that a revolutionary crisis is present.

Therefore, in our epoch, the fact that a struggle goes on "between separate layers of the ruling class for a share of the totally diminishing income," that there is "friction on the question of the direction of economic policy (E. Varga) "Communist International," No. 1, 1931), etc., is far from enough for the appearance of a political, i.e., a revolutionary crisis. In order that a revolutionary crisis should appear, above all, the bloc between the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy must be undermined, the influence of Social Democracy on the masses must be undermined, and the possibility for the bourgeoisie to mobilise the backward layers of the nation who have been "driven" into politics, into the fascist organisations, liquidated. It is in this that the crisis of the "upper strata" now consists.

"Stabilisation is coming to an end"—this is already clear to everyone.

The revolutionary upsurge is growing even though disproportionately. The task of the Communist Parties is to *organise* it. The essence of the question lies in that.

The essence of the question lies in the revolutionary struggle *driving* the bourgeoisie into such a state that it is no longer in a condition "to govern as of old," the essence of the question is to deprive it of reserves, to intercept the awakening, formerly apathetic, masses, and not allow them to be used as reserves for counter-revolution, but to direct them on the rails of revolution.

Social Democracy fetters the masses with the intensification of the crisis. It is necessary to say clearly that the revolutionary crisis will be the deepest, but also the shortest crisis, consequently the least torturing for the working population and the only real way out from the present crisis which has brought dreadful unemployment, want, and poverty.

ORGANISATIONAL TASKS AT A NEW STAGE

By O. BEVER.

IF an active member of any Communist Party in a capitalist country is asked what is the fundamental weakness in the work of the Communist Party, he will answer at once: the lagging of organisational work behind the tempo of the Leftward swing of the toiling masses in the towns and the villages, behind the growth of the new revolutionary upsurge of the workers' movement. This answer would be perfectly correct.

There is not a single Communist Party which does not feel the weakness of organisational work very keenly in the course of all the big political campaigns, and especially in the course of the mass actions of the proletariat.

This disharmony is expressed most clearly in the fact of the weakness in the numerical growth, and in some cases the numerical decline, of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union oppositions. This is the case, for instance, in England and France, in spite of the fact that the Communist Parties of these countries have had a correct political line and have acted in circumstances of a sharp leftward movement of the broad working masses of town and country.

Whereas in 1928 the numerical decline of some Communist Parties might have been explained by the departure of opportunist elements who could not or would not carry out the new line fixed by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, in 1930 this explanation clearly will not stand criticism. In the same way it is impossible to explain the pheno-

menon by the growing terror of the employers and the police. *Under conditions of a growing revolutionary upsurge*, when non-Party workers very frequently take part in militant activity, repression against the working-class merely strengthens their sympathy to their revolutionary party, and at the present time the Communist Parties in all countries are the only revolutionary parties of the proletariat. Thus, there remains only one explanation: *unsatisfactory organisational work, insufficient attention to the questions of organisational work, insufficient self-criticism of all the present forms and methods of building the Party, insufficient determination and consistency in carrying out in practice the organisational directions of the Communist International, an insufficiently energetic and determined struggle against the relics of Social democratic and anarcho-syndicalist traditions in the sphere of party constructional tasks.*

If the present organisational work of the Communist Parties is unsatisfactory, it must be changed. In what direction? The starting point for the immediate future is still the directives given by the session of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. in February, 1930:

"Along with the greatest possible strengthening of agitational and propagandist work, it is necessary to assure the reorganisation of the forms and methods of work of the Communist Parties to correspond to the tasks of the leadership of the mass activity of the proletariat, the farm labourers and the poorest section of the peasants (both within the country and in the colonies), making practical prepara-

tions for the mass activity." (See Political Resolution of the February Presidium of the E.C.C.I.)

At the present stage of development of the world economic crisis, these directives become more urgent. *At the present moment, the central task of all Communist Parties is to organise resistance to the capitalist offensive and to prepare for a revolutionary way out of the crisis.*

When we study the concrete forms of the mass activity of the proletariat, two typical forms of this activity in recent times become strikingly evident—the economic strikes of employed workers and demonstrations of the unemployed. The Communist International sets the task of fusing these two currents. Until very recently, the contact between them in practice has been very weak, and this had its inevitable undesirable effects on the whole of the struggle of the working-class. Consequently the concrete methods and forms of party work (and also the structure of party organisations) must now in the first place correspond to the demands of the preparation, the development and the leadership of the economic struggles of the workers, and demonstrations of the unemployed, these two forms of the struggle of the proletariat being linked by strong internal connections.

The solution of these tasks in turn demands the following organisational prerequisites: (1) the existence of strong Party organisations (factory cells) in the most important big works, and the existence of strong and reliable fractions in the trade unions of the workers in these works, and also fractions in the organisations of the unemployed; (2) the structure of all these lower Party organisations must be such as to assure that they will be in constant close mutual contact and will have strong Party leadership; (3) there must be the greatest flexibility of the whole system of the Party organisation so that the Party will be able to concentrate its forces swiftly on the most important sectors and reorganise itself again with corresponding speed.

The last demand forms the starting point for good Party work in general, but it is especially important at the present moment. The Communist Parties do not yet understand the mechanism of the development of the new revolutionary upsurge. Besides this, the revolutionary workers' movement is developing with extreme irregularity not only according to countries but even within each country and in various branches of industry.

The proletariat has not yet succeeded in wresting the initiative of the offensive from the hands of the ruling classes and has not yet succeeded in commencing a *general* counter-attack. Under such conditions the Communist Parties must set themselves the task of utilising every single partial revolutionary action by the proletariat for the purpose of extending it, raising it to a higher level, linking it

up with the other revolutionary acts of the working-class, and in this way causing these concrete acts to become starting points for a general counter-attack by the proletariat against the foundations of capitalism. *Such tactics can only be carried on if the Party organisations and the mass organisations connected with them adopt shock methods, and consequently if the Party structure is adapted for shock methods. What is meant by shock methods with regard to the Party organisations of capitalist countries?*

Its meaning is as follows. At any moment, the Party leadership must concentrate its attention and forces on the most important sectors where the mass activity of the proletariat is being prepared or is already developing. Such an approach requires a rapid regrouping of forces, the formation of special temporary groups with definite concrete aims and united by the single authority of the leaders, etc. *The shock brigades, which are used with such great success in the U.S.S.R. for carrying out the Five Year Plan in four years, must be applied in another form in capitalist countries. In the near future such brigades must form one of the fundamental methods of Party work, assuring for the Communist Parties the possibility of resisting all the attacks of the class enemy and in the future making them starting points for the revolutionary counter-attack and the general counter-offensive of the proletariat.*

While vigilantly following all the manoeuvres of the class enemy and rapidly concentrating forces on all the sectors of the front which are threatened by the blows of the ruling classes and their social-fascist assistants, the Communist Parties must steadfastly and with the greatest persistence develop the basic strategic plan of their organisational consolidation by means of penetration into the big factories, the most important branches of industry, etc., and the consolidation of their forces there. More concretely, their line must be to form in the big factories in the most important branches of industry strong factory cells and factory groups of the corresponding trade unions, while at the same time carrying on increased work to win these trade unions as a whole.

Along these lines, there has not been sufficient persistence and determination in the work of all Communist Parties up to very recent times. Much has been said, there have been many circulars and resolutions, but satisfactory results in the organisational sphere have been insufficient, even in such strong Communist Parties as the Communist Party of Germany, where, according to the data of the chief of the organisation department of the Central Committee, in January, 1931, the necessary change had not been brought about in the work of the factory cells. It is true that the ruling classes excel in inventing every kind of hindrance to the formation of strong factory cells in the big works. But these hindrances

and even the furious terrorism of the bourgeoisie in general is no argument for the absence of progress in the matter of factory cells. There exists no terror and no hindrance which could break or defeat the Bolshevik determination of the Communist Party.

But in this case, the most urgent tasks for all Communist Parties at the present moment, are *the tasks of concrete leadership and the verification of fulfilment*. . . This must be applied first of all to the tasks in the sphere of the work of factory cells and the trade unions—systematic verification of the fulfilment of directives, additional instructions, the greatest concreteness in fixing the personal responsibility of individual activists for carrying out tasks, the organisation of auxiliary shock groups having also their own personally responsible organisers, etc., etc. Such a system of concrete direction and the verification of fulfilment must be introduced from top to bottom.

The verification of fulfilment of tasks will give no result, and consequently will be unnecessary, if it is limited merely to the registration of shortcomings in the work and the pointing out of the subjective and objective causes of these weaknesses, as has been the case in all Parties up to the most recent time. It is true that old Social Democratic traditions in the sphere of everyday Party work still play a very strong role in the activity of the Communist Parties of capitalist countries, and it is a perfectly correct slogan, to carry on a merciless struggle against these traditions. At the same time it is no less true that the struggle against these traditions will not give any serious results if the traditions are not only opposed but replaced by other Bolshevik methods of Party work and if considerable work is not carried on for concretely explaining the practical use of these methods. Moreover, it is exactly in this matter that the criticism and self-criticism of the Communist Parties suffers to the greatest extent from lack of concreteness.

Recently in all Communist Parties, a new cause has figured when explaining the weakness of organisational work—the *practical opportunism* of the lower Party activists and the members of factory cells. On the other hand, failures when carrying out political campaigns and when developing and leading the strike movement, are explained as a rule by the absence of strong factory cells in the works. Thus we obtain a vicious circle: mass revolutionary activity cannot be developed because there are no factory cells and factory nuclei cannot be organised because the Party workers in the factories are opportunist in practice.

The way out of this situation can only be found if the approach to organisational work, including the work in factory nuclei, is changed, and subordinated to the concrete tasks of the organisation of resistance to the attack of capital and to preparations for a revolutionary

way out of the crisis, so that shock methods can be utilised to the greatest possible extent.

For example, suppose at some factory that there is a ferment among the workers in connection with the attempts of the employers to reduce wages, and at this factory there are, say, two or three Communists, while in other factories of the same town or settlement there are two or three dozen members of the Party (a very typical case for England). If all Party members in this town or settlement work each according to their place of residence or work, even if they were all marvels, no great results could be expected from their work. It is another matter if the Local Party Committee mobilises the whole Party organisation consisting of twenty or thirty Party members and, organising shock groups among them with concrete and definite tasks, throws these groups on to the preparation of a strike in the factories where the revolutionary ferment has commenced amongst the workers. Probably the first step would be to form initiative groups of struggle in the various workshops, then committees of struggle, the calling of delegate conferences, etc., etc.

During the course of this work for the preparation of militant action, a Communist kernel must be consolidated and strengthened, and around the previous two or three Party members there must be grouped new elements from among the sympathisers. The cell will be strengthened and *it will be strengthened in the struggle as the leading centre of the revolutionary activists among the workers of these factories, relying on a broader non-Party body of activists (committees of struggle, factory revolutionary trade union organisation, etc.), i.e., it will thus be converted into the real foundation and the most important organisation of the Communist Party.*

According to the course of events, the shock groups with definite objects which are organised by the Party committee to assist the Party organisation of the given factory may be dissolved or re-grouped. It may be that they need to be rapidly transferred to some other sector of the class struggle.

Along these lines we must search for the ways and means of liquidating the backwardness of organisational work in the growth of the political influence of the Communist Party. *The fundamental condition for overcoming this backwardness is a correct political line combined with ability to throw out the necessary slogans for mobilising the masses. Without this preliminary condition, the best organisers who understand international experience perfectly with regard to all organisational schemes and structures, will not be able to perform any serious work.*

What would have happened, for instance, if the Communist International had permitted a united front from above with Social Democratic organisations? Corresponding mistakes made by various Communist Parties show that the adoption of this

line under present conditions inevitably leads all the Communist Parties into a situation in which they, together with the Social Democratic leaders, play the role of strike breakers and traitors to the revolutionary struggle of the workers. The same is true with regard to slogans.

In the programme of the Communist International adopted by the Sixth Congress, there is a point which says :

“Not to utilise the culminating point in the development of a revolutionary situation, when the most determined attack on the enemy is required from the Party of the proletariat . . . and not to commence a revolt, is equivalent to handing over the initiative to the enemy and dooming the revolution to defeat.”

Although the hour of armed rebellion has not yet arrived for the Communist Parties of capitalist countries, nevertheless all the workers in Communist Parties must take serious thought concerning this paragraph in the programme of the Communist International, when deciding the question of carrying on any serious political campaign (e.g., the International Day for the Struggle against Unemployment) and in general when preparing any mass revolutionary activity (strikes, demonstrations, etc.).

In contradistinction to the anarchists and the Mensheviks, the Communist Parties cannot rely on spontaneity and are obliged to prepare politically and organisationally for every expression of activity in the most serious manner, but at the same time they must watch vigilantly so as not to let pass the vital moment, otherwise the most careful preparation will be useless.

The realisation of this most important point in the tactics of the Communist Parties demands in turn that the Parties should keep in close contact with all that is taking place in the midst of the working-class, what moods are growing there, how strong they are, and, which is most important, in which concrete forms the revolutionary activity of the proletarian masses is growing.

For example, the C.P.G.B. and the English Y.C.L. in 1929 were continually losing members. In this same year, 1929, the number of workers taking part in strikes increased from 124,000 to 534,000 in comparison with 1928. The official reports of the C.P.G.B. state that all these strikes took place against the wishes of the official trade union leaders, and that on the other hand, the role of the Y.C.L. and the Party in their preparation was either insignificant or was altogether absent. To a considerable extent, literally the same thing may be said regarding the strikes in England during the last six months, in which about 600,000 workers took part and which showed the greatest stubbornness and a determined fighting spirit among the broad masses of the English proletariat.

The question naturally arises—suppose in England there was carried on immediately a real businesslike

study of these movements, commencing from the establishment of contacts with those non-Party workers who were the organisers and leaders of the movements, together with them, carefully discovering how they acted, what were their methods of propaganda, agitation and organisation, who were their supporters, why did they act without contacts with the Communist Party and the national Minority Movement, etc. Probably, if the questions were raised in this manner, the C.P.G.B. could find new and excellent fighting cadres, could find the proper methods of approach to the masses and also could discover the shortcomings in its own work which up to the present have so strongly separated it from the masses. It would be completely incorrect to limit ourselves to a study of the methods of preparation and organisation of strikes alone, taking into consideration the special features of the present severe economic crisis.

In this respect, a good lesson is given by the decision of the Russian Bolshevik C.C. in January, 1912, on the question of the struggle of the proletariat under conditions of an economic crisis and the growth of the revolutionary workers movement. This decision was edited by Lenin and is a most important document, being of international importance. It proposes the organisation of a Bolshevik Party, arising from a general estimate of the situation, and at the same time is based on a concrete and careful study of the situation in various branches of industry and individual factories.

The above-mentioned resolution proposes with regard to factories which are weakened by the crisis, stay-in strikes, brief partial strikes in departments, mass demonstrations as being more suitable to the concrete circumstances. This experience of the Bolshevik Party which has now been tested out must certainly be taken into consideration, and in this matter it should be emphasised with special force that the most important duty of the Party organisations and the revolutionary trade union opposition is to seize and develop the initiative of the workers themselves regarding every kind of mass revolutionary activity. Lenin constantly emphasised that the Party as the vanguard and leader of the working-class must at the same time constantly learn from the masses.

The most important example of this “learning” is the Soviets which were formed in 1905 by the revolutionary creative force of the masses, and the idea of which has been seized and deepened by the Bolshevik Party. In 1928, the French proletariat brought forward the idea of broad workers’ congresses as forms of organisation of strikes. This form brilliantly justified itself and has now become a regular method of the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. The task of the Party is to

seize promptly on any such initiative from the masses. The same should have been done with the unemployed movement at the end of December, 1930, when it reached a great height, so as to be able to put forward now the slogan of an international day with the idea of carrying on the smallest amount of preparatory work.

The development of revolutionary initiative of the masses who are moving towards the Left must be carried on by the Communist Parties by the organisational forms of this initiative (Committees of Action, etc.). The Party must weld together Communist groups, must boldly open the doors of the Party in such cases to the non-Party worker activists and also to the dissatisfied Social Democratic workers who are leading mass actions. Simultaneously, the Party organisation must be rapidly reorganised so as to become the fundamental internal driving force.

This bold and rapid manoeuvring with slogans, this rapid transfer of Party forces to the most important sectors, requires the existence of the following two preliminary factors: (1) the existence of a strong Party leadership from top to bottom, Party committees from top to bottom which are strong and equal to their task; and (2) a radical change in the present character of the Party Press.

On the first question we have to recommend once more the same resolution of the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party in 1912. With regard to organisational structure of the lower Party committees, this resolution proposed the following: at the head should be the conspirative trio appointed by a higher Party committee, then members of the committee, elected by the most important Party nuclei and fractions in trade union organisations.

Such an organisational structure guaranteed the carrying out of the line of the C.C. (and concealed the leading group from the police) and guaranteed a constant contact between the leading group of the committee (in modern terminology, the bureau) and the most important lower links of the Party organisations, linking up the Party with the most important sectors of the class struggle. This structure can be recommended at the present time.

Naturally, an illegal bureau is not essential for legal parties, but with regard to the present legal parties a definite rule must be established that the bureau of the Party committee must be carefully selected by the higher Party committees and that the higher Party committee must not wait till the date of the election. If necessary, it must raise the question of elections before the appointed date and in extremely urgent cases must make changes in the composition of the bureaux of the lower Party committees without elections if the bureau does not give the necessary guarantees for the carrying out of the general line of the whole Party and of the whole of the Communist International for preparing and developing the mass

revolutionary activity of the workers against the offensive of the employers, for a general counter-offensive by the proletariat.

If the legal Communist Parties, such as the German, Czecho-Slovakian, etc., do not yet need Party committees appointed from above owing to the impossibility of holding elections owing to police conditions, the question of an illegal apparatus and illegal methods of work by the Party committees is becoming of increasing importance. The Party activists must not delay in studying these questions and the Party leaders must prepare suitable cadres and carry on organisational and technical preparation from the point of view of arranging that even unexpected blows by reaction will be not able to destroy the fundamental links of the Party apparatus and the contacts of the Party organisations with the masses. This first of all applies to work in the factories, to factory nuclei. The factory nuclei must compulsorily be constructed as an illegal organisation with all the consequences arising therefrom as pointed out in the instructions of the organisational department of the E.C.C.I. on the work of factory nuclei.

With regard to the Party Press, the change which is necessary is as follows: in all Communist Parties the Press to a considerable extent lives a more or less independent life. The corresponding Party committees limit their Party situation to the appointment of a responsible editor or editorial board, and from time to time discussing individual disputed points. The editors are not connected directly with the Party leaders, and naturally they cannot carry out the Party line with sufficient consistency and energy. This situation with the Party Press must come to an end. Every number of the Party newspapers must be drawn up from start to finish in such a way that Party members and sympathising workers can receive an absolutely concrete idea from its contents as to the Party line at the moment, as to the concrete tasks set by the Party leaders, as to how these tasks are being carried out, what are the most important slogans of the moment, etc.

What is required for this? (1) The responsible editor must be a member of the committee or a fully trusted person who is present at all sessions of the bureau. (2) At every session of the bureau, the back numbers of the paper should be discussed and the line and the most important articles for the coming numbers should be indicated. In individual cases, especially during strikes and other mass actions, the question of the contents of every number of the Party organ must be the subject of special care by the Party leaders. (3) All the leading articles and other important articles in the paper must not only be approved by the editor or editorial board, but in the main must have the approval of the bureau (through the secretariat). (4) Every number must be drawn up in such a way as to give the general line and at the

same time to point out concretely how to carry on this line, how to ward off the blows of the social-fascists, the fascists and other opponents, etc., must analyse the experience of the past in the greatest detail (as far as possible under police and other conditions), must show and explain all concrete mistakes and shortcomings, etc.

The newspaper itself must be in the closest contact with the working masses. The most suitable and reliable form of such contact is the formation of support groups in factories and districts. These groups of support together with the Communist groups must attract the widest possible sections of sympathising non-Party workers. The tasks of these groups are : (a) to assist in the distribution of the newspaper ; (b) to assist in strengthening the material basis of the newspaper by organising the collection of money, votes of money, etc. ; (c) to organise and develop the workers' correspondent movement ; (d) to organise systematic discussions of the contents of the paper with the extensive attraction of non-Party workers, and as far as possible with the participation of representatives of the editor. All propositions adopted at such meetings must be carefully studied in the editorial board and the results reported to the Party committee (the verification of fulfilment and directives of how to utilise to the best effect the materials of these meetings) ; (e) to support the formation of factory newspapers and to establish contacts between the editors of these papers and the editors of the Party organ.

All these measures must be carried out without fail and as quickly as possible, because a well-organised Party Press is the most powerful weapon in the hands of the Party for the Bolshevik line and for a powerfully organised Communist Party.

In conclusion, a few words are necessary on the subject of cadres. A special and detailed article is needed to deal with this question. In all Parties the fulfilment of the line of the Communist International meets with difficulties owing to the absence of cadres. It must be repeated that these excuses concerning the

absence of cadres are not convincing and they testify to the fact that in addition to the general insufficiency of attention to questions of organisational work in the Communist Parties, there is not the necessary attention to the question of cadres ; there is not a correct line or the necessary boldness in attracting new forces.

As the quintessence of this question under present-day conditions, it will be very useful to repeat the words of Lenin on the question of cadres at the time of the revolutionary upsurge in 1905, in the article "New tasks, new forces." At the end of this article in which he raised enormous tasks arising from the political crisis of Czarism and the development of the revolutionary upsurge of the workers' movement, for the young and organisationally weak Russian Social-Democratic Party, Lenin wrote : "There are masses of people and there are no people."

In this contradictory formula is concentrated the contradiction of the organisation and life and the organisational demands of Social-Democracy. And this contradiction comes out at the present time with special force ! With equal frequency we hear from all parts passionate appeals for new forces, complaints about the absence of people in the organisations and alongside of this there is everywhere a tremendous supply of assistance, a growth of young forces especially among the working-class . . . whoever talks in this way cannot see the wood for the trees and confesses that he has been blinded by events, that he, the revolutionist, is not the master of events but they are his master and have crushed him. Such an organiser had better *remain on one side*, had better make place for young forces whose energy can frequently take the place of insufficient experience.

There are people and in revolutionary Russia there were never such masses as now. There are masses of people and we need only to throw overboard tailist ideas and sermonising and give scope to inventiveness and initiative . . . and then we shall be worthy representatives of the great revolutionary class.

THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL-SOCIALIST MOVEMENT AND ITS METHODS OF WORK AMONG THE MASSES

By L. ALFRED.

FASCISM is one method by which the bourgeoisie fights against the working-class. Its task consists in fighting and keeping down by force the revolutionary workers' movement, and particularly, in destroying the Communist vanguard of the working-class.

It would, however, be incorrect to describe every method of violence, every act of civil war committed by the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the working-class, simply as fascism, just as it would be wrong to regard every form of the direct dictatorship of the

bourgeoisie as a fascist dictatorship. Among the distinguishing features of fascism, as the Programme of the Communist International clearly asserts, are, besides active terrorism, the elements of social demagoguery and corruption.

Fascism appears as a *movement* which, it is true, is everywhere supported by the ruling bourgeoisie, organised and financed by them and is always placed, more or less openly, under the protection of the bourgeois State apparatus, with which it is connected, but which, to outward appearances, is independent

of the State machine. Fascism does not form a constituent part of the bourgeois State from the beginning, but appears as a political party, just like the Social-Democratic and other parties of the bourgeoisie. Under the terrorist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, it tries to create as wide a mass basis as possible. It does not confine itself to organising the openly bourgeois elements as a united counter-revolutionary force, it also recruits cannon fodder for the counter-revolution from among all other sections of the population.

In these efforts fascism avails itself of quite peculiar methods of mass work, organisation and agitation. These methods form the subject of this article, which deals chiefly with the most recent factual material on German fascism, that is, with the so-called National Socialist Labour Party of Germany.

MILITARIST LEAGUE ORGANISATION.

The original and predominating organisational form of fascism is the militarist league.* It is only at a certain stage of development in the fascist movement that "civil" party organisations have been formed besides the military ones. In Germany, as in Italy, the militarist-fascist organisations were formed expressly for the struggle to crush the revolutionary movement of the working-class; their members are frankly guards of the bourgeoisie in the civil war, employed not only in times of avowed civil warfare, but permanently, in order to terrorise the revolutionary working-class, as recent experience in Germany, Poland, Finland, etc., eloquently shows. They are the murder battalions of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, regarding the murder of revolutionary workers as their regular occupation and fully aware that this may demand sacrifices on their part. The militarist leagues of the German national fascists have therefore introduced a special insurance fund to cover any case of death among their members. In some speakers' notes on this question it is stated that:

"Our movement is a fighting movement, and fighting demands sacrifices—think of the storm divisions which stand in the foremost ranks."

The present militarist organisations of the national socialists fall into two groups, with different duties: storm divisions and defence corps. While the storm divisions, the broader organisation, represent the great National Socialist army of civil warfare, the defence corps were originally a special guard, a central group trained for special purposes. They have to carry out specially important secret tasks and to undertake the personal protection of Adolf Hitler and other "great leaders." They arose as terrorist

groups, as a sort of political police force. Corresponding to these important tasks, the defence corps, until very recently quite small from the numerical standpoint, were formed of carefully selected and thoroughly reliable elements. Like the storm divisions they have, up to the present, been under the direct political leadership of the civil National Socialist Party.

In the last few months extremely interesting tendencies, pointing to a radical re-grouping within these organisations, have made themselves apparent. They are directed towards (1) making the storm divisions an independent organisation, that is, withdrawing them from the direct guidance of the party, and (2) giving the defence corps, the special guards, the character of a broader mass organisation.

These questions have formed the subject of heated discussions within the camp of the National Socialists. They are not questions of mere organisational expediency. These tendencies of reorganisation express the political processes occurring inside the National Socialist camp; they must be considered in connection with the rebellion against the party leadership now taking place within the national-fascist movement.

The reasons for this rebellion are well known. Before its election victory the National Socialist Party solemnly declared to its adherents that it was not an ordinary political party "which pursues any party aims and then tries to achieve a few of its election promises by some political wangle." (From the Introduction to the National Socialist Programme.) It promises to fight against the Young Plan, against finance capital, particularly "Jewish high finance," against enslavement to the bankers and usurers. The masses were led to believe that in the near future the National Socialists would lead them to a decisive battle against the "Jewish Marxist republic," against the rule of the Social Democrats in Prussia, etc., and that the posts of the fascist "third empire" would be occupied by the adherents of the National Socialist Party.

After its election victory all these promises were forgotten. The National Socialists initiated no struggle against the Young Plan, but came out as another Young party. There was no breath of struggle against capitalism, nor against the Jewish or even Aryan capitalists. On the day that the new *Reichstag* was opened, some thousands of members and adherents of the National Socialist Party, gathered in the Leipziger Strasse, Berlin, demonstrated against the Jewish shopkeepers and broke several windows, whereupon their leaders hastened to dissociate themselves from this action, which was completely in line with their anti-semitic programme, and branded it as "Communist provocation," declaring that in the fascist third empire Jewish shops and warehouses would be better protected than they were in the Marxist Jewish republic. Instead of the

* This subject has been dealt with by Comrade Eberlein in No. 37 of the C.I. 1930; in order to avoid repetition we shall confine ourselves here to a description of the development of these associations in the last few months, during which time they were subjected to a process of reorganisation which is not yet ended.

decisive action, the "revolution" by means of which the fascists had promised to change the situation of the desperate middle classes, they did their best to demonstrate their complete innocence of any revolutionary intentions and their capacity to take part in a coalition with other bourgeois parties, "trying to achieve a few of their election promises by political wangling," — activities so solemnly condemned in their programme.

The rebellion is particularly noticeable among the storm divisions, which include the most active elements in the National Socialist movement; the strength of the storm divisions is found among the students and the unemployed intellectuals, whose impulse to activity is explained by the fact that most of them have no prospect of employment and see their only hope in a revolution which, as their leaders promised them, would push all the "Marxists" out of the State and industrial apparatus in order to make room for the National Socialist warriors. Naturally the chief cause of the radicalisation of these petty-bourgeois sections is the crisis of capitalism, the effects of capitalist rationalisation, which affects the petty-bourgeois employees and officials just as much as the workers. The storm divisions are also formed of those working-class elements, mostly unemployed, whom the fascists have been able to win over by their unscrupulous revolutionary demagoguery.

These elements within the storm divisions are extremely dissatisfied with the opportunist (the fascists also use this word) policy and the passivity of the party and are demanding a revolutionary struggle for power. This opposition sentiment is particularly strong in Berlin, where there have been collisions between members of the storm divisions and adherents of the party leadership.

The leaders, who are now feeling the effects of their hollow election demagoguery, have their hands full in quelling this rebellion. For this purpose they are resorting to desperate and startling manoeuvres, the most glaring example being the walk out of the *Reichstag* fraction, accomplished with much ceremony. At the same time, leaders attended the meetings of the storm divisions and made ambiguous remarks about "things starting soon," saying that the demonstration of the fraction was only the signal for the decisive struggle for power.

This situation explains the tendencies to reorganisation in the fascist military associations. The independence of the storm divisions is demanded by some leaders who argue on the opportunist line that the radical sentiments in the divisions may compromise the party and thus endanger the highly-prized possibility of coalition. If the storm divisions were independent, the party would have greater opportunities of manoeuvring, for then it could always dissociate itself from the "somewhat rash" or unsuccessful actions of the storm divisions.

At a conference of leaders held in Munich, Hitler's headquarters, at the end of November last year, it was decided to make the divisions independent, but a number of leaders, including Goebbels, Berlin district leader, expressed strong misgivings about this decision, on the following grounds:—

(1) the rebellion which was to be expected from the members of the storm divisions, who would see in their separation from the party the exclusion of the most active elements;

(2) the fear that their political opponents would interpret this action as an expression of political weakness, a retreat from "revolutionary illegal principles"; and

(3) the fear that without direct leadership by the party, the storm divisions would easily become a prey to disruptive political influences.

How this dispute may be finally decided is not important in this connection, but it is indicative of the social contradictions within the fascist camp.

Equally significant are the tendencies towards making the defence corps a mass organisation, also most strongly marked in Berlin. A few weeks ago there were only a few hundred men organised in the defence corps in Berlin; now there are about 3,000, i.e., as many as in the storm divisions. The defence corps have thus cast off their former role as a close and select guard to be used for special purposes.

What does this mean? This is a step directed against the unreliable and rebellious elements in the storm divisions; and it is in this sense that the latter understand it. By this regrouping, the storm divisions are deprived of their position as the decisive military organisation and their place is taken by the defence corps, which include only the faithful, thoroughly disciplined elements in the National Socialist movement. All those who have ever been suspected of oppositional inclinations were not allowed to join the defence corps, in order that the processes of disintegration now apparent in the storm divisions might be avoided.

This entire process bears a remarkable resemblance to the reorganisation recently accomplished in the Social Fascist military mass organisation, the so-called *Reichsbanner*, in consequence of the oppositional sentiments expressed among the proletarian members of this organisation, which made their reliability in the "struggle to protect the democratic republic" a matter of doubt, the Social-Fascist leaders found themselves compelled to set up special defence corps, called the *Schupo*, consisting of convinced social-fascists and other reliable elements from the *Reichsbanner*, principally employees of the S.D. Party and trade unions and Social Democratic Government officials. One does not have to be very thoroughly acquainted with the activities of the German Social Democracy to be able to assert that this is a case of creating an openly anti-working-class military organisation, of purifying the social-fascist

military organisations of all discontented and revolutionary elements.

On this question of organisational preparations for the civil war against the working-class, as on so many others, the analogy between fascism and social-fascism holds good. Their organisational structure, as well as their aims, are the same. Only their words differ.

A characteristic method employed by the fascists in Germany, as in a few other countries, is the disguise of these organisations for murder under harmless cloaks, such as sport associations, rifle clubs, musical societies, etc. It is reported that a short while ago all storm division units received orders to prepare such a "cloak" for the event that their own organisation should be prohibited. This is not merely an organisational measure, but also a typical fascist demagogic trick. The fascist leaders know well enough that there is no possibility of a serious prohibition of fascist organisations in Germany, so long as the bourgeoisie is in power. But it suits the plans of the fascist leaders to give the active members of the storm divisions the impression that they are really persecuted in the Marxist Jewish republic. This game follows from the division of labour among the bourgeoisie. It is not, of course, impossible that in a certain situation the Prussian Social Democratic Government might formally prohibit fascist organisations, while allowing them to exist under another form and supporting them in their fight against the Communists.

The National Socialists have their groups in the army and among the police, consisting mostly of officers of the National Socialist organisations, but the National Socialist leaders insist that their propaganda work in the army pursues no aims "hostile to the State," being merely concerned with "education about the fatherland." This work is proceeding under the virtual protection of the *Reichswehr* leaders and the police, although a few National Socialist leaders reproach the chief of the army, General Hammerstein, with "opportunism."

FACTORY CELLS.

The civil party organisation of the National Socialists is also constructed, more or less, on military lines. It is significant that the National Socialist Party has only a male membership, its adherents being of the opinion that women have nothing to do in politics, just as they have nothing to do with fighting. The German woman is to be the "guardian of the purity of the German blood" and the German race, and should tend the wounds of the National Socialist warriors. There is not one woman among the 107 National Socialist members of the *Reichstag* or of the parliaments of the separate States. National Socialist women are organised in a special association, the *Rote Hakenkreuz*, which forms a subsidiary organisation to the party. Its members are trained in ambulance

work, and also engage in cultural work, as understood by the National Socialists.

The actual National Socialist Party, consisting of men only, is divided into districts, local groups, street groups and organisation cells in the high schools, etc. The cells and local groups elect their own leaders who are, however, liable to dismissal from above at any time. Above them the leadership is more like a caste, district leaders being nominated personally by Adolf Hitler, who was not elected by anybody, but has an independent dictatorial position in the Party.

The factory cell organisation of the National Socialists deserves our special attention; its purpose is quite clear. Their members are the tools of the employer, on whom he can rely for the organisation of espionage and factory terror. Their principal job is to fight against workers with a Communist outlook. In an instruction issued by the national organiser of the National Socialist Party on January 12 of this year, the factory cells are described as "a special weapon for grappling with factory Marxism."

Originally the fascists in the factories worked along Pinkerton methods. It is only lately that they have gone over to mass work. In the instruction mentioned above it is stated that one of the most important tasks of the factory cells is to create a "sympathetic army" of workers "won back" from Marxism. This stage of sympathy is regarded as a training school for National Socialism.

This explains why the National Socialists now attach great value to finding, if possible, a leader for the factory cell from among the workers themselves. The instruction emphasises that "it is only in the case of urgent necessity that the cell leader should be chosen from the administrative staff."

The members of the factory cells are also to prepare themselves to act as industrial and trade union specialists in the fascist third empire. The National Socialists in the factories are to regard themselves as "shock troops who, on the seizure of political power, will occupy the existing trade unions and eventually other economic institutions." The instruction also refers to an "idea" of Adolf Hitler who, in his book, *My Struggle*, wrote that "all future institutions of the State that is to be must grow out of the movement itself."

This talk of positions of authority and the [State] of the future—that is, the "fascist third empire"—has a definite demagogic purpose: it is intended to rally the great army of students and other intellectuals who form the mass of the National Socialist adherents, to win all careerists for the idea of National Socialism.

For the present, the National Socialists are not considering the organisation of special fascist trade unions, being satisfied with the organisation of fraction work within the existing unions.

Fascist factory cell work as mass work is only at an early stage; January and February, were regarded as

the construction period of factory cell organisation.

The youth organisation is called the "Hitler Youth" which includes only boys. There is a special organisation for girls, the so-called "Sisterhood of Hitler Youth."

NATIONAL SOCIALIST SLOGANS AND AGITATION.

The content of fascist mass work, the ideas of National Socialism, represent a variegated hotch-potch of frankly counter-revolutionary, demagogic and revolutionary slogans and demands. Some of the most important slogans are : Germany Awake !—Death to the Jews !—Down with Capitalism—Down with Jewish High Finance !—Break the Bankocracy !—Down with Class War !—Death to Marxism !—For the National Revolution !—Down with the Weimar Jewish republic ! *Der Angriff*, Berlin organ of the National Socialists, always carries the slogans : "For the suppressed—Against the exploiters." The Party itself announces that it is a national, a socialist and a workers' Party.

We consider it unnecessary, within this article, to deal in detail with these slogans or to bring forward arguments against them. The mendacity of the "anti-capitalist" and "revolutionary" slogans of the National Socialists needs no stressing for our readers. The daily activities of the National Socialists which are in most glaring contradiction to their words, is calculated to expose them quite rapidly as a party of working-class murder, as a counter-revolutionary force in the pay of the capitalists, including the Jewish financiers (Jacob Goldschmidt), as a party of national treachery.

We shall only deal briefly here with the slogan of "Fight against Marxism," which has recently become the central feature of National Socialist agitation. By Marxists, the National Socialists mean not only Communists, but also the Social Democrats. It is true that they declare openly that their chief enemy is not Social Democracy, but Communism, and that the final struggle will be waged between Fascism and Communism, and for that very reason it suits their purpose to describe the Social-Democratic leadership in Prussia as Marxist, in order to make real Marxism contemptible in the eyes of the discontented masses and to win to themselves the elements which are deserting Social Democracy. The "fight" of the fascists against the Social Democrats, just like the "fight" of the Social Democrats against fascism, is a part of the necessary division of labour in the bourgeois camp.

An important part in fascist mass work is played by the external make-up, the technique which is designed to impose upon the superficially-thinking philistine. A certain Dinter, who was once excluded from the National Socialist Party, gives the following apt description of this technical aspect of fascist demagogy :

"This explains the increasing ceremonial, the barking and bluffing which is becoming more and more like a

political circus, that has finally become the distinguishing characteristic of the Hitler party. It is obvious that such goings on, appealing exclusively to primitive instincts, exercise a great attractive force on superficial natures, so that one needs to wonder as little over the present mass rush into the Hitler party as over large audiences at a well-presented circus."

It must be admitted that the National Socialists have organised their circus just as well as their phraseology ; inside it is hollow and empty. In all their numerous meetings a great part is played by military music, solemn greetings to leaders and military arrangements. In so doing they are not only imitating their great prototype, Italian fascism, but are copying from the really revolutionary movements, from the Communists too, all those methods of work which attract the workers. Their flag is red, with a black swastika. Many of their fighting songs are sung to revolutionary melodies, including that of the "International" and "Comrades, the Bugles are sounding," etc. They do everything possible to give their street demonstrations a "revolutionary" and even a proletarian character. A large number of those taking part wear workers' blouses, with sleeves rolled up, by such means they manage to make their demonstrations look more proletarian than those of the Social Democracy, which does not succeed in bringing on to the streets real proletarian elements, even from its own membership.

Another strong feature of fascist agitation is the popularity of the speech employed. In the numerous directions sent out by the propaganda leaders of the Party, it is repeatedly emphasised that agitation must be attractive and popular, adapted to the feelings of those sections which are present at the given meeting. It is expressly emphasised that agitation in the working-class districts must be carried on in an easily understandable and hearty fashion.

It must be admitted that the National Socialist agitators and newspapers really possess what we call in Germany a good tongue. They have an extraordinarily rich vocabulary of unparliamentary expressions or, more simply, swear words, which have a definite attractive force at the present time in Germany where, in the words of a fascist paper, there are only desperate, starving people, filled with hatred.

One does not need to be a prophet to see that the great success of fascist agitation among the petty bourgeois and to some extent among the more backward working masses, as expressed in the last *Reichstag* elections, cannot endure. The rebellion among the members of the storm divisions proves the possibility of successful Communist work among these elements. The situation just now is extremely favourable to convincing these masses of the fact that the only socialist party, the only workers' party and the only party of national emancipation is the Communist Party, and the winning of these elements misled by fascism requires from our Party persistent and systematic work.

For greater class ★ knowledge ★

The Soviet Union and the Capitalist World.
Socialist Reorganisation of Agriculture.
Industrialisation of the Countryside and the
Five Year Plan.
Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union.
Threepence each.

The Imperialist War and the Crisis of
Capitalism.

The Period of the Temporary Stabilisation of
Capitalism.

The Transition Period.

Tactics of the Proletariat after the Conquest
of Production.

The Soviet as the Form of Proletarian
Dictatorship.

Twopence each.

Obtainable at

MODERN BOOKS LTD.

16 KING STREET
LONDON, W.C.2

Pamphlets on the nail

PUBLISHED.

	cents.
1. Modern Farming—Soviet Style , by Anna Louise Strong	10
2. War in the Far East , by Henry Hall	10
3. Chemical Warfare , by Donald A. Cameron	10
4. Work or Wages , by Grace M. Burnham	10
5. The Struggle of the Marine Workers , by N. Sparks	20
6. Speeding Up the Workers , by James Barnett	10
7. Yankee Colonies , by Harry Gannes	10
8. The Frame-up System , by Vern Smith	10
9. Steve Katovis , by Joseph North & A. B. Magill	10
10. The Heritage of Gene Debs , by Alexander Trachtenberg	10
11. Social Insurance , by Grace M. Burnham	10
12. Paris Commune: Story in Pictures	10
13. Youth in Industry , by Sophie Melvin and Grace Hutchins	10

IN PREPARATION.

Unemployment: A Story in Pictures , by the John Reed Club Artists	10
Spying on Labor , by Robert W. Dunn	10
The Yellow Dog Contract , by Carol Weiss King	10
The Anglo-American Conflict , by Harry Gannes	10
Profits and Wages , by Anna Rochester	10

INTERNATIONAL PAMPHLETS
799 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

Obtainable from **MODERN BOOKS**,
16 King Street, London, W.C.2, at
5d. each, plus post

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

Volume 13

APRIL, 1931

Number 4

NOTES OF THE MONTH.—

LEFT SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM. R.P.D.

ON THE EVE OF THE CHARTER CONVENTION. HARRY POLLITT.

ORGANISING SLAVE LABOUR IN BRITAIN. F. DOUGLAS.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND WAR ON THE SOVIET UNION. ALLEN HUTT.

FORCED LABOUR IN AFRICA. GEORGE PADMORE.

BRITISH WORKERS AND THE "SPARTAKIADE." VIC. FARRANT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

64 pages



6^d.

Through any Newsagent or The Labour Monthly, 79 Warren Street,
London, W.2.

CONSOLIDATING MAY DAY

with mass factory sales.

IN DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC.

The Task of the Workers	J. Stalin.	½d.
The Menshevik Trial: the Indictment of International Social Democracy	6d.
The Wreckers Exposed	W. M. Holmes	2d.
The Success of the Five Year Plan	V. M. Molotov.	6d.
"Forced Labour" in the U.S.S.R.	2d.

AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

The Developing Crisis of World Capitalism	V. M. Molotov	6d.
Fifty Million Unemployed	1d.
Immediate Tasks of the International Trade Union Movement	O. Piatnitsky	3d.
India under the British Terror	P. Glading	3d.
Working Women! War is coming	1d.
The Way out. The C.P.G.B. Analysis of the Situation and Manifesto	2d.
Social Insurance	G. Burnham.	5d. 10c.
Youth in Industry	Sophie Melvin.	5d. 10c.
Report of Proceedings of First International Conference of Negro Workers	3d.
Capitalism or Socialism in Britain?	R. Palme Dutt	3d.

**FROM THE PUBLISHERS
OF THIS MAGAZINE.**