

V. b. b.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 8

PRESS

22nd January 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

The Second Anniversary of the Death of Comrade Lenin.

CONTENTS

The World Economic and Political Position.

A. Lozovsky: Lenin and the Tactical Questions of the British Labour Movement.

Fendel: Lenin and the American Labour Movement.

G. G. L. Alexander: Lenin on the Emancipation of Women.

F. G.: Lenin and the Young Communist Movement.

Andrei Shavikin: Lenin Corners' in the Young People's Clubs.

The World Economic and Political Situation.

1. The V World Congress recorded an improvement in the position of world capitalism. This improvement has been expressed by the high industrial plans of America, the stabilisation of the currency of most European countries, the partial re-establishment of international commerce and credit. The Enlarged Executive, (February—March 1925), registered the continuance of this process of relative stabilisation of capitalism and at the same time characterised the current era as one «between two waves of the revolution». The Relativity of the stabilisation signifies that within the epoch of imperialism, i. e., the dying, decaying capitalism, the demobilisation crisis was overcome by capitalism and its economic development has entered upon a stage which marks stabilisation in comparison with the first post-war years, but not of course with pre-war conditions.

Upon the basis of this analysis the Enlarged Executive indicated the necessary directives for the change of strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties in the present epoch; these were to be concentrated upon one point, the creation of the revolutionary proletarian united front. The Leninist conception of the essential character of the present historical epoch holds true; as heretofore, the conception of the steadily progressing dissolution and decay of the capitalist world economy and the actuality of world revolution. No change has taken place in the activity of the forces which are ever more and more bringing to a head the rivalries within the imperialist camps and which press for a decision on the antagonisms on principle toward the first proletarian State, the Union of the U. S. S. R.

Even far-sighted bourgeois economists and politicians frequently doubt the possibility of complete recovery of capitalism from the harmful after-effects of the world war. Only the Social-Democratic theoreticians, (Bauer, Hillerding, Kautsky and Adler) maintain that there is a checking of the tension of the internal antagonisms among the imperialists of the various national economies within the capitalist order which must result in an easing of the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat and a peaceful democratic evolution into Socialism.

2. The analysis of the present stage must also concern itself with the two most recent phenomena which are evaluated by the Social-Democratic ideologists of the bourgeoisie as signs and evidence of the reconstruction of capitalism and the overcoming of its contradictions; upon the investigation of the conditions and results of the Dawes Plan and of the Locarno Pact.

This analysis must be concentrated, seriatim, upon the following points:

1. Is the revival of capitalist world economy possible?
2. Is the trend of development within the imperialist camps and in its relationship to the Socialist camp directed toward equalisation and mediation or toward the intensification and violent settlement of the antagonisms?
3. What effects upon the proletariat's standard of living and upon its chances to combat the capitalist class are provided by the present period?

Even superficial observation of the present world economy shows that the idea of the possibility of revival of a unified world economy upon purely capitalist basis is erroneous. World economy is split in two by the existence of Soviet Russia, — both by the demands of the present and the terms of future development into a capitalist economy and a Socialist economy. This fact is sufficient to exclude a uniform conjuncture within the capitalist world and combines all its contradictions into an insoluble dilemma. The dilemma: industrial sham prosperity and tottering currency and finance, or its antithesis temporarily stabilised currency and a balanced state budget plus industrial depression and widespread unemployment. During the post-war years no European State has escaped from this dilemma. A convincing recent example of this may be found in a comparison of French and British economy. It applies without exception to all European capitalist countries and again substantiates the Leninist thesis that a uniform and general recovery, a permanent revival of world capitalism is no longer possible, that in the background of its progressing decay only an ebb and flow, a rapid alternation of prosperity and crises must take place, that the economic improvement of one country must inevitably result in the economic depression of another.

4. Nor are these facts altered by the new factors of economic development which proceed from American attempts to revive the capitalist world market and the international credit system. The United States of America, which has transformed its former debtor relationship toward Europe into an unchallenged financial and economic hegemony, which emerged from the world war as the strongest of imperialist States, must abandon its attitude of isolation toward Europe. The insufficiency of the internal market for the tremendously developed productive apparatus and the necessity to export capital force it to this. With the London Conference of 1924, which formulated the Dawes Plan, America begins to subject Europe to its economical and political control.

The outward reason for the realisation of the Dawes Plan was the failure of the French Ruhr adventure. The occupation of the Ruhr was the last effort of French imperialism to place its hegemony on solid foundations. This effort was frustrated by the opposition of the United States and Great Britain. The Dawes Plan means that American imperialism is undertaking the control of Europe for the purpose of disposing of its surplus goods and for the export of its finance capital. But a primary condition for the safe investment of American capital in Europe's shattered economy is the stabilisation of the currency of the countries invested in. Therefore American capital export requires as its first pre-condition the introduction of the gold standard in the export countries. The Dawesification of Germany, like the same process in the other European countries, makes possible the orderly state economy only upon the condition of increased plundering of the exploited masses.

The execution of the Dawes Plan in Germany now reveals all these conditions clearly. The way in which the despoilation of the German proletariat by American capitalism and its enslavement by all the victorious countries results, is clearly apparent upon closer examination of the terms of the Dawes agreement. A typical example of this is the Morgan loan to Germany for the purpose of initiating the reparation extortion apparatus.

5. The realisability of the Dawes Plan for Germany depends upon two circumstances: (1) whether the annual national production can furnish, in the form of duties and taxes, the surplus demanded for the payment of reparations. From the standpoint of the German state budget this condition depends upon whether the surplus of income can be increased to the extent that after deducting all expenses, it can turn over for reparation sums an equal amount. (2) In what form this slave tribute of reparation payments can be exported in gold and foreign currency. Both points reveal that the reparation sum to be paid can be raised mainly out of Germany's net profit, only out of its export of commodities. Thus we find that the execution of the Dawes Plan absolutely demands tremendous increase of German export since only thereby gold payments become possible.

To cover the annual reparation sum Germany's active trade balance must amount annually to two and a half milliards. But the realisation of this sum demands not only a tremendous increase in German export but also an increase in raw material import. In order to effect the necessary balancing of this import Germany's export must reach a tremendous height so that as an exporter of commodities it would be compelled to engage in the most intense competition on the world market.

The results of the first year of the application of the Dawes plan have already clearly revealed all these difficulties. The meeting of the debt obligations thus far was possible only because the Morgan loan furnished the necessary sum in foreign currency, and that the payments in kind (particularly coal deliveries to France) and payments in German marks for the maintenance of the occupational troops still constituted a heavy item. But the accomplishment of the transfer, the transport of payments abroad becomes more difficult from year to year because of the cessation of payments in German marks and payments in kind. Thereby the contradictions of capitalism inherent in the Dawes Plan are ever more clearly revealed; on the one side the fulfilment of the reparation requirements demands from Germany a tremendous flooding of the foreign market with German goods, on the other hand it calls for a grave restriction of the potential market of the industries of all other competing capitalist countries. This at the same time clearly exposes the divergent interests of America, Great Britain and France in the question of realising the Dawes agreement. Only France is interested in the immediate receipt of reparation payments in order thereby to bring order into its state administration which lies in its death throes. In the meeting of the reparations obligations Great Britain sees only the menace of increasing German competition while America's interests are directed principally toward preventing the interference of reparation obligations with the profits of its capital invested in German undertakings.

Hence the Dawes Plan has not only failed to minimise economic conflicts of interests of the three most powerful imperialist states but has given them clear expression. The law of unequal development of imperialist countries during the present epoch determines the further sharpening of this process. Just as there is no equality of economic position on the world market, so no power or group of powers possessing an advantage over their competitors can or will ever enter into an economic equality and create a community of interests in them.

6. The group of powers which revealed itself immediately after the close of the world war and the ensuing years as the strongest imperialist combination is the so-called Anglo-Saxon Group. The United States and Great Britain have conquered the economic hegemony within the capitalist world but the conflict between these two powers for preeminence expresses and brings to a head all the inner contradictions of imperialism itself. In a word the conflict amounts to this, that America seeks to shatter the British Empire from within by bringing the Dominions namely Canada and Australia — under its financial and, hence, political sovereignty. The export of capital and of commodities on credit is the effective lever with which this is accomplished despite all the British statesmen's efforts to wall in the Empire, despite all measures of protective tariff policy. It must also be mentioned that in the Far East (China) America conducts a policy contrary to that of England since America is interested to a certain extent in the industrialisation of China to benefit the export of its machine industries products, while Great Britain seeks to hold China as the market for its finished goods and its source of raw material.

This fundamental conflict between Great Britain and America is supplemented and modified by the partial conflicts between the other imperialist states. We may mention here: conflict between America and Japan, between Great Britain and France, between Great Britain and Germany, between France and Germany, France and Italy, — to cite only the most important. The foundation of all these antagonisms is the struggle for the expansion of their own market, the hunt for new sources of raw materials, the necessity of satisfying the demand of the industry whose productive apparatus was tremendously hypertrophied during and after the war. Thus the characteristic feature also of the present stabilisation period of world capitalism remains the appearance of tremendously sharpened competition, the struggle for the world market, and the economic repartition and reformation of the world. The external concomitants of this phase are: the equalisation of prices in the various national economies to the world market price, the increase of the protective tariff policy in all industrial countries, development of the colonies which are constantly becoming stronger competitors of the imperialist lands. The fight for China, the war menace in Mosul, the wars in Syria and Morocco, the expansion ambitions of American imperialism (which is getting a foot-hold in every corner of the British Empire) — these are clear symptoms and proofs that the present era of capitalist stabilisation is approaching its turning

point and blasts the pacifist illusions of Social Democracy, its illusions on the possibility of a peaceful evolution into Socialism. All these facts show clearly the absurdity of the Kautsky-Hilferding theory of ultra-imperialism. Even though the present stage of development, in distinction to the first post-war years, reveals a certain reconstitution of the capitalist world market, a renewal of international credit, a stabilisation of the currency of most European countries (as seen in the extremely questionable example of Poland) there nevertheless remain the counter-facts: the "internationalisation" of economic relations within capitalism signifies neither "internationalisation" and harmonisation of capitalist interests nor a diminution of the antagonisms between the capitalist class and working class on a national or international scale.

7. On a national scale the era of relative stabilisation brings only new sacrifices and burdens for the workers. The firm valuta stops the inflation premium in the countries which hitherto enjoyed its advantage in competition. The tremendously swollen industry, the changes in productive and commercial technique, the development of new sources of power are, in view of the small absorptive power of the internal and foreign market, no preconditions for improving the situation of the workers but rather for their constant deterioration. The trustification and cartelisation process works in the same direction: restriction of factory capacity, increase of unemployment, reduction of wages are its results. The crises have not ceased to exist, but have only been postponed. The financial crisis of France is but a counter balance to the relative financial stabilisation of Germany and Great Britain, but precisely in these countries, as in all European states with stabilised currency, the above-mentioned dilemma makes itself felt; the financial stabilisation is purchased at the price of ruthless expropriation of the middle class and the pauperisation of the proletariat, and it results in an industrial depression, a tremendous increase in unemployment, so that the balance of the state budget itself can only be maintained by a terrific tax burden upon the working masses.

8. Of a Relative solidarity and internationalisation of the interests of the capitalist States one can speak only comparatively: only in their attitude toward Soviet Russia, the world's first proletarian state, can they create a united front. The Locarno Guarantee Pact, eulogised by the Social Democrats as the "end of all wars pact" is the open cynical expression of the imperialist powers' unity, despite their antagonism, to fight out the epoch making war of principle against the U. S. S. R.

9. The Locarno Pact is the general political form of the reorganisation of Europe under the control and hegemony of the United States and Great Britain. It brings the Dawes agreement to its conclusion. The purpose of the Guarantee Pact, as far as America is concerned, may be formulated as the Guarantee of the investments of American capital in Europe in the countries controlled by it. This can be accomplished only through the regulation of the political and governmental conditions in the European countries. The expansion of American capital categorically demands the pacification of the investee countries. Side by side and simultaneously with America, Great Britain now appears as the strongest leading imperialist power in Europe. Thereby results of the Versailles Treaty are revised. The guarantee Pact means the complete defeat of France and French imperialism and of its surrender of the hegemony over continental Europe. Great Britain appears as umpire between France and Germany and henceforth utilises Germany as an instrument against belligerent France. America prepares for the Dawesification of France. Germany is condemned to a role of dual serfdom; on the one hand it must enter the League of Nations in order to serve as the springboard for the preparing mobilisation of imperialism against the U. S. S. R., on the other, by occasional slight ameliorations of its economic and political situation, then again through the tightening of the reparations vice, it is made pliable to the will of Anglo-Saxon imperialism. Above all, the significance of the Guarantee Pact lies in the effort to build up a united front of the capitalist world, by means of the postponement of its internal contradictions, in order to form an imperialist bloc against Soviet Russia. Squeezed between the pincers of the victorious and expansive American capitalism and the revolting colonies, its advance delimited on all fronts by the existence of Soviet Russia, Great Britain appears as the chief instigator of an open ordeal of battle between capitalism and Socialism, it seeks to establish a Holy Alliance against Soviet Russia. The attitude of the United States on the other hand is determined by the standpoint that for

the purpose of gathering in the profits from the Dawesified Europe it prefers a more peaceful development and also hopes for a Dawesified Soviet Russia and China, at the same time not losing sight of the advantages accruing to it from the sharpened antagonisms between Great Britain and Soviet Russia.

10. The present period was characterised by Lenin in one of his last articles in the following manner:

"The system of international relations is now evolving in the following manner: In Europe one state, Germany, is subjected by the victorious states. Then a number of states, the oldest Western states, as a result of their victory, came to a situation in which they were compelled to make certain non-essential concessions to their subject classes, concessions which served to divert the revolutionary movement and called forth something rather similar to "social peace".

At the same time a number of countries, the East, India, China, etc., as a direct result of the last imperialist war, were thrown from their customary path. Their development is proceeding absolutely along the general European measure and it is now clear to the entire world that they have been drawn into a development which must inevitably lead to a crisis in world capitalism".

These tendencies which characterise the epoch of the decay of world capitalism in the proletarian world revolution, were already charted by Lenin prior to the present stage of relative stabilisation. This stage is, however, also specially marked by a tendency in its development to accompany the stabilisation of world capitalism by the stabilisation of Socialism, and also by the tremendous political and economic growth of the power of the first proletarian state. As Soviet Russia is the focus of all strategic forces of world revolution, it signifies the organisation of revolutionary forces on a world wide scale. The new turning now approached by the present phase of development demands the regrouping and reorganisation of the proletarian forces.

II. The Perspectives of the World Revolution.

1. Under "perspectives of the world revolution" one does not understand the exact or approximate prediction of the date of the outbreak of the revolution in this or the other country or even in the entire world. When the Communists in 1918—1920 reckoned with the proximate outbreak of the revolution in the most important countries of Europe, they did this under the influence of two facts: the imperialist robber-war and the Russian proletarian revolution. Thus Lenin, on Jan. 11th, 1918, at the Third All-Russian Soviet Congress said:

"And with us in one rank there will march the working masses of the developed countries that are being dismembered by the predatory war, the workers who have been through a long schooling in democracy... Our division of workers and peasants who support the Soviet power, is one of the divisions of that world army which is now dismembered by the world war, but which aspires to unity and which greets every report, every crumb of news of our revolution with intense sympathy — because they know that in Russia their joint affairs are being carried forward — the affairs of the proletarian uprising and of international Socialism. The living example, the carrying out of the work in one country is more effective than proclamations, and conferences — it is this that inspires the working masses in all countries..."

"The October strike of 1905, this first step of the victorious revolution, did not at once seize Western Europe, yet already then, in 1905, it called forth the movement of the Austrian workers; if already then we saw the value of the example of revolution in one country — we can now see that the Socialist world revolution matures not daily, but hourly."

Thus since we know that this hope of the Communists remained unfulfilled, not because of the absence of the preconditions of a socialist revolution in the West, but chiefly because of betrayal by a section of the proletariat (the labour aristocracy) and its Party — the Social Democracy. They aided capitalism and the bourgeoisie economically (reconstitution of production) and politically (bourgeois democracy!) to retain political and economic power. The immediate revolutionary situation which was at hand thus was dissipated without proletarian success in conquering power in the most important European countries.

2. Although the Communists in 1918—1920 counted on the speedy outbreak of the world revolution they well knew that the Socialist revolution would require an entire historical epoch. We again cite Lenin:

"Every Marxist, yes, every person, acquainted in general with modern science, if confronted with the question: Is there possible an even or harmoniously proportional transition of the various capitalist countries to the proletarian dictatorship? — would undoubtedly have answered in the negative. Neither evenness nor harmony nor proportionality ever prevailed or can prevail in the capitalist world. Every land evolves with special emphasis sometimes on this stand again toward that side, or toward these or those features or groups of circumstances of capitalism and the labour movement. The process of development runs unevenly."

Or:

"This force will be a world historic period, a whole epoch of various wars, — the imperialist wars, the civil wars within the country, the combination of one with the other, the national wars, the liberation of the nationalities dismembered by the imperialists or by the various combinations of imperialist powers... this epoch is the epoch of gigantic convulsions, the mass wars, the violent solution of the crises, — it has begun, we see it clearly, but this is only the beginning..."

At the same time the Communists knew that the beginning of the revolution in Europe would be far more difficult than was the case in Russia.

"The revolution does not come as quickly" — Lenin realised already in 1918 — "as we had expected. We must accept this as a fact. One must be able to realise that the revolution in the advanced countries cannot begin as easily as in Russia... In this country it is easy to begin the revolution, extremely easy, but to start the revolution without work and preparation in a country in which capitalism has attained a luxuriant development... this is incomparably harder..."

Or still more pregnantly:

"One must appraise the forces in tens of millions, fewer do not count in politics, fewer are rejected by politics as a number without significance. When we look upon the international revolution from this angle then it is clear as day: the backward country can make the uprising sooner, but to continue the revolution requires a hundred times more circumspection, cautiousness and endurance. In Western Europe it will be otherwise. There it is very much harder to begin, but it will be disproportionately easier to continue. This cannot be otherwise because the organisation and concentration of the proletariat is tremendously greater."

3. Since therefore for every Communist it must belong to the ABC of Marxism-Leninism, that the world revolution will occupy an entire long painful epoch of world history and that the continuation of world revolution in Western Europe will be excessively harder than its beginning in Russia, then we understand by "perspectives of the world revolution not":

a) The substantiation or proof of the fact that we live in such an epoch. The very existence of the Soviet Republic in Russia proves this, quite apart from the Leninist theory of imperialism, as the phase of **dying capitalism**.

b) Not the exact prediction of when and where the next stage of world revolution will begin. Prior to 1905 Lenin stated that we were confronted with a social revolution in Russia and that thereby the revolutionary era had recommenced in Europe. No one could accurately predict exactly when the Russian revolution would break out nor when this occurred in 1905, could anyone state when the first revolutionary period, which ended in defeat, would be followed by a second. This occurred in February 1917 and was replaced in October 1917 by the first stage of the world revolution. That a second stage has not yet followed this first one in no way alters the fact that we are living in a revolutionary epoch which really had its beginnings in 1905. An error in this regard mainly as to the date, although possibly avoidable, is no argument against the claim, that the epoch of world revolution has begun.

Under "perspectives of the world revolution" we understand however:

a) the demonstration that the basic forces tending towards world revolution, e. g. the trend of development, have remained unchanged. This proceeds from the entire scientific theory of Socialism itself, especially in the form in which it is applied by Lenin in the present period;

b) the exact analysis of the stage in which we momentarily find ourselves;

c) the weighing of the relationship of forces favourable and unfavourable to the further development of the revolution.

4 As to the first we point out in the opening part of the theses that the economic and political world situation reveals unchanged such contradictions and antagonism as render impossible a "normal" functioning of capitalism. As already stated, the basic theses of Leninist theory that imperialism is an "epoch of dying capitalism" — remain inviolate.

As regards the analysis of the current stage it must be stated that we again find ourselves in a rising line of revolutionary movement, yes, that large parts of the world are actually in an immediate revolutionary condition.

Here, first of all, the Chinese revolution must be considered. The significance of the events in China is immeasurable, and for the moment cannot be overlooked. China is in flaming revolutionary revolt, the struggle between revolution and counter revolution has begun. The revolutionary government in South China (Canton) has solidified itself, Peking is occupied by the Peoples' Army of Feng-Yu-Sang who prepares for the decisive struggle against the counter revolutionary Mukden (Chang-Tso-Lin). The national revolution in China is unavoidable: It will be a mighty factor in the revolutionisation of the entire East. In connection with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat the Chinese revolution will play, however, a dual role:

a) It will intensify the difficulties and the antagonism among the imperialist powers;

b) It will revolutionise the European proletariat and simultaneously;

c) as an ally of the proletariat against the common enemy, imperialist capitalism, it will stand on the side of the proletariat and aid in its struggles.

The Chinese revolution is a link in the chain of world revolution. Herewith a large part of the world finds itself in an immediate revolutionary condition, it is a sign of the actuality of the world revolution.

5. In Europe the situation is not immediately revolutionary, viz., the revolutionary convulsions, which during the demobilisation period and partially up to 1928 expressed themselves in immediate civil war, have become less tumultuous, but no less significant events which everywhere expose a deep seated condition of crisis. Taking in order the most important countries we see the following:

Great Britain: A conservative government which achieved power through trickery is cloaking with brute force its inability to solve the problems of the vast empire. British economy goes downhill: not alone has its own monopoly position been lost finally to America, but the previously reached height can no longer be maintained, productivity of labour sinks, the economic life, industry, transport, commerce, are shrinking. The result is a growing antagonism between the two major classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat. The British bourgeoisie and its government are preparing to solve this antagonism by force and to help British economy regain its footing at the expense of the working class. (Strikebreaker organisations, Fascists, special Party, etc.) Chronic and growing unemployment, for the solution of which the Conservative government does not and cannot undertake anything. Growing recognition on the part of the working class that the problem of unemployment is inseparable from the decline of British industry. Growing antagonism between the Mother Country and the Colonies whose interests do not coincide with those of Great Britain. Growing conflict with France (Syria, Morocco), temporarily brought to its knees in Locarno; growing industrial competition with Germany; (Superiority of German technique, starvation wages of the German workers) and finally: financial and political dependency upon America which actually determines British policy. Growing conflict with Russia (to be dealt with specially).

Under the pressure of economic and political conditions the British proletariat is becoming ever more revolutionised: the unification endeavours of the trade unions mount (despite reformist leaders), the left trade union movement becomes stronger; the influence of the Communist Party rises. The last Municipal elections were a sign of the British workers' radicalisation although it was the reformist Labour Party that received the votes of the workers.

France. One governmental crisis follows upon another. (Herriot, Painlevé, Briand). Commencing economic crisis whose full eruption is temporarily checked by a chronic financial crisis (inflation). Extreme agitation of the peasant and petty bourgeois masses, menaced with expropriation through the inflation, op-

pressed by tax burdens. This is increased by the extravagant, costly and unjust Morocco war and Syrian uprising. Growing powerlessness and hence increasing violence of the government: a certain sign of the sharpening of class antagonism. The pressing question of debt to America, threatening Dawesification of France. Defeats in foreign diplomacy by Great Britain have isolated France in Europe. This is momentarily concealed by the agreement with Germany.

Germany. The Dawes plan begins to show its shady sides. The industrial crisis, lack of circulating capital, unemployment. The "Western orientation" means a growing exploitation of German people, in first instance by America and Great Britain, and then by France. Growing tax burdens, mounting dissatisfaction of the broad masses (elections in Berlin, provincial parliaments).

Italy. Bulgaria, Poland Roumania, Yugoslavia — countries in which the most vicious terror reigns. Italian Fascism was forced to interdict even the Menshevik workers organisations in order to deprive the masses of every possibility of expressing their dissatisfaction and agitation. The terror is certainly no sign of "stabilisation" but rather the contrary: "The counter-revolutionary field is also a revolutionary field."

We stand on the eve of a new world war. Palestine, Syria, Morocco, are curtain raisers. Feverish armament by America and Japan on one side, Great Britain, France and their vassals on the other. The projected Second Washington Conference will at little relieve the ever-increasingly colliding antagonisms than did the first, rather it will further intensify them.

6. Crises and crisis-omens everywhere, but the labour movement which, after the defeats in Bulgaria, Germany, Esthonia, after the conservative election victory in Great Britain, the election of Hindenburg in Germany, etc. seemed to retreat momentarily before the reaction, again shows an ascending curve. The chief features of this are:

a) The united-front movement and the Anglo-Russian rapprochement. The antagonism between capitalist Great Britain and proletarian Russia were never so sharp as under the present Conservative government — the British labouring masses never stood so close to the Russian workers as since the Scarborough Congress (despite Liverpool). The British working class begins to shake off its reformist leaders. But everywhere, not only in Great Britain, the working class begins to orientate itself toward Russia. While previously the European working class defended Russia against Blockade, intervention, and famine, it now begins to look upon Russia as the powerful proletarian brother who is actually beginning to realise socialism.

The workers delegations which visited Russia ripped as under the web of bourgeois and social democratic lies and are the best sign of and one of the means toward, the revolutionising of the European working class.

b) The Communist election victories in Germany and Czechoslovakia and those of the Labour Party in Britain. Election victories are appraised differently by us from social democrats but precisely in these countries in which the Communist Parties went through a severe crisis these election victories are symptomatic, they give evidence of the growing revolutionary sentiment of the masses.

c) The crystallisation and strengthening of the revolutionary Communist Party in its Bolshevisation process. The most important sections of the Comintern have overcome their crises, the Parties begin organisationally and ideologically (factory nuclei — educational work) to take their stand upon a Bolshevik foundation. The further this process progresses and shows results the more it contributes to the revolutionisation of the situation, since the lack of a well organised, thoroughly educated, disciplined revolutionary Party was the chief factor which prevented the utilisation of the actual revolutionary situation in the years 1918—1923.

III. Soviet Russia.

1. The existence of Soviet Russia is in itself a portent of the revolutionary situation and a vital factor in the revolutionary perspective. Two hostile economic and social systems today stand opposed; capitalism and socialism. The strengthening of the one means the weakening of the other and vice versa. Today it is undeniable by friend or foe that Soviet Russia has finally solidified itself and that it has entered the stage of economic improvement and Socialist construction. In 1924—25 industrial production has reached 70% of the pre-war standard (1921—22 — 23%, 1922—23 — 31%, 1923—24 — 40%), e. g. has doubled

in comparison with the last fiscal year, and according to the plans of the Supreme Council of National Economy it will attain the pre-war niveau in 1925—26.

The value of industrial production, according to reports of the Central Statistical Department, amounted to the following:

Year	In Gold Roubles
1921/2	850,280
1922/3	1,238,856
1923/4	1,617,835
1924/5 (half year)	1,174,235

Hence the value during the last half year is almost as great as in the preceding year!

The Agricultural Production presents the following picture:

Year	Area under Crops
1915	87,382,9 dessiatins
1923	70,861,0 "
1924	77,241,7 "

Number of Live Stock (in thousands).

Year	Horses	Cattle	Sheep and Goats	Pigs
1916	31,542,8	50,074,6	84,353,5	19,527,7
1923	21,408,1	41,288,6	58,258,7	9,394,9
1924	22,878,0	47,596,8	69,949,8	17,202,2

In Percentages.

Year	Horses	Cattle	Sheep	Goats	Pigs
1916	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
1923	67,9	82,4	69,5	57,5	48,1
1924	72,5	95,0	83,4	71,5	88,1

Thus agriculture is approaching the peace time standards almost as rapidly as industry. Taking up transport we get the same picture:

Average daily loadings.

Number of loaded cars.

Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Annual average
1921/22	10,022	8,325	10,020	9,482	9,590
1922/23	11,071	11,809	11,299	11,895	11,744
1923/24	13,514	12,996	13,056	14,525	13,517
1924/25	16,344	16,374	16,637	—	—

Or the balance of the State Bank.

(In Million Roubles.)

January 1, 1922	53
January 1, 1923	131,0
January 1, 1924	1,099,1
January 1, 1925	2,051,2
June 23, 1925	2,849,3

As compared with this picture capitalist Europe shows a picture of economic decline. It is the less necessary to illustrate this with statistics (they can be found in Varga's last economic report) because apart from the momentary status of capitalist economy the ascendancy of Soviet Russia sharpens the antagonisms within Capitalism, weakens it, strengthens the International Proletariat and revolutionises the situation.

2) Before considering the significance of Soviet Russia as a revolutionary factor let us cite a few figures on the trend of the development in the first proletarian country.

Ratio of private enterprise to state enterprise:
(From the reports of the Peoples' Commissariat for Finance.)

	Number of Enterprises			
	1922/23	1923/24		1923/24
		1st half year		
State industrie	3,530	8,868	5,834	5,834
Cooperative industry	2,915	5,380	3,819	3,819
Private industry	97,812	271,921	246,797	246,797
Total enterprises	104,357	268,169	256,440	256,440

In connection with this table it must be taken into consideration that the decrease in the number of State enterprises in the second half year, 1923/4, is ascribable to the concentration of large industry and that the State and cooperative undertakings are mainly large enterprises, while the private undertakings are almost entirely (exclusive of concession enterprises) petty undertakings. This explains the large number. At that we can note a more rapid growth of the first as against the second category.

Turn-over of the same enterprises (in thousand Gold Roubles).

	1922/23	1923/24 1st half year	1923/24 2nd half year
State undertakings	783,293 (64,1%)	976,406 (67,3%)	1,280,806 (71,3%)
Cooperative undertakings	29,317 (2,4%)	29,853 (2,1%)	36,634 (2,1%)
Private undertakings	403,848 (33,2%)	444,143 (30,6%)	476,819 (26,6%)
Total	1,216,458 (100%)	1,450,402 (100%)	1,974,259 (100%)

The number of employed Trade Union Members.
(From the report of the statistical department of the Central Trade Union Council of the U. S. S. R.)

	State Enterprises	Cooperative Enterprises	Private Enterprises
July 1st 1924	1,846,744	74,122	116,247
October 1st 1924	2,024,796 +	96,949 +	130,068 +
January 1st 1925	2,044,928 +	115,582 +	124,014 -

In percentages:

	State Enterprises	Cooperative Enterprises	Private Enterprises
July 1st 1924	90,7	3,6	5,7
	94,3		
October 1st 1924	89,9	4,3	5,8
	94,2		
January 1st 1925	89,5	5,1	5,4
	94,6		

Thus not more than a little over 5% of the wage workers are employed by private capitalists. The preponderance of state i. e. essentially socialistic, enterprise as against private undertakings stands out still more clearly (according to the reports of the Peoples' Commissariat for Finance) when we take into consideration the gross turnover of industry in the realisation of its products.

	1922/23 Enterprises	Turnover in thousands of gold roubles	%
State industry	3,630	783,293	64,4
Cooperative industry	2,915	29,317	2,4
Private industry	97,812	403,848	33,2
Total	104,357	1,216,458	100
	1st half year 1923/24 Enterprises	Turnover in thousands of gold roubles	%
State industry	8,886	976,406	67,3
Cooperative industry	5,380	29,853	2,1
Private industry	271,921	444,143	30,6
Total	286,169	1,450,402	100
	2nd half year 1923/24 Enterprises	Turnover in thousands of gold roubles	%
State industry	5,834	1,280,806	71,3
Cooperative industry	3,819	36,634	2,1
Private industry	246,797	476,819	26,6
Total	256,450	1,974,259	100

Thus for the period of 1922/24 we can show an increase of turn-over by the state industries from 64.4% to 71.3%, while the corresponding figure for private enterprises declined from 33.2% to 26.6%. Let us yet consider the development of commerce:

Wholesale Turnover by 12 Syndicates:

Period considered	Total sums in thousand of gold roubles	Of which in Percentage				
		State	Cooperat.	Mixed S. C.	Private	Unk. own
1st half 1923/24	210,829	45,3	32,2	0,5	20,0	0,9
2nd half 1923/24	331,127	44,2	39,5	0,1	15,6	0,5
1st half 1924/25	410,856	39,7	46,0	1,2	12,6	0,6

In this short space of time we see that the percentage of private purchases declined practically by one half.

3. These figures show the steadily growing pre-eminence of state and cooperative industry and state and cooperative trade as against private industry and private trade. This means nothing other than that in Russia Socialism (Socialist big industry) is winning the upper hand over capitalism. This fact has a double significance:

a) for the international proletariat and for all workers of the earth it signifies nothing other than the theoretical, therefore the practical, actually realised supremacy of Socialism over capitalism. Its effect therefore is in highest measure revolutionising;

b) for the capitalists and their governments it signifies an increasing menace to their power. The influence of Soviet Russia in the East, its influence on the international proletariat and the peasantry — is the gravest menace to all capitalist power. Therefore efforts to proceed jointly against Russia (Locarno!). A weak Russia they will recognise despite the divergence of economic and social orders, a powerful Russia is intolerable in the measure in which it becomes stronger.

4) The growing power of Soviet Russia is an active support of the world revolution, not only an ideal but also a material force factor of first rank to all oppressed (classes, peoples) on earth. And the economic power of Soviet Russia will grow from year to year. When the pre-war standards are regained it will not stop but go beyond these heights with the aid of Socialist state industry, the cooperation of the population, the increasing improvement of living conditions of the workers and peasants, the cultural betterment — all these in connection with the country's immeasurable natural riches will make Russia, and thereby Socialism, invincible within a few years.

5) This does not mean that the capitalist powers will bow to the inevitable, that they will make no efforts to stop this victorious advance. On the contrary: they will try to exploit the internal contradictions inherent in the tremendous economic development in a peasant country like Soviet Russia (strengthening of the new, particularly the rural bourgeoisie, differentiation of the peasantry, growing commodity demand concomitantly with growing prosperity, etc.). They will try to throw obstacles in the way of the proletarian state among them, in first rank, blockade and war. The R. C. P and the Russian proletariat is equal to meeting the inner contradictions, the international proletariat must make sure that the evil designs of the reactionary imperialist world powers are negated.

6) Out of the present situation of the world revolution certain tactical problems proceed, which are common to all Communist Parties. Such are:

a) Strengthening of the organisational structure of the Party, factory nuclei.

b) Increased educational work within the membership, central schools, district schools, educational circles, contiguous to the nuclei, short courses on practical themes, etc.;

c) united front. As has been seen, we are in an ascending revolutionary period. The broad masses of the proletariat are again becoming revolutionary minded. Their acquisition and permanent retention is our most pressing task. For this purpose: increased trade union work.

d) Organising of workers delegations to Russia. The living example of Soviet Russia is the best means of agitation.

e) Unmasking of the tactics of the bourgeoisie and social democracy which characterise Soviet Russia's politics as Red Imperialism. Soviet Russia is the practical realisation of Socialism and must live as such in the consciousness of all workers.

f) Increased attention to the peasantry. The economic burdens, the decline of capitalism, the colonial war, the Dawes

Plan, etc., which are piled upon the masses today, hit the peasantry no less than the workers. In the next turn of the world revolution this ally if he fights by our side is a decisive factor. Without him there is no possibility of utilising the active revolutionary period when it appears (Bulgaria).

g) Increased agitation for a workers and peasants government in every governmental crisis.

h) Increased agitation against imperialism and the coming world war.

i) Increased agitation against the governments' hostile plans against Soviet Russia.

Besides these general tasks every section of the C. I. naturally has particular problems, which proceed from the special situation in the respective countries.

IV. Theses on the Spitting of the Working Class and on the Tactic of the United Front.

1. The struggle for the united front, which for the last four years constituted the C. I.'s basic tactic, is principally rooted in the old axiom of the necessity for the unity of the working class. The many distinctions which undoubtedly exist within the working class, the economic competition between various strata of the workers, the national differences in living standards, etc. must unquestionably be overcome and subordinated to the general aims of the class struggle. This axiom is based on the whole historical epoch of working class struggle for Socialism. A half century of this struggle, the period of the existence of the I and II Internationals up to 1914, was in great measure dedicated to the impregnation of the idea of internationalism into the political consciousness of the working class. This is indicated in the general attitude of the Social Democratic Parties of all countries, and the numerous decisions of the World Congresses of the II International prior to 1914.

2. But the events of the beginning of the imperialist world war showed that this unity was only a formal one which found its expression in the unity of external organisational structure, a formal internationalism which was often stressed in the speeches of the II International, but not an actual unity, rooted in the International's policies and actions. It developed that the epoch of organic evolution and capitalism, and above all that of the rapid rise of imperialism, was an epoch of the corruption of the uppermost strata of the working class. While the international unity of the working class was given lip service, there was being formed, in the imperialist states, at the cost of the exploited colonial peoples a strata of labour aristocracy whose temporary craft interests were opposed to the historical class interests of the proletariat. The general opportunist suspension of the entire policy of the II International and the parliamentary struggle as its basic method only sharpened this contradiction. The II International gradually became the representative of the petty-bourgeois interests of the labour aristocracy with all the catastrophic consequences of this metamorphosis. All this led to Chauvinist degeneracy, to imperialist "theories" concerning the "defence" of the menaced fatherland, etc. within the working class. As a result of the organisation principles and struggle methods of the II International the Socialist Parties were unable as well as unwilling to oppose the bourgeois inculcated patriotic instincts of the workers. The outbreak of the world war and the attitude of the Social Democratic Leaders in favour of civil peace actually meant the liquidation of the unity of the working class, the breaking off of its international relations. Proletarians of various countries fired upon one another. Thereby the bankruptcy of the II International became a fact.

3) The schism of the working class was thus called forth by the spontaneous forces of imperialist developments. It was the horizontal splitting of the working class according to opposing national groups. The interests of the revolutionary labour movement could have been saved only through the changing of this horizontal split into a vertical, e. g. into a decided and organisational delimitation of the revolutionary elements from the opportunistic. This process of world historic significance was put into motion under the leadership of the "Zimmerwaldist Left" and was organisationally embodied in the Communist International formed in 1919. The champions of this splitting process were Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, and other champions of the idea of turning the imperialist war into a decisive civil war of the international proletariat against the international bourgeoisie. The idea of utilising the war-born

bitterness of the oppressed masses for the overthrow of the capitalist social order.

4) The split in this situation was an unavoidable necessity but not an end in itself. The split, the destruction of proletarian unity upon opportunist foundation was necessary in order, by means of the split, to achieve the proletarian unity upon a higher foundation, upon the basis of the revolutionary class struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship.

As long as the revolutionary wave was on the upsurge there was every basis for creating this mass unity in the course of immediate struggles for the conquest of power. In the revolutionary storm period this was the only method for the achievement of unity. But other methods for the achievement of unity had to be found when it became evident that as a result of the betrayal by international Social Democracy, this wave of revolution, after the heroic efforts of the Hungarian and Bavarian Soviet Republic, began to ebb, international capitalism, demoralised but not destroyed in the demobilisation crisis, launched a renewed vicious offensive against the international working class.

5) The third world congress of the C. I. recognised this turn in the world situation and coined the slogan: "To the masses". It dealt with the organisation of Communist mass Parties, with the conquest of the majority of the socially decisive part of the proletariat. In this connection the problem of the tactics of the united front was launched which, ever since has constituted the foundation of all tactical movements of the C. I. This tactic was tested in a series of struggles, (Germany, Bulgaria), and it came about that certain leaders of Communist Parties opportunistically conceived this tactic as a unity stupor, as a parliamentary governmental idyll with the Social Democratic leaders, while others considered the tactic itself opportunistic and rejected it. Throughout an entire period the C. I. was forced to conduct a hard fight against both deviations in order to achieve its correct application in a Marxist-Leninist sense.

6) The politically most significant moment of the struggle of the C. I. for the united front of the proletariat is unquestionably the struggles for international unity of the trade union movement. The extraordinary importance of this question is lent by the fact that the trade unions are the reservoir of the majority of the socially decisive part of the proletariat. The "trade unions", it is declared in the V World Congress thesis on the trade union movement, "in the period of revolutionary preparation play a very big role, in the moment of the social revolution they will assume an extraordinary role and to them will fall the most important tasks of Socialist construction, when, after the victory of the proletariat, they become the organs of proletarian dictatorship". The Red Trade Union International and its organs, as a result of the raging persecution of the revolutionary trade union elements, by the bureaucratic leadership, was formed for the purpose of gathering the expelled into this militant organisation and of organising the resistance against the economic offensive of capital. Although the revolutionary unions in some countries, (France, Czechoslovakia) can show splendid results, the overcoming of the split in the trade union movement remains the precondition of success in the current battles of the world proletariat. The crystallisation of the Left Wing in the Amsterdam Trade Union International, the extremely significant leftward movement of the British proletariat, the formation of the Anglo Russian Unity Committee, etc., signify the first major results of the movement for trade union unity.

7) The current political situation is identified by the most extreme political instability in a whole number of countries. We have in mind the vacillating balance of power within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, the more or less energetic demands of various bourgeois fractions for controlling political power. From this follows an increasing and extremely real menace of the advance of blackest reaction, monarchist restoration attempts, etc. Effective struggle against these attempts is possible only through the unification of the entire proletariat. On the other hand such attempts offer the Communist Party exceptionally favourable conditions for the formation of the united front since in such moments the workers are spontaneously driven to demand unity. The history of the oldest Bolshevik Party, the R. C. P., reveals the lightning-like crystallisation of the united front against the monarchistic-reactionary dangers of the attack by General Korniloff in September 1917. The lessons of the Fascist uprising against the Stambulinsky peasant government in 1923 on the other hand shows that this united front can fail even in the time of the greatest reactionary danger when the Party makes errors

in the question of tactic and strategy. A similar error is to be seen in the attitude of the C. P. G. during the Hindenburg elections.

8) The struggle for unity cannot however be restricted to the movement for trade union unity. It must exploit every moment and every organisational possibility in order to approach the non-partisan and social democratic masses and to convince them that the Communist Party is the only Party which fights decisively, consequently, and to the end for the interest of the proletariat. Sport societies, free-thinkers organisations, all mass organisations of the proletariat, etc., must be intensively worked upon by our fractions in this regard. The sending to the Soviet Union of workers' delegations in which the overwhelming majority of Social Democratic workers participate has splendidly justified itself and must be continued with full energy. A

method of the struggle for unity that should not be underestimated is the organising of workers correspondents.

9) To summarise; the labour movement, disrupted by the opportunism of the II International had to be split in order to reconstitute unity upon a higher basis, the bearer of which is the III International. This process must necessarily lead to the elimination of the reformist leaders and the unification of the revolutionary proletarian masses. Both elements of this process, the splitting as well as the unity, are based upon the theory of Leninism, they are organisational elements of the unified Marxist-Leninist conception of the proletarian revolution. The anniversary of the death of the great leader of the world revolution must be utilised also for the purpose of theoretically clarifying the sense of the C. I.'s tactics, so that the practical political struggle for unity may be carried out with maximum result.

Lenin and the Tactical Questions of the British Labour Movement.

By A. Lozovsky.

"The proletariat needs the truth, and there is nothing more harmful to its cause than plausible, high-sounding, commonplace falsehoods." (From Lenin's reply to MacDonald in August, 1919).

The British labour movement always interested Lenin, and therefore he studied economic and social relations in Great Britain with particular attention. A connoisseur of imperialism, Lenin could not fail to pay attention to the method by which the British bourgeoisie had succeeded throughout many decades, in holding in moral and political subjection large masses of workers and the organisations they created. Lenin understood excellently the economic reasons for the British labour movement remaining "non-political" for so many years, and why, despite the growth and development of the trade unions, the Socialist Parties of Britain were of a skeleton nature. He followed with great attention the struggle of ideas that was taking place in the British Socialist movement; even before the war he frequently commented in the Bolshevik press upon the most important events, and in his time he sharply opposed Hyndman when the latter, still before the war, made the British working class happy with the theory of Socialist imperialism or imperialist Socialism.

The war, and the role of the trade union and Socialist organisations in the war, compelled Lenin to peer still more profoundly into the labour movement, in particular into the British labour movement. The reason for the chauvinism of the majority of trade union and Socialist leaders is to be found in their attachment to the bourgeois State and their ideological subjection to bourgeois ideology; this Lenin proved in quite a number of articles even during the pre-war period. In his numerous works, he gave a Marxist explanation of this ideology which is so very hostile to the interests of the working class.

In this article I will not deal with separate periods, I will only investigate Lenin's views on the main questions of the British Labour movement in the period following the October Revolution, when Lenin was at the same time the director of the new State and leader of the Third International.

In 1920, the British trade unions and the Labour Party sent a delegation to the U. S. S. R., with the task of becoming acquainted with the state of affairs. Some of these delegates, the most Right wing, Tom Shaw and Guest felt themselves more as the representatives of the British Government than of the British proletariat. In his Letter to the British Workers (May 30, 1920) Lenin says: "I am not surprised that a number of members of your delegation do not adopt the working class point of view, but the bourgeois point of view, that of the exploiting class, for in all capitalist countries the imperialist war has revealed deep-rooted sore: namely, the transference of the majority of workers' parliamentary leaders to the side of the Bourgeoisie. Under a false pretext of defence of the fatherland, they have actually defended the thieving interests of one of the two groups of world robbers — Anglo-American-French or

German; they have entered into an alliance with the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat; they have covered up this treachery with sentimental petty-bourgeois, reformist, pacifist phrases about world revolution, constitutional methods, about democracy and so on. This has been the case in all countries: it is not surprising, therefore, that the same thing in Great Britain also infected the composition of your delegation." Tom Shaw and Guest asked Lenin whether he could prove that the British Government was continuing intervention, and that it really was acting by agreement with Wrangel and Poland, etc. Lenin replied to this that: "In order to get hold of secret treaties of the British Government, it would be necessary to overthrow it in a revolutionary manner, and to seize all documents concerning foreign policy, as we did in 1917". "Those leaders or representatives of the British proletariat" writes Lenin in the same letter, "No matter whether they be parliamentary, trade union, journalists or others, who pretend that they do not know anything about the existence of secret treaties of Great Britain, France, America, Italy, Japan and Poland, concerning robbery of other countries and the sharing of the loot, and who do not conduct a revolutionary struggle for denunciation of such treaties, show by that alone once again that they are the true servants of the capitalists... In Great Britain there are also influential labour leaders' who help the capitalists to befool the workers, and the journal the "New Statesman" which is the most moderate of moderates of the middle class journals, writes about supplying Poland with tanks more powerful than those used in the war against the Germans — after that can we fail to smile at these 'leaders' of the British workers who, with a look of injured innocence, ask what 'proof' there is that England is fighting against Russia and helping Poland and the White Guards in the Crimea".

I have cited these phrases from Lenin's letter, in order to show what was his attitude towards those of the leaders of the British labour movement who tried to gloss over things that are evident. It was absolutely impossible not to know in the middle of 1920 that England was fighting against Soviet Russia. What then in this case was the meaning of these "naive", if not crafty questions of Shaw and Guest? They were nothing more than an attempt to remove responsibility from Lloyd George for his anti-Soviet policy.

The members of the British Delegation asked Lenin what he considered most important: "The forming of a consistent revolutionary Communist Labour Party in Great Britain or the immediate assistance of the British working masses to the cause of peace with Soviet Russia", Lenin replied to this as follows: "Sincere supporters of liberating the workers from the yoke of capital can by no means be opposed to the formation of a Communist Party... There is no need to fear that there will be too many Communists in England, for there is not even a small Communist Party there. But if anyone still con-

tinues to remain in moral slavery to the bourgeoisie, continues to have petty-bourgeois prejudices about 'democracy' (bourgeois democracy), pacifism, etc., then it stands to reason that such people would be still more harmful to the proletariat if they were to think of calling themselves Communists and joining the Third International. Such people are not capable of anything but sugary resolutions against intervention, made up of nothing but petty-bourgeois phraseology." In concluding this letter, Lenin explained to the British workers what compelled the Soviet Power to employ the Red Terror. "The non-Communist leaders, bound by bourgeois prejudices, fear even the question: against which class is the Terror directed, against the exploited or against the oppressors and exploiters? is it a question of 'freedom' for the capitalists to rob, deceive, and befool the toilers, or of 'freedom' of the toilers from the yoke of the capitalists, speculators and proprietors?"

This letter, which touches on the general problems of the labour movement and the Russian Revolution, gives us a clear idea of Lenin's opinion of the Right wing leaders of the British political and trade union movement. In this sharp estimation, the views of Lenin are also given, in passing, on certain questions of the British labour movement. Now we will turn to concrete problems that have arisen during the process of the formation of the Left wing in England.

* * *

In the middle of 1919 a British Communist put a number of questions to Lenin. Having given a brief outline of the situation of the British labour movement in England, the British Communist illustrated the moral and organisational scatteredness of the revolutionary elements, their disagreement as to parliamentarism. The author of the letter, himself an anti-parliamentarian, ends his letter with the following words: "If you were here, you would say: concentrate all your forces on direct action, and stop all this palaver about the political machine... In no country other than Great Britain is there a political apparatus which would be so difficult for the workers to conquer!" To this letter from a man who at that time did not know that the task of the Communists is to destroy the entire political apparatus of the bourgeoisie and not conquer it, Lenin replied in a detailed letter, in which he explained the views of revolutionary Marxists on parliamentarism.

"I do not doubt in any way", wrote Lenin in his "Letter to a British Communist" (August 28, 1919), "that many workers belonging to the best, most honest, sincere revolutionary representatives of the proletariat, are enemies of parliamentarism and of all participation in parliament. The older capitalist culture and bourgeois democracy is in a given country, the more comprehensible this becomes, for the bourgeoisie in the old parliamentary countries has learned excellently how to play the hypocrite and to deceive the people in a thousand ways, putting forward bourgeois parliamentarism for 'democracy in general' or of 'pure democracy' and the like, while artfully concealing the millions of undercurrents between parliament and the stock exchange and the capitalists, and in employing the corrupt press and by every means setting going the strength of money and the power of capital. The Communist International and the Communist Parties of various countries would be committing an incorrigible error if they were to turn down workers who were in favour of the Soviet system, but who do not agree to participating in the parliamentary struggle. If we take the question theoretically, in its general aspect, it is just this programme, i. e. the struggle for the Soviet Republic which is capable of uniting, and must now undoubtedly unite, all sincere, honest revolutionaries from among the workers." "What is to be done", asks Lenin further on, "if in a certain country Communists who, by conviction, and by their readiness to conduct revolutionary work, are sincere supporters of the Soviet system, cannot unite because of disagreement on the question as to participation in parliament?" "I would consider such differences unessential at the present time", replies Lenin, "as the struggle for the Soviet system is a political struggle of the proletariat in its highest, most conscious, and most revolutionary form. It is better to be with the revolutionary workers when they err on particular or secondary questions, than with the official Socialists or Social Democrats if they are not sincere, not firm revolutionaries, and do not wish or are not able to conduct revolutionary work among the working masses, but conduct a correct tactic on this particular question." "I am personally convinced", continues Lenin, "that the refusal to

participate in parliamentary elections is an error on the part of the revolutionary workers of Great Britain, but it is better to concede to this error, than to retard the formation of a Workers' Communist Party in England from among all those whom you enumerate who sympathise with Bolshevism and all tendencies and elements which are sincerely in favour of the Soviet Republic."

We see what interests Lenin most. Lenin, who can in no way be reproached with love for unclear or unformed programmes, Lenin who valued more than anything else clearness, complete agreement and full ideological unity of thought on all the most important questions, advises the British revolutionaries to form a party as soon as possible irrespective as to divergencies of view on the question of parliamentarism. Lenin understood quite well that such divergencies would soon be overcome and that the Party in the struggle with its enemies would become strengthened and emboldened. "Criticism of parliamentarism", says Lenin, "is lawful and necessary, as motivating the transition to the Soviet system, but it is also absolutely correct as a recognition of the historical conventionality and restrictedness of parliamentarism, its connections with capitalism, the progressiveness of parliamentarism with regard to mediaeval systems and its reactionary attitude as compared with the Soviet system". "The error of the Anarchists and the Anarchist-Syndicalists", says Lenin in another place, "is that they are against any participation in Parliament, whereas there can be and should be Soviet propaganda in bourgeois Parliaments from within". Certainly great difficulties lie in the path of such parliamentarism, but these difficulties must be overcome "And if the Labour Party be really revolutionary, if it is really labour (i. e. connected with the masses, with the majority of toilers, with the proletarian rank and file, and not with its upper strata) if it is really a Party i. e. strong, a serious compact organisation of the revolutionary vanguard, capable of conducting work among the masses by every possible means, then such a Party will assuredly be able to hold back with its hands its own Parliamentarians, turn them into real revolutionary propagandists, like Karl Liebknecht, and not opportunists, not pervertors of the proletariat, with bourgeois lack of ideas". Nothing had been heard of this kind of parliamentary activity in the old parliamentary countries, for all the countries of the Second International, even before their moral and political bankruptcy, have never set themselves tasks of this kind. Why did Lenin refer to the question of parliamentarism in such detail? Because he feared that, what with one thing and another, the British Communists would be late in organising the Communist Party, and although most space in this letter was given to the question of parliamentarism, the central idea, the main theme of the letter, was the necessity for forming a Communist Party. Lenin was not only for the formation of a Communist Party, but says in the same letter that a Communist Party is necessary for England. How did Lenin formulate this task? "Unbroken contact with the masses of workers, the capacity for continually agitating among them, participating in every strike, responding to all questions of the masses — that is what is most important for the Communist Party, particularly in such a country as Great Britain, where up to now (as by the way in all imperialist countries) it has mainly been the narrow upper strata of the workers, the representatives of the labour aristocracy, who participated in the Socialist and in general in the labour movement, for the greater part hopelessly spoilt through and through by Reformism, and captivated by bourgeois and imperialist prejudices. Without a struggle against this stratum, without destroying all its authority among workers, without convincing the masses of the complete bourgeois contamination of this stratum, there can be no question of any serious Communist labour movement." This advice given to the British Communists goes far beyond the bounds of Great Britain. This may be considered as one of the main conceptions of the tactics of international Communism.

* * *

In "Left Wing Communism", (written in April 1920), a book most brilliant in its compactness and clearness of thought and profound analysis, Lenin once more deals with the tactical problems of the British labour movement and alludes to opportunism and petty bourgeois revolutionism. He returns to the question of parliamentarism, and by citing examples of all revolutions he proves the disadvantageousness for the proletariat of renouncing the utilisation of the parliamentary tribune. He

objects here to references to the Bolsheviks having dissolved the Constituent Assembly, and that therefore there was no use in participating in parliaments. Historical facts speak against references of this nature, for the Bolsheviks after the October Revolution did not boycott elections, but participated in them. "It has been proved that participation in bourgeois-democratic parliaments a few weeks before the victory of the Soviet Republic, and even after that victory, not only has not harmed the revolutionary proletariat, but has actually made it easier to prove to the backward masses why such parliaments should be dispersed, has made it easier to disperse them, and has facilitated the process whereby bourgeois parliaments are actually made 'politically outworn.'" "It is impossible to build up revolutionary tactics solely on revolutionary dispositions and moods", says Lenin in another place. "Tactics should be constructed on a sober and strictly objective consideration of the forces of a given country (and of the countries surrounding it, and of all countries on a world scale), as well as on an evaluation of the experiences of other revolutionary movements. To manifest one's revolutionism solely by dint of swearing at parliamentary opportunism, by rejecting participation in parliaments is very easy; but just because it is too easy, it is not the solution of a difficult, a most difficult problem... To attempt to 'circumvent' this difficulty by 'jumping over' the hard task of utilising reactionary parliaments for revolutionary purposes, is absolute childishness."

I have referred thus in detail to these views of Lenin's on participation in Parliament not because this question is of vital importance for the British Communist Party at the present moment, but because I wanted also to show Lenin's method of approach to those questions, which arose in England at the dawn of the Communist movement.

Lenin paid very close attention to the infantile disorder that was to be observed then in England in 1920, because at that time "in Britain there is as yet no Communist Party, but there is a young, extensive, potent, Communist movement, rapidly growing among the workers" (Left Wing Communism). This young potent movement might pass by the Communist Party if Lenin had not drawn serious attention to it. In an article by Gallacher in which the latter wrote that "The workers feel disgusted at the idea of Parliament", that the revolutionary comrades shall not support the Hendersons and Clynes, for "to support parliamentarians and opportunists by no matter what means, would simply mean laying into the hands of the above-mentioned gentlemen." And Lenin replied to this heart-felt protest against the support of the Labour Party by revolutionaries and workers: "People who are able to express such a disposition of the masses, who are able to awaken in them such a mood (which often lies dormant) should be cared for attentively and every assistance rendered them. At the same time they must be told frankly and openly that mood alone is not sufficient to guide the masses in the great revolutionary struggle... This hatred of the representative of oppressed and exploited masses is indeed 'the beginning of all wisdom'; it is the basis of every socialist and communist movement and of its success. The author (Gallacher) however, evidently does not take into consideration the fact that politics is a science and an art which does not drop from the skies, and which cannot be obtained for nothing; and that the proletarian, if it wishes to overcome the bourgeoisie, must create for itself its own, proletarian, 'class politicians', as capable as bourgeois politicians... The author (Gallacher) of the letter does not however even think of putting the question as to whether or not it is possible for the Soviets to vanquish Parliament without introducing 'Soviet' workers into the latter, without disintegrating Parliament from within, without preparing inside Parliament, the success of Soviets, in the impending struggle for the dispersion of Parliaments." Lenin objects with particular force to the refusal to support opportunist representatives of the Labour Party at elections. "That the Hendersons, Clynes, MacDonalds and Snowden's are hopelessly reactionary is true. It is also true that they want to take the power into their own hands (preferring, however, a coalition with the bourgeoisie), that they want to govern according to the same old rules of the bourgeoisie, and that they will inevitably behave, when in power, like the Scheidemanns and the Noskes. All this is true, but it does not necessarily follow that to support them means treason to the revolution; on the contrary, in the interests of the revolution, the revolutionaries of the working class must render to these gentlemen a certain parliamentary support...

The Left Communists find it inevitable that the power will fall into the hands of the Labour Party and admit that at the present time the latter is backed by a majority of working men. From this they draw the strange conclusion which Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst expresses as follows:

"A Communist Party must not enter into compromises... A Communist Party must keep its doctrine pure, and its independence of reformism inviolate; its mission is to lead the way, without stopping or turning, by the direct road to the Communist Revolution".

On the contrary, since the majority of the workers in Britain still support the British Scheidemanns and Kerenskys, since they have not yet experienced a government composed of such men, which experience was necessary in Russia and Germany, before there was an exodus of the masses towards Communism, it follows without any doubt that the British Communists must participate in Parliament. They must from within Parliament help the workers to see in practice the results of the Henderson and Snowden Government; they must help the Hendersons and Snowden's to vanquish Lloyd George and Churchill united. To act otherwise means to hamper the progress of the Revolution; because, without an alteration in the views of the majority of the working class, revolution is impossible; and this change can be brought about by the political experience of the Masses only, and never through propaganda alone. If any indisputably weak minority of the workers say 'forward, without compromise, without stopping or turning', their slogan is, on the face of it, wrong. They know, or at least they should know that the majority, in the event of Henderson's and Snowden's victory over Lloyd George and Churchill, will, after a short time, be disappointed in its leaders, and will come over to Communism — or at any rate to neutrality and, in most cases, to benevolent neutrality towards the Communists. It is as though ten thousand soldiers were to throw themselves into battle against fifty thousand of the enemy at a time when a re-inforcement of one hundred thousand men is expected but is not immediately available; obviously, it is necessary at such a moment to stop, to turn, even to effect a compromise.

The question as to compromises being permissible and necessary for the Communist Parties raised no doubts in Lenin. But the knowledge of British conditions and the readiness on the part of opportunists to utilise every thing, to catch on to any hook in order to be able to conduct their opportunist policy, compelled Lenin to deal with this question in detail and to make it as clear as possible as to what compromises were in question. Lansbury, who visited Lenin, told him in a conversation: "Our British trade union leaders say that compromises are also allowable for them if they are permissible for Bolshevism" (a hint at Brest Litovsk). Lenin replied to this with a simple and "popular" comparison:

"Imagine that your automobile is held up by armed bandits. You hand them over your money, passport, revolver, the machine. In return you are spared the pleasant company of the bandits. The compromise is plainly there 'Do, ut des' (I 'give' you money, arms, the automobile, in order that you 'give' me the possibility of going in peace). But one can hardly find a sane man who would pronounce such a compromise 'inadmissible on principle', or would proclaim the compromiser an accomplice of the bandits — even though the bandits, having got into the automobile, used it and the firearms for new robberies. Our compromise with the bandits of German imperialism was such a compromise.

But when the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries in Russia, the Scheidemanns (and to a great extent the Kautskians) in Germany, Otto Bauer and Friedrich Adler (let alone Messrs. Renner and Co.) in Austria, the Renaudels, Longuets and Co. in France, the 'Independents' and the 'Labourites' and the Fabians in England, effected in 1914—18, and in 1918—20, compromises with the bandits of their own bourgeoisie, and sometimes with those of the bourgeoisie of the 'Allies', against the revolutionary proletariat of their country, that is where these worthies were guilty of aiding and abetting.

The conclusion is clear: — To reject compromises on 'principle', to reject every admissibility of compromises generally, no matter of what kind, is a piece of childishness hard even to take seriously. He who wishes to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must be able to sift the concrete cases of such compromises which are inadmissible, which stand for opportunism and treachery, and to direct all the force of his criticism against

these concrete compromises, mercilessly exposing them, fighting them to a finish, and not allowing 'experienced Socialists' and parliamentary Jesuits to dodge and shirk responsibilities by resorting to discussions of 'compromises generally'. The 'leaders' of the British trade unions, as well as of the Fabian Society and the 'Independent' Labour Party, use just this method of dodging responsibility for the betrayal they committed. Theirs was a compromise which indicated the worst kind of opportunism, treason and betrayal." Such a reply given to the elements who want to hide their opportunism by talk about abstract compromises, leaves nothing to be added. It was no mere chance that Lenin, in replying to the British Rights and extreme Lefts dealt with this question in such detail. Lenin pursued two objects: to teach the British Communists to conduct a correct Bolshevik policy against decaying opportunism and sterile Left phraseology.

* * *

What was most difficult of all for the Communist Party of Great Britain while in process of formation, was to establish a correct attitude towards the Labour Party. The advantage for the Communists in the Labour Party entering power, was not clear to the majority of the leading elements of the revolutionary movement in Great Britain, and as this was the most important question of Communist tactics Lenin continually returns to this question. In order to make his ideas clear, Lenin outlined the "fundamental law of revolution". "It is not sufficient for the Revolution", says Lenin "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 able to live and rule as of old. Only when the masses do not want the old regime and when the rulers are unable to govern as of old, then only can the revolution succeed. This truth may be expressed in other words: Revolution is impossible without an all-national crisis, affecting both the exploited and the exploiters. It follows that for the Revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for a revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; second, that the ruling class be in a state of governmental crisis, which attracts even the most backward masses into politics. It is a sign of every real revolution, this rapid ten-fold, or even hundred-fold, increase in the number of representatives of the toiling and oppressed masses, heretofore apathetic, who are able to carry on a political fight which weakens the government and facilitates its overthrow by the revolutionaries.

In Britain, as is seen specifically from Lloyd George's speech, both conditions for a successful proletarian revolution are obviously developing. Mistakes on the part of the Left Communists are now all the more dangerous just because some revolutionaries show an insufficiently penetrating, insufficiently attentive, conscious and foreseeing attitude, towards each of these conditions. If we are not a revolutionary group, but a Party of the revolutionary class, and wish to carry the masses with us, (without which we run the risk of remaining mere babblers), we must first help Henderson and Snowden to defeat Lloyd George and Churchill; or, to be more explicit, we must compel the former to defeat the latter, for the former are afraid of their victory! Secondly, we must help the majority of the working class to convince themselves, through their own experience that we are right; that is, they convince themselves of the utter worthlessness of the Hendersons and Snowdens, of their petty-bourgeois and treacherous natures, of the inevitability of their bankruptcy. Thirdly, we must accelerate the moment when, through the disappointment of the majority of the workers with the Hendersons, it will be possible, with serious chances of success, to overthrow the Henderson Government which will most certainly lose its head if the clever leader of, not the petty but the grand bourgeoisie, Lloyd George himself, loses his wits so completely and weakens himself more — and with himself the whole bourgeois party — yesterday through his 'collisions' with Churchill, today with his "collisions with Asquith."

Lenin's idea is quite clear: to help the masses to outlive their reformist prejudices and the belief in constructive socialism, in formal democracy, and the rest. "And if the objections be raised" — concludes Lenin — "these are too cunning and intricate tactics, the masses won't understand them, they scatter and disintegrate our forces, they will interfere with the concentration on the Soviet Revolution, etc." "I shall reply to the 'Left' critics 'do not attribute your doctrinarism to the masses!'"

The political life in Great Britain during the last 2—3 years has brilliantly confirmed the correctness of Lenin's prediction that the government of the Labour Party would play into the hands of the Communist Party, as these gentlemen would imitate bourgeois governments and in doing so denounce themselves. MacDonald realised all Lenin's predictions by 100%, and on the other hand confirmed Lenin's assertion that the growth of the Communist Party would proceed at a rapid rate with the advent of the reformists to power. The British Communist Party and the Minority Movement have become strengthened and become a political factor in the country only since the time of the MacDonald Government, which like all opportunists worked for Communism in spite of itself.

* * *

Polemising with certain ultra-Left elements, Lenin in passing touched upon one of the most important and difficult problems as to the roots and causes of opportunism. At the Second Congress of the Comintern Lenin in his report: "the International Situation and the Fundamental Questions of the Communist International" puts the question: How do we explain the stability of such opportunist tendencies in Europe and why is this opportunism in Europe stronger than in our country? And he replies: "Because the advanced countries have created and are creating their own culture by the possibility of living at the expense of millions of oppressed people. Because the capitalists of these countries receive much more than they would be able to receive as profit from plundering the workers of their own country... These milliards of surplus profit represent the economic basis upon which opportunism is maintained in the Labour Movement. In America, Great Britain and France, there is an immeasurably more stubborn resistance on the part of the opportunist leaders, the upper strata of the labour class, the workers' aristocracy, they offer a much stronger resistance to the Communist movement and therefore we should be prepared for the liberation of the American and European Labour Parties from this malady to be much more difficult than was the case with us."

How were these difficulties to be overcome in Great Britain, where there existed a gigantic Labour Party and a number of small revolutionary Communist groups? Firstly, by immediately forming a single Communist Party, and secondly by a correct attitude towards the Labour Party. For Lenin, the question as to the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party arose from his entire policy on the British Labour Movement. In "Left Wing Communism" he writes the following on this subject: "I have too little information on this question, which is especially complicated on account of the quite unique composition of the British Labour Party, which is so very unlike the composition of the usual political parties on the Continent. I have no doubt, however, that, on this question as well, he would be mistaken who would be inclined to draw up the tactics of the revolutionary proletariat on the principle that the Communist Party must maintain its doctrine pure and its freedom from reformism inviolate; its slogan must be to go forward without stopping or turning aside, to follow the straight road to the Communist revolution". For such principles only repeat the mistakes of the French Communard-Blanquists, who, in the year 1874, proclaimed the 'repudiation' of all compromises and of all intermediary positions. Secondly, it is beyond all question that the problem, here as everywhere, consists in the ability to apply the general and fundamental principles of Communism to the specific relations between classes and parties, to the specific conditions in the objective development towards Communism — conditions which are peculiar to every separate country, and which one must be able to study, understand, and point out." At the Second Congress of the Communist International Lenin speaks on this subject very definitely: "The Communist Party" said Lenin, "may affiliate to the Labour Party only on condition that it retains entire freedom to criticise that party and to conduct its own political propaganda." In reply to a remark of Serrati that this would be "class collaboration" Lenin replied: "But in the present place, in respect of the British Labour Party, we have a case of cooperation between the advanced minority and the great mass of the English workers. All the workers, all the members of the trade unions, are members of the Labour Party. The Labour Party is a peculiar organisation having no parallel in any other country; it comprises from six to seven million organised workers of all trades. Political convictions are not required in applying for membership... This means the collaboration of the vanguard of the working class with the rearguard. It is a matter of ut-

most importance for the entire movement that we insist that the English Communists form a link between the Party of the Minority and the masses of the workers. When the Minority is unable to lead the masses, and incapable of getting into close touch with them, than it is no Party, and is of no significance, whether it be called Party, or National Committee, or shop stewards. As far as I know, the shop stewards in England have their national committee and central guiding organ which is already a step towards the formation of a Party. Therefore since it cannot be denied that the British Labour Party is composed of workers, it is clear that working in that Party means co-operation of the vanguard of the working class with the less advanced workers; and, when this cooperation is not systematically carried on, the Communist Party is worthless, and there can be no question of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The discussion on the question of the attitude of the Communist Party towards the Labour Party became heated, and Lenin made a speech on August 6th, 1920 with regard to entry into the British Labour Party.

"Sylvia Pankhurst" said Lenin, "asked whether it was possible for a Communist Party to join another political party which still belonged to the Second International. She says this is impossible. But we have very peculiar conditions in the British Labour Party: this is a very original party, it is not a party in the ordinary meaning of the word. It consists of the members of all the trade union organisations... We have in this party the great mass of the English workers, led by the worst bourgeois elements, by the social patriots, worse even than Scheidemann, Noske and similar gentlemen. The Labour Party admits, however, that the I.L.P., which is one of its members, should have its own organs, where the members of the same Labour Party openly declared the leaders to be social traitors... It is not correct — as Comrade Gallacher states, that if we decide to accept the Labour Party, the best revolutionary English workers will not go with us. We must put it to the test."

When we read now, five years after the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin's tactical advice to the British Communists, we see how correctly and capably he traced out the correct line, fighting against all kinds of prejudice and formal revolutionarism. With the question as to the affiliation or non-affiliation to the Labour Party, the question as to the proper approach to the masses, so important for any Communist Party, was solved...

* * *

What occupied Lenin more than anything else, was the question of forming a Communist Party in Great Britain as soon as possible, although he only spoke of the necessary organisational steps for this, in passing. He drew the main attention of all revolutionary workers in Great Britain to the political tasks, to the methods of approach to the masses, to the nature of the work, emphasising thereby, that without a proper policy, it would be impossible to form a real Communist Party. "The Communists in Britain", says Lenin in "Left Wing Communism", "must continually assiduously and determinedly utilise both the parliamentary elections and every opening offered by the Irish, Colonial, and world-imperialist policy of the British Government, and all other aspects, domains and spheres of public life, working everywhere in a Communist spirit, the spirit not of the Second, but of the Third International." To work in this new spirit was what Lenin emphasised over and over again as being necessary for Communists in all countries. A little less looking back at the old expiring Socialism and trade unionism, and remember that humanity has entered a new epoch, that tens of millions of toilers have been awakened, have been aroused by war and revolution and we must persistently set our hands to work, and yet more work.

"The Communists of Western Europe and America", says Lenin in the same work, "must learn to create a new parliamentarism, entirely distinct from the usual opportunist office-seeking forms. This new parliamentarism must be used by the Communist Party to set forth its programme; it must be used by the real proletarian, who, in cooperation with the unorganised and very much ignored poor, should go from house to house of the workers, from cottage to cottage of the agricultural proletariat and isolated peasantry, carrying and distributing leaflets. (Fortunately, in Europe there are fewer isolated peasants than in Russia, and fewer still in England.) The Communist should penetrate into the humblest taverns, should find

his way into the Unions, societies and chance gatherings of the common people and talk with them, not learnedly, nor too much after the parliamentary fashion. He should not for a moment think of a "place" in parliament; his only object should be everywhere to awaken the minds of the people, to attract the masses, to trip the bourgeoisie up on their own words, utilising the apparatus created by them, the election contests arranged by them, the appeals to the whole people issued by them, to preach Bolshevism to the masses. Under the rule of the bourgeoisie this is possible only during an election campaign — not counting of course, the occasion of great strikes, when a similar apparatus of general agitation may be utilised, as we utilised it, more intensely. It is exceedingly difficult to do this in Western Europe and America, but it can and must be done, for without labour the problems of Communism can in no way be solved. It is necessary to work for the solution of all practical problems which are becoming more and more varied, more and more involved with all branches of public life, as the Communists tend to conquer one field after another from the bourgeoisie.

Likewise in Britain it is necessary to put the work of propaganda, of agitation and organisation in the army, and among the nationalities oppressed and deprived of equal rights in 'their' Empire (e. g. Ireland, Egypt, etc.), on a new basis. This work must be carried on not on Socialist, but on Communist lines, not in the reformist but in the revolutionary manner. For all these spheres of public life are especially filled with inflammable material and create many causes for conflicts, crises, enhancements of the class struggle. This is especially true in the epoch of imperialism generally, and particularly now when war has exhausted the peoples and has opened their eyes to the truth namely, that tens of millions have been killed and maimed solely to decide whether English or German plunderers should rob more countries. We do not know, and we cannot know, which of the inflammable sparks which now fly in all countries, fanned by the economic and political world crisis, will be the one to start the conflagration (in the sense of a particular awakening of the masses); we are, therefore, bound to utilise our new Communist principles in the cultivation of all and every field of endeavour, no matter how old, rotten and seemingly hopeless. Otherwise we shall not be equal to the occasion, shall not be comprehensible, shall not be prepared to master all the types of weapons in the struggle, shall not be ready for victory over the bourgeoisie, — which is responsible for the creation of all the aspects of public life, but which has now disrupted them, and disrupted them in a purely bourgeois manner. Not without careful preparation shall we be ready for the impending Communist reorganisation of society after our victory."

* * *

In April 1919 MacDonal wrote an article, "The Third International", in which he definitely opposed the formation of the Communist International. MacDonal acknowledged that at the Conference of the Second International in Berne, the discussion on the question of war responsibility "was only a concession to non-socialist public opinion", but he nevertheless considered existence in one International as being possible. "We must establish our socialist principles", wrote MacDonal. "We must lay the solid foundations of International Socialist policy. After this, if we find that we are in essential disagreement over these principles, if we do not see eye to eye as regards liberty and democracy, if we have definitely divergent views about the conditions in which the working class can exercise power, if the war has tainted certain sections of the International with imperialism, then the split can take place.

However, I do not think that such a calamity will occur. Consequently, I regret the Moscow manifesto as being at least premature and certainly useless."

And Lenin replied to these narrow-minded melancholy arguments in an article "On the Tasks of the Third International" in which he revealed with vivid clearness the difference between opportunism and Communism. "Ramsay MacDonal declares, with the entertaining naivete of a parlour Socialist, who speaks in the air without the least notion in the world that his words have a serious bearing, without in any way understanding that words compel action. — At Berne a concession was made to non-Socialist public opinion".

Lenin, in replying to MacDonal, refers to imperialism and its connection with opportunism in the labour movement.

"Fabian Imperialism" and "Socialist Imperialism" are one and the same thing. It is Socialism in word and Imperialism in deed. It is the transformation of fully developed opportunism into imperialism. Today, during and after the war of 1914—1918, this phenomenon has become universal. The failure of the yellow Berne International to understand this is the result of its extreme blindness and constitutes its greatest crime. Opportunism or reformism inevitably developed into Socialist Imperialism or social patriotism, with world-historical significance. For Imperialism brought to the fore a group of very rich, highly developed countries, who plunder the whole world, and whose bourgeoisie is able, by that very fact, to buy with the surplus of its monopolist profits (for Imperialism means monopolist capitalism) the upper strata of the working class of these countries.

Only complete ignoramuses or hypocrites, who deceive the workers by repeating commonplaces on capitalism, concealing in this way the bitter truth of the passing of an entire Socialist tendency to the side of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, can fail to see the economic inevitability of this fact.

Two indisputable conclusions are to be drawn from this fact: —

The first conclusion is that the Berne "International" is in fact, by virtue of its actual historical and political role, independently of the goodwill and the innocent desires of such and such of its members, an organisation of agents of International Imperialism, acting in the midst of the working class, infusing the working class with bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies, and bourgeois corruption."

Lenin counterposes to MacDonald's concession on Socialist Parties and the International, the Bolshevik understanding of the Party and the International. Here is this striking juxtaposition of Communism to reformism, of the Third International to the Second:

To defeat opportunism, which was the cause of the ignominious death of the Second International, and to assist effectively the revolution, the approach of which is recognised even by Ramsay MacDonald, the following must be done: —

First: All propaganda and agitation must be directed towards revolution as opposed to reforms. This distinction must be systematically made clear to the masses, both theoretically and practically, in every instance of parliamentary, cooperative, trade union, and other work. There must be no refusal (except in rare special cases) to make use of parliamentarism and all the "liberties" of bourgeois democracy. Reforms must not be renounced, but should be looked upon only as subordinate issues in the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat. Not one of the parties of the Berne 'International' satisfies these demands. Not a single one of them even evinces an understanding of how all propaganda and agitation must be directed towards making clear the difference between reforms and revolution, and of the necessity for the most strict and constant preparation, both of the Party and of the masses, for revolution.

Secondly, it is necessary to combine legal and illegal work. This was taught by the Bolsheviks at all times and particularly during the war of 1914—1918. It was ridiculed by the despicable opportunist heroes, who in their self-satisfied manner praised the 'legality', the 'democracy' and the 'freedom' of the West European countries, of republics, etc. At the present time only evowed scoundrels, who deceive the workers by phrases, can deny that the Bolsheviks have been proved right. There is not a single country in the world, even the most advanced and 'freest' of bourgeois republics, where there is not a reign of bourgeois terror and where agitation, propaganda and organised work for the Socialist revolution is not prohibited. The Party which up to now has been unwilling to recognise that this is so under bourgeois domination and which fails to carry on systematic illegal work all along the line, in spite of bourgeois laws and bourgeois parliaments, is a party of cowards and traitors who deceive the people by only recognising the revolution in words. Such Parties have a place marked out for them in the yellow Berne 'International'. No place will be given them in the Communist International.

Thirdly, a ruthless struggle must be carried on in order to clear right out of the Labour Movement these opportunist leaders who showed their true characters before and especially during the war in politics, and particularly within the Trade

Unions and Cooperatives. The theory of 'neutrality' is a false and mean subterfuge which helped the bourgeoisie to bulldoze the masses during the war of 1914—1918. Those parties which verbally assert that they are in favour of revolution, but which do not in fact carry on a relentless struggle for the supremacy of the one genuinely revolutionary party in all working-class organisations — such a party is a party of traitors.

Fourthly, it is not enough to condemn Imperialism in words, with the fixed intention not to conduct a revolutionary struggle for the liberation of the colonies (and the dependent nationalities) enslaved by their Imperialist bourgeoisie. That is hypocrisy. That is the policy of 'Labour lieutenants of the capitalist class'. That party — English, French, Dutch, Belgian or any other — which is opposed in words to Imperialism, but which does not in fact carry on the revolutionary struggle within its 'own' colonies for the purpose of overthrowing 'its own' bourgeoisie, which does not systematically and in every possible way assist the revolutionary work which has already begun in the colonies, which does not provide the colonies with arms and literature for the work of the revolutionary parties — that party is a party of cowards and traitors.

Fifthly, a phenomenon typical of the parties of the Berne 'International' and which is the height of hypocrisy, consists in recognising the revolution in words, and parading this recognition before the workers in pompous phrases, whilst as a matter of fact they behave in a purely reformist manner towards the first signs and manifestations of revolutionary development, such as all mass movements which, by smashing bourgeois law, take on an illegal character; for instance, mass strikes, street demonstrations, soldiers' mutinies, meetings among the troops, the distribution of leaflets in barracks and camps, etc.

These five points excellently determine the tasks of the Communist Party and are more than ever opportune for Great Britain. The second point concerning illegal work and the terror of the bourgeoisie against revolutionary workers, would appear not to be written at the commencement of 1919, but at the end of 1925. Many problems which were presented by Lenin a few years ago have been settled in Great Britain. A Communist Party now exists there, it is excellently connected with the masses, it has already long ago outlived the infantile disorders of Leftism, and, despite all persecutions, is going further and further ahead. But why is it that during the last two years the Communist Party of Great Britain has grown into a serious political factor? Because it has ably applied the Leninist tactic of winning the masses. Now, when the Communist Party of Great Britain has entered a phase of persecutions, when simultaneously with the increase of repressions, the sympathy of the workers towards the Party also grows, now Leninist strategy must be studied with particular attention, so that despite illegality, the Party will be able to become still more strongly and still more closely linked up with the masses. The objective position is favourable for turning the Communist Party into a mass Party. The movements now taking place at the very heart of the masses of the British proletariat, the increase of left wing moods, which have found expression in the formation of an Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Bloc, the formation of a Left wing in the Labour Party and the sharpening of the struggle in the trade unions and in the Labour Party against the opportunist policy of the MacDonalds, Thomases and Clynes — all these factors bear witness to the fact that neither the bourgeoisie nor the reformists will be able to strangle the growing Communist movement. They will not be able to strangle it, because Lenin stood at the cradle of the British Communist movement, and because the British Communists remember Lenin's advice: "It is necessary to coordinate the strictest devotion to the ideas of Communism with the ability to accept all necessary practical compromises, manoeuvrings, temporisings, zig-zags, retreats and the like. This coordination is essential in order to hasten the rise and fall, the realisation and the withering away, of the political power of the Hendersons... It is essential in order to facilitate their inevitable practical bankruptcy, which enlightens the masses precisely after our ideas, precisely in the direction of Communism. One must precipitate the inevitable quarrel and conflicts between the Hendersons, Lloyd Georges and Churchills, and choose correctly the moment of the maximum disintegration between all these 'buttresses of sacred private property' in order to defeat them all in one decisive offensive of the proletariat, and conquer political power."

Lenin and the American Labour Movement.

By F e n d e l.

I. The Growing Strength of American Capitalism. Problems of the American Labour Movement.

The exclusive role of the United States of America in the coming process of development of world economics and politics is more clearly and evidently revealed every day. The war of 1914—18 broke the United States away from its "happy isolation" and bound it up economically and politically with the rest of the world by the closest ties. The all-conquering American dollar truly and invariably subjects, though in various degrees, the economic systems of all other capitalist countries; the "Dawes Plan" is becoming a "normal" kind of measure for concretely expressing the economic hegemony of American capital. As a result of this state of affairs the importance of the USA is undoubtedly also growing in the field of world politics, and is re-inforced by such weighty arguments, as the increase of the standing army, frantic construction of new naval and air fleets etc., etc. The oily pacifist and bigoted-christian-democratic declarations are no longer capable of hiding the obviously reactionary activity of the U. S. A. government which subsidises Mussolini with money and stubbornly shuns recognition of the U. S. S. R.

The world proletarian revolutionary movement is bound to take into consideration this new factor of world politics. The active entry of American capital into the international economic and political arena means, among other things, the entry of the strongest and the most powerful forces of world capital against the revolutionary movement of the working class. This brings the International proletariat face to face with the problem of the American Labour movement. Until quite recently the American Labour movement in accordance with the "happy isolation" of American economy and politics in general has developed along separate lines, it has proceeded on its own isolated path far from the path of the Western European Labour movement. Contact has been casual, weak and superficial.

It is true that through the immigrant workers, the Western European Labour movement has given its own ideology to the American movement, but in the specific conditions of American economic and political reality, this ideology has not been able to adapt itself organically to American soil and has proved to be a jaded and badly growing plant. On the contrary opportunist distortions have blossomed forth over it into double blooms. National antagonisms, antagonisms between separate strata of the working class, specific methods of government of the American bourgeoisie up to quite recently in an unusually condensed form have piled obstacles in the way of the class organisation of the proletariat. Difficulties are very great even now, but the prerequisites for a mass labour movement and its class political formation are existent: the last decade which has brought American capital to the heights of world hegemony has at the same time consolidated to a considerable degree the American proletariat in the sense of its national-language and group homogeneity, has brought it face to face with a centralised state apparatus which carried out the class policy of the capitalists with cynical frankness (while keeping up democratic phrases and decorum and sometimes without same).

The spasmodic nature of development of American economy, the extreme acuteness of its crises, the ever-increasing difficulties of solving the problem of markets, — all these factors on the background of the growing economic and political power of the Soviet Union and of the revolutionary movement of the colonial peoples make ultimately inevitable the creation of a revolutionary situation followed also by a revolutionary situation in America, which up to the present has seemed to be immune from the "revolutionary bacillus".

In connection with these perspectives arising from the process of the economic and political developments of the United States, a whole number of most serious problems face the Workers Party of the United States — problems which during the coming period will be centred round the basic problem of organising a politically independent mass Labour Party, as a commencement of the political self-determination and development of the class-consciousness of the American workers. But the solving of this problem is in turn linked up with other

problems: relations to a so-called "third Party", the awakening of class-consciousness of the American proletariat on the basis of the vital every day demands of the working class, the drawing over of the poorest strata of farmers, etc., to the side of the working class.

The tasks which the Workers Party of the United States, is called upon to solve are by no means light ones, they can only be solved in conditions of applying as a weapon in the struggle the teachings of Lenin which represent a most colossal synthesis of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

Lenin did not make a special study of the problems of the American Labour Movement. These problems had not yet come up on the revolutionary agenda, one might say. They were still to a considerable extent the music of the future. But he attentively followed the process of development in the United States, and the economic and social-political processes that were taking place in that great Trans-Atlantic country. He expressed in this respect quite a number of opinions which are of particular interest for American Communists, so much the more as the problems of the American Labour Movement which Lenin touched upon¹⁾ are essentially the same as those which face the American Workers Party at the present time. There is only one difference and that is that the time has arrived for solving these problems not only theoretically, but also practically.

Taken as a whole, Lenin's conceptions with regard to the American Labour movement are in the main construed in the following manner: The general characteristic of the United States as a highly developed capitalist country, in which capitalist evolution of agriculture is very apparent, is combined with its characteristic social-political order, as a classical example of bourgeois democracy in different periods more or less nakedly representing bourgeois dictatorship.

It is in this peculiar social-economic and political situation that the revolutionary vanguard, of a proletariat which is extremely heterogeneous, with many substrata and which is politically, ideologically and organisationally backward, has to fight. A whole series of problems crop up, of which the most important are the following: attitude towards the formation of what is termed a "Third Party"; the formation of an independent Labour Party; the most appropriate tactic for the solution of this basic task; attitude towards the farmers' movement; estimation of reformist currents in connection with estimating bourgeois tactics and finally, the questions as to the "peaceful" or revolutionary nature of development of the American Labour movement.

That is the scope of the problems within the American Labour movement touched upon by Lenin.

II. Capitalist Development in American Agriculture and the Problems of the Farmer Movement.

"The United States is an advanced country of present-day capitalism. The United States has no equal rival either in the rapidity of the development of capitalism at the end of the 19th and commencement of the 20th century, nor in the highest stage of development it has already achieved. America is also unrivalled in the tremendous area over which its technique applies, which is equipped according to the last word in science-technique which takes into account the remarkable variety of natural-historical conditions. This country is also unrivalled in its political freedom and cultural level of the masses of the population. The ideal of our bourgeois civilisation is also in many respects indebted to this country²⁾."

¹⁾ It is opportune to say that these opinions of Lenin's relate to the period commencing from 1913. During the last decade with all the great importance of the changes in the economic and political life of the U. S. A. which have taken place, the Substance of these problems have certainly not changed.

²⁾ "New Data on the Laws of Development of Capitalism in Agriculture". Lenin's Collected Works, (Russian Edition) Volume IX. p. 197.

In this highly developed capitalist country the correctness of the Marxian law of capitalist evolution as applied to agriculture stands out most clearly, despite the assertions of bourgeois democrats and opportunists, who put forward the theory of non-capitalist evolution of agriculture in capitalist society.

These theories obviously constitute one of the foundation stones of the theoretical arguments of the reformists of all countries and all colours who build up the fantastic edifice of the peaceful development of Socialism on this basis. A correct diagnosis of the processes taking place in agriculture is of great importance particularly for American Communists for whom the question as to the attitude towards the farmers' movement and the correct estimation of same is a most serious problem; it is therefore all the more interesting to give Lenin's opinions on this subject.

Lenin dealt with the question of the evolution of agriculture in the United States in special investigations based on a thorough study of original sources of information³⁾ the twelfth census in 1900, the thirteenth in 1910 and from statistical works ("Statistical Abstracts of the United States for 1911").

The conclusions which Lenin arrived at were the following: "Manual labour predominates over machine labour in agriculture immeasurably more as compared with industry, but machinery is gradually forging ahead, raising the technique of farming, making it more intensive, and more capitalistic.

The increase in a number of hired workers is overtaking the growth of the agricultural and the entire population of the country.

The increase in the number of farmers lags behind the growth of the population.

The process of petty production in agriculture being ousted by large scale production is going ahead, but this ousting is being minimised, and the position of the small farmers is artificially represented in view of the fact that the investigators restrict themselves to classifying the farms according to the quantity of land.

Capitalism grows not only by means of hastening the development of large area farms in the extensive (non-intensive) districts, but also by means of creation of farms carrying on production in larger dimensions, more capitalist farms on smaller pieces of land in the intensive districts.

The expropriation of petty farming is proceeding.

During the last decade the percentage of proprietors amongst the total number of farmers has been steadily decreasing, and in turn the total number of farmers does not catch up with the growth of the population⁴⁾.

A peculiarity of the U. S. A. is the great quantities of unused free lands. This peculiarity which has served Sombart and Kautsky as a basis for explaining away the absence of Socialism in the United States (which was partly true only up to the nineties) was in the first place characterised by Lenin as one of the bases for the exceptionally extensive and rapid development of capitalism in America.

"The absence of private property on the land in certain districts of a tremendous country does not remove capitalism, but on the contrary, extends the basis for it and hastens its development"⁵⁾.

In the second place this was characterised by Lenin as a means of **Hiding** in America the process of expropriating the petty farmers, which was already taking place in the colonised industrial districts of the country.

This analysis of Lenin's provides what is essential for American Communists in questions of organising the agricultural proletariat on the one hand and conquering the farmers' movement on the other.

III. American Bourgeois Democracy, the Intensification of Class Antagonism.

In this advanced capitalist country, class contradictions increase and become more acute.

Lenin gives figures which strikingly illustrate the essence of the social order of the U. S. A.

"In America the entire national wealth now amounts to 120 million dollars. Of this about one-third (40 billion dollars)

³⁾ "New Data on the Laws of Development of Capitalism in Agriculture" "Capitalism and Agriculture in the U. S. A.", written in October 1913.

⁴⁾ The same works page 272.

⁵⁾ Same work, page 260.

belongs to two trusts, Rockefeller and Morgan or to trusts under their influence. Not more than 40,000 families, comprising these two trusts, are the owners of 80,000,000 hired slaves."^{6, 7)}.

The United States is essentially a modern slaveowning society. What is the American Government? This most "democratic" government in the world is actually an executive committee for the capitalists.

An analysis of the indirect taxes (1913) brings Lenin to the conclusion that the workers pay 7 cents for every dollar in indirect taxes, and the capitalists one-third of a cent. ("The workers pay proportionally 20 times more than the capitalists"⁸⁾)

The bourgeois democracy of the United States is an absolute hypocrisy just as is bourgeois democracy of any other country.

"Take the fundamental laws of modern States, take their internal administration, take the right of meeting and the freedom of the press and the so-called equality of all citizens before the law, and you will see at every step evidence of the hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy with which every honest and intelligent worker is familiar. There is not a single state, however democratic, which does not contain loopholes or limiting clauses in its constitution, which guarantee the bourgeoisie the legal possibility of dispatching troops against the workers, of proclaiming martial law and so forth, in case of disturbances of public order, that is, in case of the "disturbance by the servile class of its servile condition, and of attempts to strike up a non-servile attitude". Kautsky shamelessly gives attractive airs to bourgeois democracy by suppressing, for instance, such acts as are committed by the most democratic and republican bourgeoisie of America and Switzerland against strikers⁹⁾.

"The law of bourgeois democracy" is such that the more developed democracy is, the nearer at hand is the danger of pogroms or civil war, in connection with any profound political divergence which threatens the existence of the bourgeoisie. This law of bourgeoisie democracy the learned Kautsky could have studied in connection with the Dreyfus affair in the republic of France, with the lynching of negroes and internationalists in the democratic republic of America¹⁰⁾.

The tactics of the American bourgeoisie are extremely flexible — from knout to ginger-bread and vice-versa.

In addition to the knout there is the "American-bourgeois fashion of killing weak Socialists by kindness"¹¹⁾.

"The opportunistic habit of renouncing Socialism to the advantage of the gentle, kind and democratic bourgeoisie" corresponds to this¹²⁾.

IV. Peculiarities of the American Labour Movement.

In this advanced country of capitalism, this country of the sharpest class contradictions, where under the hypocritical mask of democracy, which hides the most cynical and brutal bourgeois dictatorship, which kills opportunists by kindness and revolutionary fighters with lead and the electric chair—in this country the many millions of the proletariat are scattered, split up nationally, culturally and also in respect to their trade union organisations, are weakly organised economically, absolutely backward, unorganised politically and eaten by the cancer of reformism. "In the United States emigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe are engaged in the worst paid jobs, whilst American workers supply the largest percentage of those promoted to be foremen and receive the best paid jobs. Imperialism has the tendency to separate privileged categories among the

⁶⁾ Same work, p. 272.

⁷⁾ Result and significance of Presidential elections in the U. S. A., Lenin's collected works, Russian edition, Vol. XII Part 1, p. 324.

⁸⁾ "Capitalism and Taxes" Lenin's Collected Works, Russian edition. Vol. XII. (Part 2), p. 132.

⁹⁾ "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky." Lenin's collected works, Russian Edition, Vol. XIV, p. 459.

¹⁰⁾ Same work, page 27.

¹¹⁾ "What should not be imitated from the German Labour Movement", Lenin's collected works, Russian edition, Vol. XII, part 2.

¹²⁾ Same work.

workers and to cut them off from the wide masses of the proletariat".¹³⁾

Therein lies the origin of the "bourgeois proletariat" about which Engels wrote in a letter to Kautsky on September 12, 1882 concerning the British proletariat: "You ask me what do the British workers think with regard to the colonial policy? Just the same as they think about politics in general. Here there is no Labour Party, there are only Conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, and the workers in the calmest manner possible gain advantages together with them from the colonial monopoly of Great Britain and her monopoly on the world market".

(Lenin cites these words in his "Imperialism".)

These remarks of Engels concern the American proletariat to a still larger degree for up to now it has not even a Party such as the British Labour Party.

In general, the British and American labour movements had and have to a large degree up to this very moment common **fundamental features**, which Lenin enumerates in his preface to the Russian translation of the book "Letters of Becker, Dlugen, Engels, Marx and others. To Sorge and others."¹⁴⁾

"These features consist in the absence of any considerable general national democratic task whatsoever for the proletariat; the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics; sectarian isolation of small groups of Socialists from the Proletariat; not the slightest success for the Socialists at elections in which the working masses participate, etc."

V. The Question of Tactics in the American Labour Movement.

In such a situation of things the problem of an able tactic and practical policy of the vanguard of the working class, its revolutionary Marxist kernel acquires great importance. The opinions of Marx and Engels on questions of the Anglo-American (and German) Labour movement in the above-mentioned correspondence with Sorge and the rest are characterised by Lenin as an example of materialist dialectics, "the ability to bring to the forefront and to emphasise the various points, and various sides of the question as applied to concrete peculiarities of different political and economic conditions".

"From the viewpoint of practical politics and tactics of the Labour Party, we see here an example of how the creators of the 'Communist Manifesto' defined the tasks of the struggling proletariat in application to the various stages of the national labour movement in different countries."¹⁵⁾

Lenin considers the indications of Marx and Engels with regard to what was the most appropriate tactic from their viewpoint — particularly in America — as being extremely important and instructive.

Marx and Engels criticise Anglo-American Socialism particularly sharply in respect to its isolation from the Labour movement, and its transformation of Marxism into a dogma "into a petrified orthodoxy" a symbol of belief, whereas it is really a "guide to action". The Anglo-American Socialists, "cannot adapt themselves to the theoretically helpless but live powerful labour mass movement which is in process around them"¹⁶⁾

Lenin cites the following passages from the correspondence, which in his opinion are "very interesting".

Engels writes in his letter of January 27th, 1887: "Where would we be now, if in the period of 1864—73 we had always wished to go hand in hand only with those who openly recognised our programme". With regard to the request of Vishnevetskaya (the American translator of Engels) to criticise Henry George for whom the American workers had voted at the elections, Engels wrote that **time was not ripe for that** (Lenin's italics) as it would be better to let the Labour Party start being formed on a programme that was not absolutely pure. "One or two million workers' votes given in the House for a bona fide Labour Party at the present moment is of infinitely more importance than hundreds of thousands of votes for a programme

that is irreproachable theoretically." (Same work.) And further on — "...to hinder the national consolidation of the Labour Party on the basis of no matter what programme, I would consider a great mistake". (Same source.)

Lenin points out that Engels understood the true value of Henry George's ideas to his finger-tips, who was the ideologist of the radical bourgeoisie and adds "And Engels was not afraid of going to the poll with this real Socialist reactionary, if there would only be people who could foretell the masses the consequences of their own errors". (Same work.)

Lenin alludes to two policies of Marx and Engels: "They most firmly called upon the Anglo-American Socialists to merge with the labour movement, and to drive out of their organisation the narrow and shrivelled sectarian spirit. They most firmly taught the German Social Democrats: do not fall into philistinism, into 'parliamentary idiocy' into 'petty-bourgeois-intellectual opportunism'. On what do these varying instructions depend? They depend upon varying concrete conditions of the labour movement."

"In such a country where the bourgeois-democratic revolution remains unfinished, where 'military despotism cloaked in parliamentary forms' reigned and still reigns, where the proletariat has long ago been drawn into politics, — in such a country Marx and Engels feared parliamentary corruption more than anything. That is how the matter stood in Germany, but things were different in England and America (in America this is still almost entirely the case). Here the proletariat displayed hardly any political autonomy whatsoever. In these countries the political arena in view of the almost complete absence of bourgeois-democratic historic tasks, was completely filled up by the triumphant self-contented bourgeoisie who have no equal throughout the whole world in the art of deceiving, perverting and corrupting the workers." (Same work.)

"In such countries, where there is no Social-Democratic Labour Party, where there are no Social Democratic members of parliament, where there is no systematic, consistent Social Democratic policy, neither at elections nor in the press, etc... in such countries Marx and Engels taught the Socialists to break with their narrow sectarianism at all costs and to join up with the Labour movement in order to shake up the proletariat politically". (Same work.)

VI. The Formation of the Third Party — its Significance and Perspective.

The problem of forming an Independent Labour Party in America is closely bound up with the question of the so-called "Two Party system", and "the organisation of a Third Party".

In 1912 Lenin pointed out with regard to the Presidential elections in America¹⁷⁾ that these elections have world significance not so much because the number of Socialist votes has greatly increased (Debs received 800,000 votes) but because that here in the first place a "tremendous crisis of the bourgeois parties and their disintegration was revealed and secondly the entry of bourgeois reformism as a means of struggle against Socialism".

Up to the present the "Two Party System" has had almost undisputed rule, and the internecine struggle of same has had practically no serious importance for the masses of the people.

"The people were deceived, and detracted from their vital interests by means of efficacious and empty duels between the two bourgeois parties." (Same work.)

This "Two Party System" is in Lenin's opinion "one of the most powerful means of hindering the foundation of an independent Labour Party, i.e., of a real Socialist Party; at the 1912 elections it became bankrupt. A new Third Bourgeois Party made its appearance ("The National Progressive Party" of Roosevelt, received 4,000,000 votes in 1912).

The appearance of a new Third Party whose programme is formed around questions of labour protection and trusts is very symptomatic.

"The New Party is engendered by the present-day epoch, which questions the very existence of capitalism". What brought

¹³⁾ "Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism". Lenin, Collected works, Russian edition, Vol. XIII, p. 320.

¹⁴⁾ Lenin's Collected Works, Russian edition, Vol. IX, p. 330.

¹⁵⁾ Preface to Correspondence with Sorge, p. 331.

¹⁶⁾ Same Work.

¹⁷⁾ "Result and significance of the Presidential Elections in America" — Lenin's Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. XII, Part I, p. 322.

it to life? The strength of the Labour movement, the growth of Socialism.

The question has already been brought up to "how to save capitalism by means of . . . bourgeois reforms". (Lenin's italics.)

What did this new Party say?

Lenin portrays its symbol of belief in a very exemplary manner, in its essential it strongly resembles the La Follette programme.

"We are saving capitalism by reforms. We will give the most advanced factory legislation. We will introduce State control over all trusts (in America this means over the entire industry!). We will introduce State control over them in order that there be no poverty, in order that everyone receive a 'decent wage'. We will establish 'social and industrial justice' . . . We bow and pay homage to all reforms, only there is one reform that we do not want, and that is expropriation of the capitalists."

Lenin denounces this bourgeois reformism. "It is clear that while these modern slave-owners exist, all reforms are an empty deception. But Roosevelt has been knowingly hired by the millionaire swindlers in order to preach this deception. 'State' control which is promised by him, will, as long as the capitalists retain their capital, be transformed into a means of struggle against, and the suppression of, strikes."

What kind of future that the Third Bourgeois Party?

At best it can only have temporary success. "The American proletariat has already awakened and stands at its post. It meets Roosevelt's successes with cheerful irony. You, kind charlatan Roosevelt, have detracted 4,000,000 people by your promises of reforms? Fine! Tomorrow these 4,000,000 will see that your promises are a deception, for these millions are only following you because they feel they can no longer live in the old way."

And thus the American working class, and its revolutionary vanguard is faced with the problem of creating an **Independent Labour Party**. The most appropriate tactics under American conditions, as pointed out by Marx and Engels in their correspondence with Sorge, is the tactic of the united front with the working masses.

VII. Perspective and Path of the American Labour Movement.

What are the perspectives of the labour movement in America in general, and what are the paths it is to pursue?

Lenin soberly estimates the condition of the American Labour movement.

In his well-known "Letter to American Workers" (August 20, 1918) he says: "We know that assistance from you, comrades, American workers, will still be a long time in coming for the development of the revolution in various countries proceeds in varying forms, and at a varying tempo (it cannot proceed in any other way)".

But he knows that this aid will come. "There are already detachments of the international Socialist revolution, they are maturing, growing and becoming strengthened in proportion to the continuation of imperialist savageries. The workers are breaking with their Social traitors, the Gomperses, Renners, etc. The workers are proceeding slowly, but steadily towards Communist Bolshevik tactics, towards the proletarian revolution, which alone is capable of saving perishing culture and perishing humanity" (Same work).

But perhaps in "America it will be possible to get on without a revolution? Kautsky asserts that Marx considered a peaceful revolution possible in England and America, i. e., by democratic means."

In "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" Lenin denounces this renegade subterfuge of Kautsky's by continuing to refer to Marx.

"The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is violence in respect of the bourgeoisie, and the need of such violence is caused especially, as respectfully explained by Marx and Engels in detail (particularly in 'Civil War in France' and the preface to it), by the fact that there exist an army and bureaucracy. But just these institutions in the 70's of last century, when Marx was making his observations, did not exist in England or America (though now they do exist).

And further: "Kautsky, the 'historian' is so shamelessly adulterating history that he forgets the fundamental fact, that Capitalism of the pre-monopolistic era, of which the seventies of the last century were just the highest point, was, in virtue

of its fundamental economic traits (which were most typical in England and America), distinguished by, comparatively speaking, greatest attachment to peace and freedom. As against this, Imperialism, that is, capitalism of the monopolistic era, which has finally matured in the twentieth century, is, in virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by least attachment to peace and freedom, and by the greatest development of militarism everywhere."

And so America also cannot evade the revolution. But does this mean that one can calculate it for a definite time? This is just what Kautsky accuses the Communists of doing. Lenin said in respect to this: "To charge one's opponent with something evidently silly and afterwards to deny this, is the method of not very brainy people. . . . If the Bolsheviks based their tactics on expecting revolution in other countries by a definite time, this would be undoubted foolishness. But the Bolshevik Party has not been guilty of such foolishness. In my letter to the American workers, I openly guard against such foolishness, by saying that we do calculate on an American revolution, but not by any definite date." (Same work.)

Lenin attached tremendous significance to the revolutionising of the American Labour movement. In the same "Letter to the American Workers", he says: "The American revolutionary workers are called upon to play a particularly important role especially now as they are the irreconcilable enemies of American imperialism, which is the newest and strongest, and which was the last to participate in the world slaughter for sharing out the capitalist loot."

"America has occupied the first place amongst free and educated countries in the height of development of the productive forces and in the application of machinery and all the latest achievements of technique. At the same time America has become one of the foremost countries for the profoundness of the gulf between a handful of brazen millionaires indulging in debauchery and luxury on the one hand, and millions of toilers eternally living on the verge of beggary on the other hand. The American people which has given the world the example of the revolutionary war against feudal slavery has proved to be in a state of the most modern capitalist wage slavery in the hands of a handful of milliardaires, has turned out to be playing the role of hired hangmen, who to the advantage of the rich rascals suppressed the Philipiners in 1898 under the pretext of 'liberating them', and in 1918 is suppressing the Russian Socialist Republic, under the pretext of 'defending it from the Germans'." (Same work.)

The sober estimation of the condition of the American Labour movement at the present day did not shake Lenin's belief that the American proletariat would proceed along revolutionary paths.

"The American people have a revolutionary tradition which has been adopted by the best representatives of the American proletariat, who have frequently expressed their complete sympathy for us Bolsheviks. This tradition is the war for liberation against the British in the 18th century and later the civil war of the 19th century."

Just as these revolutionary movements were lawful, progressive and necessary (this is also recognised by representatives of the bourgeoisie) so is the war against the capitalists for the overthrow of capitalist wage slavery also to an immeasurably greater degree lawful, necessary and holy (meanwhile "now the representatives and defenders of the bourgeoisie, and also the Socialist reformists frightened by the bourgeoisie, cannot and do not wish to understand the necessity and lawfulness of civil war").

The practical evolutionary and revolutionary theoretician, Lenin, soberly weighed the perspectives of the American Labour movement, and the tremendous difficulties facing it. He firmly believed because he firmly knew (armed with the revolutionary-Marxist method) that in time the American proletariat would also enter the world army of the Socialist revolution as one of its strongest detachments. "The American workers will not follow the bourgeoisie. They will be with us for the civil war against the bourgeoisie. In this conviction I am supported by the entire history of the world and the American Labour movement."

Lenin on the Emancipation of Women.

By G. G. L. Alexander.

There is certainly no question of the Labour movement which was not thoroughly thought out by Lenin and illuminated in his writings, and no revolutionary will be able to solve, in Lenin's spirit, the tasks which are often difficult, forced on him by the fight against the bourgeoisie of the world which is defending its last positions with tooth and claw, the fight against world imperialism, if he does not familiarise himself with Lenin's doctrines, with his attitude to the various problems.

Lenin attached great importance to the emancipation of woman. If he did not bequeath us any particularly extensive work on this question, it is only because he did not regard the emancipation of woman as a special task, apart from the general revolution, but within the confines and as part of the proletarian revolution. Women are to him "half of human society", which must be revolutionised, "half of the oppressed class".

Innumerable times, in connection with every special question, in all aspects of the fight, Lenin thus expressed his opinion as to the position of women, the question of their revolutionisation and activation and the necessity and importance of drawing them into the revolutionary fight.

The special importance and necessity of women participating in the carrying out of the social revolution and in the construction of the new society, has not hitherto been appreciated and understood either by the broad masses or their leaders.

The workers have not understood how to draw women into the fight in broad masses, although just women belong to the most oppressed and exploited groups of whom Lenin said that "they must be attracted into politics as one of its chief supports". Lenin repeatedly drew attention to the great significance of attracting the exploited masses of women into the active revolutionary fight:

"We cannot construct a communist society unless we have millions of women on our side. We must seek the way that leads to them, we must try and find it by experiment and study."

The neglect of the tasks of interesting women and gaining their active cooperation in politics, the failure to recognise the importance of work in this direction, are largely due to the backwardness of men, of the proletariat as a whole, in all women's questions. This misunderstanding and neglect of work among women prevailed even in the ranks of our body of functionaries. The awakening of woman and her education in politics and in the class war was left to the women's sections and to women. Our aim in this respect also must be to bring about a close connection between the backward and oppressed masses of women and the fighting proletariat as a whole, to have them join in the advance of its organised vanguard, the Communist Party.

Recognising that the emancipation of the doubly oppressed proletarian women can only be achieved within the ranks of the proletariat and through its revolutionary struggle, we must do everything in our power to make women active fighters in this struggle.

This however cannot be the task of woman alone, it is the task of the whole mass of the fighting proletariat, of the whole Party. Lenin says:

"It is a vital question for the Communist Parties and for their victories that women should be mobilised and that this mobilisation should be carried through with clear, fundamental recognition and on a basis of firm organisation."

This task however requires that all comrades, especially all functionaries should actively cooperate in this field. The only task of our women's sections can be to find out the special ways and means by which the masses of women can be effectively approached.

The reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei is particularly favourable for this work of interesting working women in politics and obtaining their active cooperation and for persuading the men to take an active part in awakening and liberating women and in attracting them to the revolutionary

fight. The factory is often the place in which the proletarian women work and are exploited side by side with men. A similar fate forces them into the necessity of fighting in common.

Neither must it, in the street nuclei, among housewives and home workers and among the masses of women agricultural workers and small peasant women, be left to a comparatively small number of women agitators to win over and train for the revolutionary fight these enormous masses of oppressed women.

The whole work of the whole Party must include propaganda among women.

The great majority of the proletarian women is part of the indifferent masses who must be persuaded to join the united front of the revolutionary proletariat. We must approach them, on the one hand, in those fields where they have special tasks to fulfil, such as the factories and workshops where they work and in circumstances where they suffer privations and bear their share of the general distress, indeed a specially heavy share in the household and in the family and on the other hand in those places where there is an opportunity for women to join the ranks of the class front, to work, act and fight in it, i. e. in the trade unions, in the Cooperatives, in the social political bodies of the State and the municipalities and in the organisations for proletarian defence.

Lenin repeatedly points out that there can be no social revolution without the liberation of woman from the fetters with which the capitalist State has held her bound for centuries.

"There can and will be no true freedom, until woman is freed from the burden of the privileges which the law gives to man... enlightenment, culture, civilisation, freedom — all these high-flown words are, in all capitalist bourgeois States of the world, combined with unspeakably vile, loathesomely foul, brutally cruel laws for depriving woman of her rights, laws as to matrimonial rights and divorce, as to the inequality of the "illegitimate child" as compared with the "legitimate" one, as to the privileges of men — all laws which establish the humiliation and debasement of woman.

Away with this lie! Away with the liars who speak of freedom and equality for the oppressed, as long as there are oppressed classes, as long as there is private ownership of the means of production, as long as there are satiated persons who use their abundance of bread to make slaves of the hungry." Lenin says in one place:

"If woman is to be completely liberated, if she is to be on an equality with man, there must be socialist economics and the woman must participate in the common productive work. Then woman will maintain the same position as man."

Lenin recognised that the liberation of woman would open up to society new, fresh forces which have not been exhausted but which have been kept down and prevented from developing by the oppression in the capitalist State.

"There is no doubt that among the working and peasant women there is much more organising talent, i. e. there are far more people capable of practical construction, than we dream."

And he, who showed himself to be the great organiser of such forces, already discerned the various functions of these rescued talents and capabilities of women and allots them their place and their tasks in education, in the militia and the co-operatives — fields in which the fertility of the cooperation of women has hitherto either not been recognised, or if recognised, not made use of."

"The tasks which would fall to the lot of such a militia are those which aim, to express it in learned words, at "improving the public welfare", at carrying out and controlling hygienic measures etc. Women, all women must be attracted to work of this kind... woman must even be active in the storm of war when it is a case of supporting and carrying on agitation in the army."

This question is just now being once more warmly debated in the ranks of communist women. The proletarian women of

Russia have already given a shining example of the participation of woman in the battles of the Red army, and Lenin gives those who are still debating this question, a clear answer which helps them to grasp the necessity of participating in the conquest of power and in the revolution.

"Our forces grow with the difficulties they encounter", says Lenin in one place, in speaking of the importance of the construction of the cooperative movement, — "the necessities met with in practice will find new ways for freeing the masses of women from slavery. In working together with the Soviet State, the cooperative movement will achieve great results. The cooperative movement of course in the communist and not in the bourgeois sense, as the Reformists preach it... a personal initiative must go hand in hand with the cooperative movement, which is transformed into an activity for the common weal and becomes identified with it. Under the proletarian dictatorship, when communism is realised, the emancipation of woman will proceed even in the village. I hope for the best as a result of the

electrification of our industry and agriculture, that is a grandiose work!... The powerful forces of the masses must be set free and trained to accomplish it. Millions of women workers must help in it."

In Soviet Russia, where the proletarian revolution, the proletarian State, has given women all the rights which the bourgeois State still withholds from them, the revolution has, in its course, won over and trained the masses of women to fight for the proletarian cause.

In all spheres of the enormous workers' State, women have awakened to living activity, they are taking part in all the tasks of society and helping to realise Lenin's great work. Even in the far-away East of the Soviet State, in the remote villages of Siberia, woman is playing a prominent part in carrying out the new tasks. In Central Asia especially, which belongs to the particularly oppressed section of society, she often takes the initiative in the construction of the workers' State and is a living factor in the whole revolutionary movement in the Far East.

Lenin and the Young Communist Movement.

(Some thoughts from his works.)

By F. G.

Lenin, it is true, never concerned himself especially with the youth movement but he gave a clear and concise formulation for the chief tasks of the young proletarian movement. — W. I. Lenin's conception of the youth movement — the application of Leninism to this concrete domain, forms the foundation of the theory of the youth movement.

In the present article an attempt will be made to develop some of Lenin's ideas on the fundamental questions of the youth movement. Lenin's remarks on the youth question are, it is true, scattered throughout his works; attempts have however already been made to collect them — in German for instance the volume of the Young Leninists' Library — but they are still far from being the common property of young communists.

This is not the place to expound in detail the historical development of Lenin's attitude to the youth movement. It was Lenin who called the attention of the Russian Social Democratic Labour party at its 2nd party conference (1903) to the relation of students to social democracy. In the years up to the war, the proletarian youth movement became more and more the bearer of the revolutionary idea within social democracy, particularly by its anti-militarist campaign, above all during the war, when the Y. C. I. began to develop out of the "flaming, seeking and buoyant youth", which flocked round the "Youth International". Just at that time when there was an ideological clearing of the sky within the youth movement, Lenin, whilst revealing the mistakes of many adults, pointed to the necessity of a special organisation for the young as follows:

"It not infrequently occurs that the representatives of the adult and older generation do not understand the best way to get hold of the young who are necessarily compelled to approach socialism differently, not by the same path, not in the same form and in different circumstances from their fathers."

(Lenin: the "Youth International").

A large number of the young people who are now entering into the process of production, i. e. the mass of the young workers, did not consciously live through the imperialist war. These young people demand a different kind of treatment from those who exposed their lives in the war.

"We must therefore, among other things, advocate an independent organisation for the Leagues, not only because the opportunists dread this independence, but by the very nature of things. For, without complete independence, the young people will neither be capable of becoming good socialists nor of preparing to lead socialism onwards."

(Lenin, *ibid.*)

This organisatory independence is the first prerequisite of any youth movement whatever. This principle remains in force even when the existence of a Communist Party relieves the communist youth organisation of the duty of an independent po-

litical fight, which it had to take upon itself at the time of the formation of the C. P.

The communist youth organisation will thus become a "mass organisation for training Labour Youth for the communist fight" (Schatzkin), into which it is developing and which it actually is to a large extent to-day.

What then, according to Lenin, are the chief duties of the young people's organisations? "Their duty is to learn", he says in his speech at the 3rd Congress of the R. Y. C. L. and explains:

"If communism could be learnt by merely assimilating what is contained in communist books and brochures, we should soon have enough communist braggadocios, for such people would not be capable of turning to good account the knowledge gained or of acting as Communism really demands.

One of the greatest evils which we have inherited from the capitalist regime, is the complete discrepancy between books and practical life." (Lenin, *ibid.*)

"Without work, without fighting, the knowledge of Communism quaffed from communist writings is of no value, for it would only widen the existing gulf between theory and practice." (Lenin, *ibid.*)

The communist youth organisation however is not a school, the young people must learn and fight at the same time.

"The young rising generation can only learn Communism by combining every step of its training and education with the never ceasing fight of the proletariat and of the masses of workers against the established society which exploits them." (Lenin, *ibid.*)

The young people in the capitalist countries however further take their share in the great tasks of the proletariat as a whole, in "the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, in rousing the hatred of the masses against the bourgeoisie, in awakening class consciousness and gathering together the forces of the proletariat."

"It is the duty of the Young Communist League to shape its practical activities in such a way that it gathers together the young people, wins them over and organises them and educates them into Communists." (Lenin, *ibid.*)

One of the chief duties of the young people in gathering together the forces of the proletariat is a campaign against war. During the war, a good many vague ideas on this subject prevailed in the revolutionary youth organisations. They raised the slogan of "disarmament" because they did not understand that "the essential thing is not only to prevent the outbreak of war, but to make use of the crisis produced by war to precipitate the overthrow of the bourgeoisie", that it is not enough "to turn war into peace, but that capitalism must be turned into socialism". (Lenin). To this, Lenin declared the following:

"The proletariat cannot throw all weapons on the rubbish heap until it has disarmed the bourgeoisie; the proletariat will undoubtedly do away with weapons but only then, and in no case earlier..."
for

"An oppressed class which does not strive to learn how to handle weapons and to possess weapons, would only deserve to be treated as slaves."

(Lenin & Sinoviev: Against the Current.)

The whole work of the communists in the bourgeois armies was based just on this recognition — it is only necessary to recall the fight against the Ruhr movement.

The communist youth movement is faced by quite new tasks since the proletariat seized power.

"The generation of workers which is brought up in a capitalist society, will at the best only be able to build up an order of society which makes it possible for the proletariat and the working classes to keep the power in their hands and to create a firm foundation on which that generation alone can continue to build which can set to work under quite new conditions of life, without the relation of the exploitation of man by man."

(Lenin: To the Young People.)

It is just to the young people that this task is allotted, because they have not like "every individual who grew up in the old society, imbibed with their mother's milk the idea of being either a slave-holder or a slave."

"In order to uplift mankind and to free it from the exploitation of work, a young generation is needed which will grow up to self-conscious individuals in this unrelenting, disciplined fight against the bourgeoisie. In this

fight it, on its part, will train up real communists, and every step in their training and education must be combined with this fight and subordinated to it."

(Lenin, *ibid.*)

"To be a member of the Young Communist League, means placing one's work and one's capacities at the service of the community. It is in this that the communist education consists."

And further:

"The Young Communist League must be the shock troops which helps in every work and shows evidence of initiative." (Lenin, *ibid.*)

Thus, in the proletarian State, the Young Communist League combines the task of fighting with the daily petty tasks of proletarian construction. — The young people become the bearers of the communist idea, their organisation delivers over the revolutionary experiences of the proletariat which are embodied in the communist party, to the masses of the generation which enters the arena of the class war in the new epoch after war and revolution.

V. I. Lenin's bequest to the young people is: learn and work among the proletarian masses.

"It is necessary for the Young Communist League to combine its work, its education and its training with the work of the workers and peasants."

For:

"only in working in common with the workers and peasants can anyone become a real communist."

(Lenin, *ibid.*)

Lenin Corners in the Young People's Clubs.

By Andrei Shavikin.

In every workers' club and in every village reading room in the U. S. S. R. there is a Lenin corner. What is the meaning of this Lenin corner?

It is a small room or a part of the general club room which is devoted to impressive instruction in the importance of Lenin and of his theory and practice for the C. P. of Russia and for the development of the Russian revolution and the world revolution. The Lenin corner should above all attract the attention of the members of the club or of the village reading room. It must further be illustrative, i. e. it must represent in a telling way this or that feature of Lenin's history, this or that characteristic factor in the development of his life and his activities. Everything depends on the person who organises and arranges the corner.

First of all we must be clear as to the place taken by the Lenin corner in the general club education. The circles undertake the study of the history of the Party and of Leninism. The members of the club often hear extensive lectures on the individual questions of Lenin's practice. But this is not enough. The attention of the comrades must daily be called to the stages of the development of Leninism, to the mutual-relation and various features of his theory, to the periods of revolutionary development in Russia and the whole world and how they are determining the development of the theory and practice of Leninism. How can this be done? The best way is through object lessons (placards, diagrams, drawings, lists of books etc.). The accumulation of pictorial impressions reinforces what has been absorbed mentally. The question of the correct distribution and selection of the illustrative material is by no means the least important one.

How should a Lenin corner be organised? The chief objects required are: placards, diagrams, maps, drawings, lists and copies of books, the most important slogans and quotations from Lenin (this is very important; the most expressive and exact Leninist formulae should be chosen), and finally the decorative side: busts, portraits, red cloth, green branches, ornaments, light effects.

A Russian Lenin corner for instance is arranged as follows: in the centre Lenin (portrait or bust), across the whole wall of the corner an important slogan which may be adapted to suit the topic of the day. Under these, arrangements of maps,

posters, lists of books, transparencies, with the titles of Lenin's works etc. — finally a wall newspaper.

The wall newspaper is one of the most important parts of the Lenin corner. It serves as a tribune for the whole club and should be adapted not only in its wording but in its ideas to the Lenin corner, as it is a tool for the true Leninist education of the members of the club. The organisation of a wall newspaper does not involve much expense, and it can be kept up by the forces and means at the disposal of the club. The paper usually consists of a permanent heading under which is pasted type-written material which is interspersed with drawings or illustrated cuttings.

A permanent service must be organised in the Lenin corner (of members of the club or, still more appropriately, of members of the commissions or circles). The person on duty selects the current material for the corner, answers all questions of members of the club (entering them in a book), gives advice as to the choice of books on this or that question of Leninism, etc.

Care should be taken that in no case the arrangement of the Lenin corner develops into one of sacred pictures, accessories, stationary dead exhibitions of materials of any kind. The contents of the corner must constantly be changed. **With every important campaign, with every great political event, the materials should be changed.** The arrangement of the corner must always reflect the current tasks of the policy and tactics of the Party in the light of the Leninist doctrine.

Finally, the members of the club should be persuaded to participate in creative work in the Lenin corner. **The Lenin circles must provide materials and objects for the exhibition and arrange them.** If there is an artistic circle, it decorates the corner and so on.

These Lenin corners should also be organised in the homes for young people and in the meeting halls of the West. Our comrades in the West should, following the example of their Russian friends, create such corners illustrative of the Leninist doctrine at the time of the Leninist-Liebkecht week.

The great thing to be avoided (and this cannot be repeated too often) is that the Lenin corner should become a votive altar to a communist saint, crowded with sacred pictures and relics. Anything but that! Let our Lenin corner be a living, impressive reflection of the Leninist work answering all the current questions at issue in our fight.