

THE



# Communist

STALIN'S SPEECH TO RED ARMY GRADUATES  
THE PRESENT SITUATION. O. Platnitsky

THE DERBY CONFERENCE OF THE I.L.P.  
Harry Pollitt

FASCISM AS INTERPRETED BY R. P. DUTT

# International

VOLUME XII

# 10

MAY 20th, 1935

THREEPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

---

---

# CONTENTS

Number 10

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

1. Address by Comrade Stalin to the Graduates from  
the Red Army Academy 427
2. Some Problems of the Present International Situation.  
By O. Piatnitsky. 429
3. Danzig. By A. Karolsky. 437
4. The Derby Conference of the I.L.P. By Harry Pollitt. 441

## **TRIBUNE FOR THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.**

5. Fascism as interpreted by Comrade Dutt.  
By A. De Leov. 449

### PROBLEMS OF SOUTHERN AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

6. Struggles of the Communist Parties of South and  
Caribbean America 454

### IN THE SOVIET UNION

7. (a) The Historic Importance of the 3rd Congress of  
the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party  
(Bolsheviks). By E. Yaroslavsky. 462
8. (b) Chronicle of Events. 467

### BOOK REVIEW

9. Mr. Brailsford attacks Property. 470
- 
-

# ADDRESS BY COMRADE STALIN TO THE GRADUATES FROM THE RED ARMY ACADEMY

Delivered in the Kremlin, May 4th, 1935

COMRADES, it cannot be denied that we have recently achieved important successes both in the sphere of construction and in the sphere of administration. In this connection there is too much talk about the merits of chiefs, about the merits of leaders. All or nearly all, our achievements are ascribed to them. That, of course, is wrong, it is incorrect. It is not merely a matter of leaders. But it is not of this I wanted to speak to-day. I should like to say a few words about cadres, about our cadres in general, and about the cadres of our Red Army in particular.

You know that we inherited from the olden days a technically backward and semi-imperished and ruined country. Ruined by four years of imperialist war, and ruined again by three years of civil war, a country with a semi-literate population, with a low technical level, with isolated industrial oases lost in a welter of minute peasant farms—such was the country we inherited from the past. The problem was to transfer this country from the lines of mediaeval darkness to the lines of modern industry and mechanised agriculture. The problem, as you see, was a serious and difficult one. The question that confronted us was that EITHER we solve this problem in the shortest possible time and consolidate socialism in our country, OR we do not solve it, in which case our country—technically weak and culturally unenlightened — would lose its independence and become a stake in the game of the imperialist powers.

At that time our country was passing through a period of acute famine in technical resources. There were not enough machines for industry. There were no machines for agriculture. There were no machines for transport. There was not that elementary technical basis without which the industrial transformation of a country is inconceivable. All that existed were isolated preliminary requisites for the creation of such a basis. A first-class industry had to be created. This industry had to be so directed as to be capable of technically reorganising not only industry, but also our agriculture and our railway transport. And for this it was necessary to make sacrifices and to impose the most rigorous economy in everything; it was necessary to economise on food, on schools and on textiles, in order to accumulate the funds required for the creation of industry. There was no other way of overcoming the famine in technical resources. So Lenin

taught us, and in this matter we followed in the footsteps of Lenin.

Naturally, in so great and difficult a matter varying and rapid success could not be expected. In a matter like this success comes only after several years. We had therefore to arm ourselves with strong nerves, Bolshevik grit and stubborn patience in order to counteract the first failures and to march unswervingly towards the great goal, without permitting any wavering and uncertainty in our ranks.

You know that we set about this task in precisely this way. But not all our comrades had the necessary spirit, patience and grit. Among our comrades there proved to be people who, at the first difficulties, began to call for a retreat. Let bygones be bygones, it is said. That, of course, is true. But man is endowed with memory, and when summing up the results of our work one involuntarily recalls the past. (AMUSEMENT). Well then, there were comrades among us who were scared by the difficulties and began to call on the Party to retreat. They said: "What is the good of your industrialisation and collectivisation, your machines, iron and steel industry, tractors, combines, automobiles? It would be better if you gave us more textiles, if you bought more raw materials for the production of consumers' goods and gave the population more of the small things which adorn the life of man. The creation of industry, and a first-class industry at that, when we are so backward, is a dangerous dream."

Of course, we could have used the three billion roubles of foreign currency obtained as a result of the severest economy, and spent on the creation of our industry, for the importation of raw materials and for increasing the production of articles of general consumption. That is also a kind of "plan." But with such a "plan" we should not have had a metallurgical industry, or a machine-building industry, or tractors and automobiles, or aeroplanes and tanks. We should have found ourselves unarmed in face of the external foe. We should have undermined the foundation of socialism in our country. We should have found ourselves in captivity to the bourgeoisie, home and foreign.

It is evident that a choice had to be made between two plans: between the plan of retreat—leading, and bound to lead, to the defeat of socialism—and the plan of advance, which led

and, as you know, has already led, to the victory of socialism in our country.

We chose the plan of advance and moved forward along the Leninist road, brushing those comrades aside, as being people who only saw what was under their noses, but who closed their eyes to the immediate future of our country, to the future of socialism in our country.

But these comrades did not always confine themselves to criticism and passive resistance. They threatened to raise a revolt in the Party against the Central Committee. More, they threatened some of us with bullets. Evidently, they reckoned on frightening us and compelling us to leave the Leninist road. These people, apparently, forgot that we Bolsheviks are people of a special cut. They forgot that you cannot frighten Bolsheviks by difficulties or by threats. They forgot that we were forged by the great Lenin, our leader, our teacher, our father, who did not know fear in the fight and did not recognise it. They forgot that the more the enemies rage and the more hysterical the foes within the Party become, the more the Bolsheviks burn for fresh struggles and the more vigorously they push forward.

Of course, it never even occurred to us to leave the Leninist road. More, having established ourselves on this road, we pushed forward still more vigorously, brushing every obstacle from our path. It is true that in our course we were obliged to handle some of these comrades roughly. But you cannot help that. I must confess that I took a hand in this business. (LOUD CHEERS).

Yes, comrades, we proceeded confidently and vigorously along the road of industrialising and collectivising our country. And now we may consider that the road has been traversed.

Everybody now admits that we have achieved tremendous successes along this road. Everybody now admits that we already have a powerful, first-class industry, a powerful mechanised agriculture, a growing and improving transport system, an organised and excellently equipped Red Army.

This means that we have in the main outlived the period of famine in technical resources.

But, having outlived the period of famine in technical resources, we have entered a new period, a period, I would say, of famine in the matter of people, in the matter of cadres, in the matter of workers capable of harnessing technique and advancing it. The point is that we have factories, mills, collective farms, Soviet farms, an army; we have technique for all this; but we lack people with sufficient experience to squeeze out of technique all that can be squeezed out of it. Formerly, we used to say that "technique decides everything." This slogan helped us in this re-

spect, that we put an end to the famine in technical resources and created an extensive technical basis in every branch of activity for the equipment of our people with first-class technique. That is very good. But it is very, very far from enough. In order to set technique going and to utilise it to the full, we need people who have mastered technique, we need cadres capable of mastering and utilising this technique according to all the rules of the art. Without people who have mastered technique, technique is dead. Technique in the charge of people who have mastered technique can and should perform miracles. If in our first-class mills and factories, in our Soviet farms and collective farms and in our Red Army we had sufficient cadres capable of harnessing this technique, our country would secure results three times and four times greater than at present. That is why emphasis must now be laid on people, on cadres, on workers who have mastered technique. That is why the old slogan, "Technique decides everything," which is a reflection of a period we have already passed through, a period in which we suffered from a famine in technical resources, must now be replaced by a new slogan, the slogan "Cadres decide everything." That is the main thing now.

Can it be said that our people have fully understood and realised the great significance of this new slogan? I would not say that. Otherwise, there would not have been the outrageous attitude towards people, towards cadres, towards workers, which we not infrequently observe in practice. The slogan "Cadres decide everything" demands that our leaders should display the most solicitous attitude towards our workers, "little" and "big," no matter in what sphere they are engaged, cultivating them assiduously, assisting them when they need support, encouraging them when they display their first successes, advancing them, and so forth. Yet, in practice we meet in a number of cases with a soulless, bureaucratic and positively outrageous attitude towards workers. This, indeed, explains why instead of being studied, and placed at their posts only after being studied, people are frequently flung about like pawns. People have learnt how to value machinery and to make reports of how many machines we have in our mills and factories. But I do not know of one instance when a report was made with equal zest on the number of people we have developed in a given period, how we assisted people to grow and become tempered in their work. How is this to be explained? It is to be explained by the fact that we have not yet learned to value people, to value workers, to value cadres.

I recall an incident in Siberia, where I was at

one time in exile. It was in the spring, at the time of the spring floods. About thirty men went to the river to pull out timber which had been carried away by the vast swollen river. Towards evening they returned to the village, but with one comrade missing. When asked where the thirtieth man was, they unconcernedly replied that the thirtieth man had "remained there." To my question, "How do you mean, remained there?" they replied with the same unconcern, "Why ask—drowned, of course." And thereupon one of them began to hurry away, saying, "I have got to go and water the mare." When I reproached them for having more concern for animals than for men, one of them, amid the general approval of the rest, said, "Why should we be concerned about men? We can always make men. But a mare . . . just try and make a mare." (AMUSEMENT). Here you have a case, not very significant perhaps, but very characteristic. It seems to me that the indifference shown by certain of our leaders to people, to cadres, and their inability to value people, is a survival of that strange attitude of man to man displayed in the episode in far-off Siberia just related.

And so, comrades, if we want successfully to overcome the famine in the matter of people and to provide our country with sufficient cadres capable of advancing technique and setting it going, we must first of all learn to value people, to value cadres, to value every worker capable of benefiting

our common cause. It is time to realise that of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people, cadres. It must be realised that under our present conditions "cadres decide everything." If we have good and numerous cadres in industry, agriculture, transport and the army—our country will be invincible. If we do not have such cadres—we shall be lame on both feet.

In concluding my speech, permit me to offer a toast to the health and success of our graduates from the Red Army Academy. I wish them success in the cause of organising and leading the defence of our country!

Comrades, you have graduated from the academy, a school in which you received your first steeling. But school is only a preparatory stage. Cadres receive their real steeling in actual work, outside school, in fighting difficulties, in overcoming difficulties. Remember, comrades, that only those cadres are any good who do not fear difficulties, who do not hide from difficulties, but who, on the contrary, go out to meet difficulties, in order to overcome them and eliminate them. It is only in combating difficulties that real cadres are forged. And if our army possesses genuinely steeled cadres in sufficient numbers, it will be invincible.

Your health, comrades! (STORMY APPLAUSE. ALL RISE. LOUD CHEERS FOR STALIN).

## SOME PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

(Extracts from a talk between Comrade Piatnitsky and Party Agitators from a number of Moscow factories organised by the Journal "The Agitators' Companion" on March 27, 1935.)

By O. PIATNITSKY.

(Part I.)

**T**HIS year the revolutionary proletariat in the capitalist countries, led by the Communist Parties will demonstrate under slogans of Struggle Against the Capitalist Offensive, Against Fascism, War, and for Active Defence of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions have this year made the proposal to the Socialist Parties and the reformist trade unions that May the First be celebrated under such slogans.

In a whole number of countries, the Communist and Socialist workers, members of the revolutionary and reformist trade unions, and in some countries, the Communist and Socialist Parties, are already engaged in a joint struggle against fascism and war. The growing urge of the work-

ing class for united action, and the joint action of the Communists and Socialists which has been brought about in a number of countries, are rendering it easier for May the First to be celebrated on the basis of the proletarian united front.

In the countries where the fascist dictatorship holds sway, the struggle is being carried through under conditions still more burdensome than in the days of Czarist Russia. And in the countries where bourgeois democracy exists, the ruling classes are resorting to still more ferocious repression against the working class.

But the class-consciousness of the workers has grown over the last year, and reformist illusions which have kept wide masses under their influence for tens of years, are becoming weaker. There is

a growth of solidarity among these masses and of their efforts to participate in joint struggle with the Communists.

The bourgeoisie are resorting to fascist terror as their last means of saving their rule. The working class is replying to these ferocious attacks of the bourgeoisie by extending the proletarian united front, by heroic sturdiness in fascist underground conditions, and by self-sacrificing determination in open armed struggle.

The final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is enthusing proletarian fighters in all parts of the globe. The whole depth of the difference between the two worlds in conflict, the world of decaying capitalism and the world of flourishing socialism, will stand out exceptionally clearly before all the toilers and oppressed on the day of the proletarian holiday.

Like a living wall, ever wider masses of the toilers and oppressed are surrounding the banner of proletarian struggle, the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which already waves over one-sixth of the globe.

#### **1. The Growing Danger of an Imperialist War and of An Offensive Against the Soviet Union.**

Is the war danger growing? Yes, it is! There is no doubt about that.

Where are the main sources of the war danger? They can be easily indicated—Germany, first and foremost, and then Japan and Poland.

To be able to understand the present international situation more easily, we must call the main contradictions which exist between the imperialist states to mind. I refer, first and foremost, to the contradictions between Great Britain and the U.S.A. But at the present time the contradiction between Germany and France, along with her allies, has become still sharper.

#### **Britain—the U.S.A.—Japan.**

Anglo-American contradictions became particularly clear at the end of the world imperialist war of 1914-18.

America was the very last to enter the war of 1914-18, doing so only in 1917. The gains achieved by America as a result of this war were colossal. America gathered together two-thirds of the world's supply of gold in the vaults of its banks, while its trade doubled during the period of and immediately after the war. During the war, America captured a number of England's markets, and continued to compete with England after the war as well, squeezing it out of the markets which the latter had a firm grip on prior to the war.

The interests of Great Britain and the U.S.A. come into collision in a whole number of countries, especially in Southern and Caribbean (Central) America. A constant struggle is going on between England and America for markets and sources of

raw material, in all the countries of Southern and Caribbean America. England and America have invested huge sums of money in railroads and municipal services (tramways) there, they are engaged in a struggle for concessions, for influence over the bourgeois and feudal cliques in these countries, which are engaged in helping the Englishmen and the Americans to rob the population. To a very great extent the British and American imperialists are behind the constant coups d'état that take place in these countries. The war between Paraguay and Bolivia which has been going on up to now, for the oil region of Chaco, is being carried on in the interests of England and America. America also competes against England even in England's dominion, Canada. As a result of the Washington Agreement in 1922, the U.S.A. navy was made equal to the English navy, which had been the most powerful hitherto, and thus England lost its supremacy as mistress of the seas. At the same time, after the war, Great Britain owed America a tremendous sum of war debts.

Tremendous contradictions also exist between America, Japan and Great Britain in the Pacific Ocean.

According to the Washington Agreement, which was a continuation of the Versailles Agreement, the principle of the "open" door in China was established and the "indivisibility" of China was recognised in the so-called Nine Power Pact. Bearing in mind the relationship of forces and the economic and technical superiority of the U.S.A. over England and Japan, which existed at that time in the Far East, these principles were the most favourable for the plunder of China by America. By seizing Manchuria, Japan, of course, squeezed the other imperialist powers out of Manchuria. As is well known, Japan did not limit itself to the seizure of Manchuria, but is bringing about a military onslaught on Mongolia and northern China. It is beginning to carry through its plan of the monopoly enslavement of China. America sees the violation of its own imperialist interests in China, in this policy being pursued in China by Japan.

The contradictions between Japan and America are not limited to China and the countries which lie along the coast of the Pacific Ocean only. With its cheap commodities, Japan is successfully competing against America in the Southern and Caribbean American countries and even in the American colony, the Philippines. It is true that the figures for 1933-34 regarding Japanese and American trade in China indicate important advantages of America over Japan. Thus, for instance, in 1928, Japan introduced into China 26 per cent. of the total imports, while America covered only 16 per cent. In 1930, America intro-

duced commodities into China valued at 232 million Chinese dollars, while Japan imported 237 million Chinese dollars, i.e., more than America did. But in 1933 already, America imported into China goods valued at 297 million dollars (22 per cent.), while Japan imported only 132 million dollars, and while, in 1934, America imported into China goods valued at 272 million Chinese dollars (26 per cent.), Japan imported into China 127 million Chinese dollars (12.4 per cent.). This very great decrease of Japanese imports into China is to be explained partially by the widely-developed boycott of Japanese goods in 1933 in China. (All these figures of foreign trade of Japan and America in China do not include imports into Manchuria.) Japan is exerting colossal efforts to alter this relationship in its own favour, not only by war measures but by compelling the Nanking government to openly set about crushing the anti-Japanese boycott. Following the seizure of Manchuria by Japan, the foreign trade of Manchuria has fallen completely into the hands of Japan.

Prior to 1922, England supported Japan and was connected with it by the military alliance which was directed without a doubt against America. But according to the Washington Agreement this military alliance was torn up, on the insistence of America. Although sharp contradictions also exist between England and Japan, England encountering fierce competition by Japan not only in China itself (in Central China, especially in Huan-dun, Huan-see and other provinces where England is attempting to entrench itself in view of the proximity of Hong Kong), but even in Britain's colony, India (Japan is more and more attempting to extend its imports with its cheap textiles at the expense of England and on the Indian market); this, however, does not exclude Anglo-Japanese collaboration in the struggle against the U.S.A.

England has tremendous interests in China. Here are a few figures to show how great these are. In 1930, England imported into China commodities valued at 108 million Chinese dollars, and in 1933 the figure was 134 million Chinese dollars.

England is following how Japan is consolidating its positions in China with alarm, but it has been compelled to support Japan in return for support against America to a certain degree.

The tearing up of the Washington Agreement on the limitation of naval armaments, on the initiative of Japan, which has been striving to bring about the equality of its fleet with that of America, has sharpened the struggle on the Pacific Ocean still more.

#### **German Fascism and the Policy of Revenge.**

What has been the course of the sharpening of imperialist contradictions in Europe?

As soon as the fascists came to power in Germany (on January 30, 1933), the French bourgeoisie were faced with the danger of German revenge.

France is afraid of Germany. In 1914, Germany and its weak ally, Austro-Hungary, fought against four big imperialist states, and at the beginning of the war, Germany was victorious. Had America, which at the end of the war joined with the enemies of Germany and gave them a preponderating position, had England not taken the side of France, then France would have been crushed in this war. German troops came close to Paris, and France remembers this quite well.

Therefore, when the fascists came to power in Germany, and immediately made an open declaration of Germany's intention to get back its former provinces, taken away as a result of the war, France (which, in the given circumstances, was interested in not allowing a war to take place), began to seek the support of the U.S.S.R., which consistently and insistently carried through and is still carrying through a policy of peace.

#### **The U.S.S.R. and the Capitalist World.**

The fundamental alterations which have taken place in recent years in the relation of forces between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world, between the country where socialism is flourishing, and decaying capitalism, are of decisive importance for the entire international situation. The more the productive forces grow in the Soviet Union, the more its technical and economic independence of its imperialist surroundings becomes consolidated, the higher the material and cultural level of the workers and collective farmers, who already constitute a gigantic family of builders of socialism, and the more clearly the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist mode of production stands out before the whole of the world, to that degree does the attractive power of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the exploited and oppressed masses become more powerful and more insurmountable. The bourgeoisie of the big capitalist countries are hoping and are making efforts to find a solution to this growing contradiction between capitalism and socialism in an anti-Soviet war. But at the same time as the intrigues and plots arranged by the imperialists are going on, the defensive power of the Soviet Union is growing, the Red Army is becoming steeled, and the toilers throughout the whole of the world are developing the consciousness of the need to defend the Land of Socialism with their lives against military attack. The liquidation of the capitalist classes in the U.S.S.R. cuts at the roots of all the calculations of the imperialists as to the possibility of basing themselves on the forces of the internal

counter-revolution in case of an attack on the Soviet borders, while the peace policy of the U.S.S.R., which defends the vital interests of the toilers throughout the world, exposes the military adventurers and hinders the operation of their robber plans.

Thanks to this, the government of the Soviet Union, led by the Communist Party, has succeeded in staving off war in the Far East hitherto. Recently, after almost two years of negotiations, the U.S.S.R. secured the conclusion of an agreement regarding the sale of the Chinese-Eastern Railway, which although it is no guarantee against war, still must for a time cool down the charged atmosphere in the Far East.

The Soviet Union is also carrying on a determined struggle to keep the warmongers in Europe in check.

Many capitalist governments, for reasons already referred to, have been compelled in one way or another to support the peace policy of the Soviet Government. In these circumstances, the capitalist states have every reason to fear that war against the U.S.S.R. will call forth revolution in their rear and will result in their own destruction.

#### **Germany—France—Poland.**

The line taken by France towards a rapprochement with the U.S.S.R. cuts across the aggressive plans of Germany. In its efforts to deceive France, Germany is doing everything possible to calm the latter by declaring that after the return of the Saar region to Germany, "it is prepared to promise that it has no claims on France, and that it has no aggressive intentions in relation to its western neighbours." Germany is openly proposing to France, England and Italy to undertake joint action against the U.S.S.R.

But Germany's robber plans are not only directed against the Soviet Union. The declarations made by the fascist leaders that they are striving to seize land only in the East (the U.S.S.R.), and thus allegedly to defend "human civilisation from Bolshevism," are meant to conceal their preparations for an offensive against France, Belgium, Austria, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Lithuania.

As is well known, according to the Versailles Treaty, Poland was given the so-called Polish Corridor which cuts off part of Eastern Prussia from the remainder of Germany. When a German travels from Berlin to Königsburg, he must travel through the "Polish Corridor," a territory which belongs now to Poland. To travel through this "Corridor," he must either have a Polish visa or else remain in a closed coach. According to the same agreement, Poland was allowed to build its own military harbour, (the

port of Gdynia) near the German town of Danzig, which was transformed into a "free" city, Poland also received a part of Upper Silesia from Germany, which is rich in coal and iron.

Germany of course, does not relinquish hope of receiving back all that Poland received under the Versailles Treaty. But Germany is also carrying on a policy of lulling Poland with promises that not only does Germany not lay claim to its former territory, but that it will "make a gift" to Poland of part of Soviet Ukraine, in case of joint victory over the U.S.S.R. Of course, once war begins and German troops enter the territory of their ally, Poland, they will not so easily leave it. But Polish imperialism, blinded by its robber desires, is inclined to underestimate this danger.

Poland, which after the advent of Hitler to power began, under the influence of France, to alter its anti-Soviet policy to one of a rapprochement with the U.S.S.R., has in the recent period taken the side of fascist Germany and is supporting, although not without wavering and secret fear, the military adventurist policy of German fascism.

#### **The Policy of Great Britain.**

A few words about the policy of Great Britain. The policy pursued by England in Europe is just as dual as its policy in the Far East.

England is linked up with France. They fought together against Germany. They were allies, but at the same time England is afraid of France becoming strong and of it becoming the leading force on the European continent. Great Britain sees, or at least saw not so long ago, a counter-blast to France in the shape of Germany. This explains why it is that until very recently England, to a greater or lesser degree, and even not always in hidden form, supported the foreign policy of German fascism. And the note of "protest" issued by the British government against the declaration of conscription in Germany, was rather calculated to favour the ferocious military aggression of Germany than to hold it back. None the less, this animal appetite of a hungry imperialism, displayed by Hitler in his negotiations with Simon and Eden, compelled an important section of the British bourgeoisie to be very seriously on their guard. Hitler's declaration to the effect that German aviation is not behind that of Great Britain, the claims he made to the construction of a powerful navy, are, judging from the British press, sufficiently transparent indications of German's colonial claims. All this could not fail to show England that Germany is aiming at setting the flames of war alight throughout the world, in the

near future, a war for which British imperialism is far from being prepared as yet.

This is why, after Hitler had displayed his cards in a clearer way than previously, two main groupings are to be discerned in the camp of the British bourgeoisie.

One group, to which a section of the diehards and also such liberals as Lloyd George belong, are declaring in favour of stopping German expansion westward (against the borders of France which are not far from the coast of Great Britain), and to give Germany freedom of action in the east of Europe. In other words, to direct the armed forces of Germany against the U.S.S.R., calculating that a German-Soviet war would weaken both sides for a long time. Linked up with this are their calculations that in case of an attack by Germany in alliance with Poland against the U.S.S.R. from the West, Japan will attack the U.S.S.R. in the Far East. Japan will then cease penetrating the southern and central regions of China where England has huge interests.

The other grouping, however among the British bourgeoisie, cannot fail to see that the ferocious military adventurism of Germany threatens to bring about a war which will draw everybody in. On the other hand, this influential grouping of the English bourgeoisie cannot but see that the Soviet policy of peace does not contradict the interests of those countries which for one reason or another are not interested, in the present circumstances, in unloosening a new world war. This section of the British bourgeoisie correctly understands the assertion made by Comrade Litvinov that "war is inevitable," that war between the U.S.S.R. and Germany will inevitably become a world war, and that a world war may lead to the collapse of the capitalist system in a number of countries.

#### **The Armaments Race.**

The preparation for a world war is going on at full speed. Armaments are growing at a fierce rate. Colossal sums of money, squeezed out of the toilers, are being spent on armaments which are already far superior to the armed forces of the main imperialist countries on the eve of the world war of 1914-18.

The total number of men in the armies of the five states, Japan, Germany, France, America and England, amounted to 1,541,500 in 1914, and 8,000,000 reserves. In 1934, the total number of soldiers in the armies of these five states was 2,123,500 regulars and 20,000,000 reserves. As regards Germany, after the introduction of universal military service, its army will total 720,000 men, not counting the Storm detachments, the

labour camps, etc., which number about 2,000,000 men.

The growth of military technique is interesting. In 1914 one American division could fire 163,000 rounds per minute out of all its rifles and machine guns. In 1934, the corresponding figure was 422,000 rounds. In 1914, a French division could fire 103,000 rounds, and in 1934, 212,000 rounds per minute. While in 1914, one American division could, by artillery fire, discharge 8.1 ton weight of ammunition in one minute, in 1934, an American division could fire 17.6 tons per minute.

Two more comparative figures. In the imperialist war, the German army fired 286 million rounds from machine guns, and used 6,000 million bullets. In 1934, the Reichswehr was able to treble its firing power.

Seventy per cent. of all factories in Germany are now working on preparations for war. The enterprises producing machine guns work without a stop, day and night. Aviation factories in Germany are in a position to produce 15 aeroplanes per day.

#### **2. How the Special Kind of Depression is Developing.**

At the 17th Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin pointed out that in the majority of capitalist countries, the lowest point of the crisis had been passed in 1932, and that following that period, there was to be noted the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression.

The consequence of the economic crisis of 1929-32 was that production was very severely cut down, and that enterprises were not working at full pressure. After 1932, while the economic crisis continued, a stop was put in the majority of countries to the cutting down of production and to the fall of the quantity of the productive apparatus in use. In a whole number of countries, an unequal and unstable growth of industrial production began, mainly in individual branches of industry.

I quote figures which are the official statistics issued in capitalist countries. According to these statistics, the total production of all the capitalist countries increased in the following way by comparison with 1932. If we take 100 as representing the year 1929, then the corresponding figure in December, 1932, was 66.1, in December, 1933, 76.2, and in March, 1934, 82.2. Thus, in a year and three months, production increased by 16.1 per cent. (these figures are from the International Monthly Bulletin of the League of Nations, No. 3, 1935. According to the figures of the German Economic Research Institute, the index in March, 1934, was not 82.2, but 89.7, while in September of the same year it fell again to 80.0).

### **The Growth of Industrial Production in Various Countries.**

The U.S.A. If we take 100 to represent the amount of industrial production for the years 1923-25, the level of industrial production for March, 1933 was 56 (the lowest point reached in America during the crisis). In June, 1933, the figure rose to 101 (i.e., higher than in the years 1923-25). In November, 1933, there was a new fall to 71, by March, 1934, the figure had again reached 91, while by September, 1934, there was a further sharp fall to 69. (Index of the central financial administration of the U.S.A.)

One of the ways in which the special kind of depression shows itself is in the fact that the process of the rise and fall of industrial production is a jerky one, in the fact that the increase of production is not of a firm character, and that this special kind of depression does not lead to a "new upsurge and development of industry, but neither does it lead back to the lowest point to which it fell" (Stalin).

Take Germany, and let 100 represent the level of industrial production in 1928. In 1929, the index of production was 101.8, in 1932 it fell to 60.4, in 1933 it rose to 70.6, and in 1934 to 88.8 (Quarterly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute—Special Bulletin No. 31). Thus, industrial production in Germany rose without any big lapses.

In Germany (and in Japan) more than in any other country, the growth of industry has been called forth by the gigantic growth of armaments and by colossal orders from military institutions.

If we take the level of industrial production in Japan for the year 1928 to be 100, the corresponding figure in 1932 was 107.9, and in 1933 124. (Monthly Bulletin of the League of Nations for 1934.) In general, a growth of Japan's industry is to be observed, in the recent years, especially since Japan seized Manchuria. This growth follows two lines.

Firstly, the increase of industrial production for war purposes. Last year, about 50 big factories were built in Japan, connected with the war being carried on in China, and with the preparations for a big war against the U.S.S.R., and possibly against America.

To ensure that they were supplied with the materials that need to be imported, the Japanese were compelled to intensively export their commodities to all countries which would purchase them. To ensure that as great a quantity as possible of these commodities are purchased, the Japanese have begun to sell their products at unbelievably cheap prices. Thus, for instance, England has for tens of years supplied textile goods to all countries including its own colonies.

In recent years, however, Japan has out-distanced England both in the production and in the export of textiles. During the crisis, cloth is also consumed, but the Japanese manufacturers by selling such cloth at exceptionally cheap prices compete successfully against Great Britain and other states, and drive them out of the markets they had previously won.

Hence the second line of the development of Japanese industry. So as to export, Japan had, of course, to produce for the foreign market.

This is why industrial production in Japan in 1934 once again was above the high level reached in 1933. Japan can sell cheap commodities thanks to the great length of the working day, the exceptionally low wages paid and to the fact that a tremendous number of children are employed.

### **Trade War.**

Here is another characteristic fact of great importance. Whereas industrial production is increasing to a certain degree, world trade is not extending, but on the contrary, is declining.

I will quote one figure. The world trade turnover has been reduced from 280,000 million gold marks in 1928 to 90,000 million marks in 1934 (according to League of Nations statistics).

So as to make it possible to dispose of their products, all capitalist countries have either closed their borders to the import of commodities from other countries, or have very much increased customs duties on imported commodities. The bourgeoisie make use of the cutting down of imports from other countries to raise prices of industrial and agricultural commodities produced at home. At the same time the very same commodities are exported abroad at very low prices. Two prices operate, one for the home market and the other for the foreign market. This is called dumping. Dumping is widely spread in the capitalist countries as a weapon in the trade war and is a usual method employed to conquer "somebody else's" market.

If there is no direct war as yet between the biggest states, if they are not engaged as yet in a war by force of arms, then this war is going on in the sphere of economics. All told, world trade has declined, and this testifies to the fact that the special kind of depression is not leading to a general economic advance.

### **3. How the Special Kind of Depression Reflects Itself on the Standard of Living of the Working Class in the Capitalist Countries.**

#### **Unemployment.**

According to official statistics there were 28,000,000 unemployed in the capitalist world in 1932. In 1933 there were between 23½ to 24 million, while in March, 1934, the figure was 22

million. (See "Economy and Statistics" for May, 1934.) But in the first place, these figures are very much reduced. Secondly, the relationship between these figures for 1932 and 1934 testifies to a very insignificant reduction of the number of unemployed in connection with the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression. Thirdly, in a number of places, unemployment has increased in the second half of 1934 by comparison with the first half of the year.

What is the situation now in the capitalist factories and in what conditions do the workers carry on their work, in spite of the growth of industrial production?

The index of the total average sum of weekly wages paid in 1932 was 60.2; the index of the productivity of labour per worker per hour in 1932 was 119.6 (in both cases taking 100 to represent 1929). That is to say, by 1932, the productivity of labour per worker had increased by about 20 per cent., while the total wages per week were reduced by almost 40 per cent. In 1933, the productivity of labour per worker per hour increased by 10 per cent. more, reaching 130 per cent. of the 1929 level, while the total wages bill increased by less than 1 per cent. (61 against 60.2) (Bulletin of the Chamber of Trades).

These are the general figures covering all capitalist countries. The picture will be clearer if we take the figures according to separate countries.

In the mining industry in Great Britain, the productivity of labour per shift, for the year 1934, increased by 9.6 per cent. as compared with 1928, while by comparison with 1924, the figure was even 16 per cent. The annual wage received by the British miner, however, dropped during the years of the crisis, by 9.3 per cent. The same is true of the railwaymen (official figures taken from the *Economist*, London, April 14, 1934). Hitherto there were no less than 2.2 millions of unemployed, in spite of the fact that production increased.

Take Germany. According to fascist statistics, 18 million workers, office employees, etc., were employed in Germany in 1929, in which year they received 15,000 million marks in wages. In 1934, 15 million workers, office employees, etc., were employed and their total wage was about 7,000 million marks. (Weekly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute.)

At the Siemens Schuchert factories, 79,000 workers, office employees, etc., were employed in 1932, their total wages amounting to 1,753 million marks. In 1933, 79,000 workers, etc., were employed, but the wage bill paid was less than in 1932, amounting to 1,428 million marks. In 1934, 110,000 workers, etc., were employed in these enterprises, but their total wage bill was 1,436 million marks, i.e., almost as much as the amount

paid in 1933. In the period between 1932 and 1934, the number of workers employed had increased by 45 per cent., whereas wages had been reduced by 18 per cent. (Annual Report of Messrs. Siemens Schuchert for 1933-34.)

During this period, wages throughout Germany as a whole were reduced by 39 per cent. (Weekly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute.)

In Japan, in the period between 1930 and 1934, production increased by 18.4 per cent., while the number of workers employed during this period declined by 3 per cent. (Index of the Mitsubishi Bank, 1934.) In the woollen industry, the average total product per shift increased in the period between 1928-30 by 30 per cent. In the spinning mills the number of workers looking after 1,000 spindles declined during this period by 43 per cent. In the weaving mills, the number of workers required to serve 1,000 looms, declined in 1932 by 32 per cent. as compared with 1928 (figures issued by the Japanese Textile Manufacturers' Association for 1933). The productivity of labour has increased to an unbelievable extent, but exclusively at the expense of the sweat and blood of the workers.

As regards the wages earned by Japanese workers, here are figures comparing the wages earned by the worker in Japan and in Great Britain. A textile worker receives 80 shillings per week in England\* and 17 shillings in Japan, i.e., the Japanese worker receives only 14 per cent. of what the English worker receives. The chemical worker receives 134 shillings per week in England, and 19 shillings in Japan; in the electrical industry, 82 shillings per week in England and 7 in Japan. The figures quoted for wages of British workers (from Report of Federation of British Industries) are those of very highest paid workers and only a very insignificant number of British workers receive such wages. The average wage of British workers of all categories is about fifty shillings a week. But even in this case there is a colossal difference between the degree of exploitation of the workers of England and Japan. While the length of the working week in England is 48 hours, it is 78 hours in Japan, figures published by the British Textile Manufacturers' Association. This is why Japanese manufacturers are able to sell the products of their factories so cheaply. But the cost to the Japanese working class is not such a light one.

What conclusions can we draw from the figures and facts quoted?

---

\* "A recent check of 43 weavers for a period of 26 weeks showed an average wage of £1 19s. 5d."—Mr. P. Butlin in evidence at the Ministry of Labour enquiry at Manchester.

Beginning with the year 1932, the bourgeoisie have undoubtedly succeeded in increasing their profits at the expense of the working class. For instance, in the U.S.A., 200 of the biggest manufacturing companies received incomes in the year 1934 150 per cent. higher than their income in 1926. Their profits totalled 430 million dollars as against 100 million dollars in 1932 (report published by the Research Bureau of the N.I.R.A., 1935). In England 1,975 firms made the following clear profits in the year

1932—140,076,000

1933—144,839,000

1934—168,877,000

The Trusts and concerns of Germany, Japan and France received profits just as large.

The most powerful capitalist groupings are attempting to make their way out of the crisis at the expense of the toilers, and primarily at the expense of the workers. They have achieved some results in this connection. The workers have gained nothing from the slight improvement of capitalist industry in connection with the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression.

Conclusions: (a) Unemployment has not been wiped out, in spite of the increase of industrial production. The unemployed army has been transformed from a reserve army into a permanent army. (b) Wages, which were very severely reduced during the period of the sharpening of the economic crisis have not been increased, but continue to be still further reduced in some countries. The purchasing power of the main masses of the population continues to fall. The narrowing down of the home market prevents the capitalist world from making its way out of the crisis. (c) The urge towards struggle and towards unity is growing in the ranks of the working class

#### 4. Fascism.

The dominant bourgeoisie are increasing their offensive against the workers both economically and politically.

Side by side with the decrease in the material standard of living of the masses of the workers, the workers are being increasingly deprived of their rights and more enslaved politically. Fascism is rife in a number of countries in Europe.

In Germany, the fascist dictatorship has deprived the working class of the remnants of all its political rights and liberties, won over decades by heavy class struggle, as well as the right to strike, to join trade unions and conclude collective wage agreements, etc.

A very expressive picture of the rights of the workers in the U.S.A. is provided by the report of the commission appointed at the end of the year 1932 by President Roosevelt, to investigate the conditions in the American automobile industry. "An espionage system exists in the majority of enterprises." "The petty caprices of the foremen determine the fate of many automobile workers." As a representative of the union declared when examined by the commission, "Old and experienced workers are dismissed if they display the slightest signs of their active efforts to organise."

If this is the situation in a bourgeois "democratic country, then what shall we say about countries where fascist dictatorship holds sway.

#### Fascism in Italy and Poland.

In April, 1934, the fascist government in Italy, for the fourth time, reduced the wages of the workers, office employees, etc., by 12 per cent. Unemployment benefits are being cut down, as is the number of people entitled to receive benefit, in spite of the fact that no small percentage of the wages of those employed are transferred to a fund for unemployment insurance. The peasants are driven off the land if they have nothing with which to pay their rents or debts. The dissatisfaction and wrath of the workers and peasants break out from time to time in isolated, and to a great extent local actions, which are fiercely suppressed, but for the time being the Italian fascists are not receiving the necessary repulse from the working class.

In Poland, the new constitution which has just been published, and which fundamentally means autocratic rights for the President, completely deprives the masses of the workers of their political rights. The social rights of the workers, provided for in the previous constitution (the eight-hour day, the right to social insurance), have been completely wiped out by the new constitution, (in actual fact they have been taken away from the workers long ago). Along with the complete abolition of social insurance, it is also proposed to unify (to merge and to give a fascist character to) all the trade unions.

In spite of the fact that a very big struggle is going on in the Polish bourgeois camp, and that the Pilsudskites are losing their mass basis among the petty-bourgeoisie, the Pilsudsky fascists and the "popular democrats" form a united front when it is a question of the struggle against the working class and the oppressed nationalities in Poland. It is, therefore, premature to speak of the serious crisis of Polish fascism, in spite of the fact that the offensive of Polish

fascism invariably meets with a powerful repulse from the working class (in recent years there have been two general strikes in Poland).

#### The Position of German Fascism.

German fascism is undoubtedly faced with very serious economic difficulties. For the two years (1933-4) exports have declined by 1,500 million marks.

Germany's foreign debts amount to 35,000

million marks, but it has nothing with which to pay these debts. It is aiming at a moratorium, and arbitrarily does not pay its obligations, and this circumstance, along with many others, makes it difficult for it to receive new loans and credits.

The heavy financial situation of fascist Germany does not prevent the big firms from making profits.

*(To be concluded)*

## DANZIG

By A. KAROLSKI.

THE elections in Danzig did not produce the results which the fascists wanted. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the expectations and prophecies of the fascists, who anticipated a repetition of the victory they had gained in the Saar, were not fulfilled.

How did this happen?

Let us try to analyse the development of events, and avoid drawing conclusions from the Danzig campaign which may confuse the working class and all those who are opposed to National socialism.

The result of the elections in Danzig was, undoubtedly, a disappointment to the National Socialists. But we must not exaggerate this fact into being a "colossal victory for the anti-fascist people's front in Danzig," as some anti-fascist newspapers are doing. It is just in the last three months that we observe the further growth in Germany of a wave of nationalism, which in some respects calls to mind the powerful wave of fascism which swept throughout the whole of Germany in 1933 when Hitler came to power.

One anti-fascist newspaper even went so far as to make the following assertion with regard to the results of the elections in Danzig:

"The defeat which Hitler has suffered represents the collapse of his incitement to war, of militarism, of the introduction of universal conscription, and of chauvinism. No one other than the Nazis themselves declared this outcome to be inevitable.

"In reality the results of the elections in Danzig show the degree to which the mass basis of the Hitler régime is being narrowed down."

To write in such a way means to put forward one's desires as an accomplished fact. The anti-fascist movement will gain nothing from this kind of thing. It is unfortunate that we have still not succeeded in dispersing the wave of chauvinism in Germany.

As is well known, it was intended to carry through the elections in Danzig a year later. But the fascists were in a hurry. They wanted to make use of the favourable situation which followed on the Saar plebiscite, both in their home as well as in foreign policy. By speeding up the elections in Danzig, the fascists counted on extending those

positions in the sphere of foreign policy which they had won in the Saar region, and intensifying the pressure on the big powers to more easily abolish the last remnants of the Versailles Treaty. In the sphere of home politics, the fascists made wide use of the introduction of universal conscription, and raised an unheard of chauvinistic and nationalistic war atmosphere around it, accompanied by a wave of terror against the Communist Party. For this purpose the fascists wanted to make use of the expected consolidation of their positions at the Danzig elections. The German fascists hoped that they would obtain a majority of at least two-thirds of the votes to the Volkstag (the Danzig Parliament), so as to advance to their goal by "legal means" so to speak, without resorting this time to the putschist methods, which they had made use of with such unfortunate results when they attempted to bring about the Anschluss (unification) with Austria in July, 1934. The National Socialists who had already been in power in Danzig for two years hoped to bring about alterations in the Constitution with the aid of a two-thirds majority and to create all the preconditions for bringing about the unification of Danzig with the "Third Empire" by "normal methods."

But things turned out otherwise. A few days prior to the elections, Goering, Goebbels, Hess and Rust, who were directly responsible for leading the election struggle in Danzig, declared that national-socialism was fully guaranteed a 90 per cent. favourable vote — not to mention a two-thirds majority. The results of the elections are well known. The following table gives a general picture of the elections:

	Votes	Seats	Votes	Seats
	1935		1933	
National Socialists	139,043	44	107,331	41
Social Democrats ...	38,005	12	37,882	12
Communists ...	7,090	2	14,566	5
Centre Party ...	31,525	9	31,336	10
Nationalists ...	9,691	3	13,596	4
Ex-servicemen ...	750	—	—	—
Poles ... ..	8,310	2	6,743	2

The picture is less favourable for the National Socialists if we take the city of Danzig alone, without the countryside, where the influence of the Nazis is stronger than in the towns. In the thickly populated working-class quarters of the city of Danzig, the Nazis were in a minority as compared to the oppositional parties. There were 188 election points in Danzig. In 75 of these, the oppositional parties obtained a majority, and in ten of these the Socialist and Communist Parties received more votes than the National Socialists did, while at three points the latter were beaten by the Centre Party.

It is clear that the fascist press cannot hide its disappointment. Instead of the so-called "normalisation," on which the Nazis counted, they had to declare that they would have in the future to carry on an energetic struggle against the opposition. There was a very great increase in the terror directed against the anti-fascists, and we must still expect all kinds of surprises. But the very fact that 100,000 electors in Danzig voted against the Nazis, creates certain difficulties as far as the fascists are concerned. Thanks to this the resistance offered by the masses has grown, and at the same time the legend that the fascists have the whole population of Danzig behind them has been blown sky high.

What do the results of the elections in Danzig show?

First and foremost, that the fascists can only stage "national unity" when they destroy all the remnants of bourgeois democracy and ensure their totality by the use of the most ferocious terror. In other words, the elections in Danzig show that in those places where the proletariat find it possible to declare their will in conditions which provide even the smallest liberty of movement, they declare in the majority against the fascists. Nobody can refute the fact that the majority of the workers in Danzig voted against the fascists and, therefore, when the fascists declare in connection with the elections to the Confidence Councils, that 90 per cent. of the working class are behind the Nazis—this is a lie and a fraud. The fascists are only in a position to make a display of the astronomical figures of the votes they receive at elections when the people are held down in the vice of fascist totality.

But the terror in Danzig was not less nor weaker than in the Saar region. On the contrary, it was stronger. How then are we to explain the difference in the results of the voting in Danzig and the Saar?

We think that it is out of place to make a mechanical comparison between the Saar plebiscite and the Danzig elections. The content of the electoral struggle in Danzig was different to what

it was in the Saar region. But first let us say a few words about the common features between the situation in Danzig and in the Saar. Both in Danzig and in the Saar region there is a fierce fascist terror directed against all opponents of the National Socialists, but especially so against the Communists. We may say that the terror in Danzig was still fiercer than it was in the Saar. In the Saar region the Communist Party was legal, and published a number of legal newspapers. The Communist Party in the Saar frequently succeeded, in spite of the Nazi terror, in winning the right to rally the masses and to organise mass demonstrations. In Danzig the Communist Party was illegal and with the exception of one meeting held in Tsopot, did not succeed in organising any mass meetings at all. The Party's chief functionaries were in jail. The Party could not, as an organisation, put forward its own list in the elections. The list presented figured as a personal one in the name of the candidates put forward. The organs of the League of Nations operated in both the Saar region and in Danzig, yet all the same the conditions under which the voting took place in Danzig were different from those in the Saar.

As we stated at the outset, the Nazis thought that it would be possible to make use of the success achieved in the Saar to obtain some advantages out of the colossal rise of the wave of nationalism which began in connection with the introduction of universal military service. But here we come close to the special conditions of the electoral struggle in Danzig. The Nazis in Danzig proceeded to mobilise the masses in good time, and this campaign assumed unheard of proportions—they spent millions of money on this. Nearly all the halls were at the disposal of the fascists. The apparatus of the State and the municipality, as well as all unified organisations were in their hands. The fascists held 1,300 meetings in the city of Danzig alone, addressed by the best orators from Germany. The Nazis imported 13,000 people from Germany, who allegedly had the right to vote in Danzig, and yet the elections ended up in a fiasco. The cause of this was that the main problem that faced the electorate in Danzig was quite a different one from the one that faced the electorate in the Saar region.

We can say that the Nazis in the Saar region succeeded to a certain extent in presenting their struggle for the unification of the Saar to Germany, not as a narrow party struggle. They operated under the cover of the "German Front," around which they developed very wide campaigns. For 15 years the Saar region was occupied by French imperialism. The voting in the Saar took place in the presence of the military forces of the League of Nations. The popular slogan in the Saar dialect

of "Negs wi hem" (We want home!) embraced far wider sections of the population in the Saar than did the slogans put forward by the National Socialists in other cases. Tens of thousands of anti-fascists who were hostile to Hitler, believed that they were voting not for the Nazis but for Germany, which sooner or later would rid itself of Hitler. In the Saar the wave of nationalism reached an unheard-of height. In no other place as in the Saar has there been such a decisive confirmation of the thesis that nationalism covers far wider sections of the population than fascism does. Excited crowds of children who followed from house to house on the heels of those engaged in distributing anti-fascist leaflets, and spat at them and made a mockery of them, as though they were traitors, were at times a greater obstacle in the way of the anti-fascists than the open terror of the National Socialist Storm Troopers. Since the anti-fascists in the Saar were neither able nor knew how to carry on a struggle against chauvinism and nationalism, Hitler succeeded in obtaining victory.

The position was different in Danzig, where the slogan "Back to the Empire" was not put forward by the fascists in the same way as they did in the Saar. The slogan was to a certain degree kept in the background, was advanced in a negative form and not as openly as it was in the Saar. In the propaganda of the National Socialists it was not the question of the Anschluss (linking up) with the "Third Empire" which was put forward openly, so much as that "anyone who votes for the Separatists and the traitors to the fatherland renders unification difficult." Danzig was not occupied as the Saar region was, and the advantages which the Poles have in Danzig cannot be compared with the position in the Saar region. The National Socialist policy of a bloc with fascist Poland was unpopular in the eyes of the masses. Furthermore, the Nazis who are in power in Danzig bore the responsibility for the economic ruin of Danzig as a result of this policy.

Gdinya has paralysed Danzig as a port. Danzig, cut off from the empire, and with the Polish Corridor in the rear, is completely dependent on Poland. The exceptional reserve displayed in the recent period by the National Socialists in relation to Poland, and even their advances to the latter, toned down the sharp edges of the National Socialist propaganda which had led to such success in the Saar region. This situation compelled the National Socialists to come out openly in Danzig as a party, as against the way they behaved in the Saar region. As a result of this a big section of the petty bourgeois electors in Danzig were not faced with the question of voting against Germany, but of voting against the National Socialists.

There was another point which played a part. While the Nazis in the Saar region attempted to carry on a campaign for the return of the Saar to Germany, using pacifist arguments (to overcome territorial questions in dispute with France), in Danzig, on the other hand, the Nazis openly carried on a reckless campaign in favour of war and spread anti-Soviet calumny. All these points exerted decisive influence over the voting in Danzig, and brought about a result different from the one in the Saar region. While the clergy in the Saar district, which is mainly Catholic and borders chiefly on the Catholic population of Germany, did not openly declare against the Anschluss, for they regarded the plebiscite as a German problem and not as a National Socialist problem, in Danzig, on the other hand, they acted otherwise. Bishop Olivsky and a large section of the clergy came out openly against the National Socialists.

The results of the Danzig elections cannot be regarded as a sign of the fall of the wave of nationalism in Germany. The wave of chauvinism in Germany is far from having been scattered. And in Danzig it also played a big part, though not in the same degree as it did in the Saar. We must, therefore, carry on a struggle against the incorrect conclusions drawn as the "defeat of chauvinism," for they do not correspond to the actual situation and can exert a demoralising influence.

The National Socialists are attempting to count as their own the votes lost by the Communists. Everything goes to prove that this is incorrect. Neither can the number of votes received by the Communists in Danzig serve as a measure of the influence of the Communist Party in Germany. Danzig never did belong to the decisive regions where Communism and the bourgeoisie could measure their strength. The forces of the C.P.G. were always concentrated in the big industrial regions of Western Germany, in the Ruhr region, Berlin and Hamburg. The decline of the Communist vote in Danzig by 6,000 cannot be placed to the credit side of fascism. A number of Communist voters were faced with the alternative of either handing over their votes to the illegal Communist Party whose active workers and deputies were in jail and whose seats threatened to be annulled, or of handing their votes to the Social Democratic Party which in spite of certain complaints made by the Nazis, was able to operate legally. This section of the Communist electors voted for the Social Democrats, while the petty bourgeois masses of former Social Democratic electors ran to the side of the Nazis. We have often marked this process in Germany. The behaviour of the masses of Social Democrats and

Communists confirms this. While the Communists in the Saar region have proceeded to carry on their work underground, there are more and more frequent cases where the leaders of the Social Democratic organisations and especially of the free trade unions under their influence (Neinkirchen) have agreed to unification and have gone over to the Nazis.

It is clear that the Communists might not only have been able to prevent a loss of votes but could have extended their positions in spite of the unfavourable situation and the illegal conditions under which they had to carry on the struggle. But the Communist Party did not carry on a struggle of principles against Social-Democracy, against the Social Democrats. Our struggle was carried on almost exclusively in a parliamentary form, and practically no mobilisation of the masses outside of parliament was to be observed. The elections in Danzig are a warning to us that the hatred of the masses for the fascist dictatorship does not lead in the case of all of them directly to the recognition of the methods of the revolutionary class struggle. This depends, first and foremost, on the struggle we carry on. The masses have still not lost their democratic illusions. It depends to a very great degree on the work and the activity of the Communist Party, on the degree to which the Party succeeds in rallying these sections of the masses for the struggle outside of parliament, how soon the masses will be liberated from these illusions in the process of the day-to-day struggle.

The election results are a serious lesson for the Communists in Danzig. If we bear in mind how weakly the Party consolidated its influence among the masses in Danzig (there are only a few factory

cells in Danzig), how insufficient was its mass work (the absence of serious work in the trade unions, both reformist and fascist) and how late the Party began the election campaign, then the fact that 8,000 workers indicated their preparedness to fight and their loyalty to the Party of Thaelmann, is of great importance. Had we in Danzig carried on a consistent united front policy, then we would have had the chance of smashing the sabotage of the Social-Democratic leaders and would have been able to face the fascists with a bloc of the toilers. The rotten arguments of the Social-Democrats to the effect that fear of the Communists made the united front unpopular in the Saar, and that the rejection of the united front allegedly led to an increase in the number of votes given to the Social-Democrats in Danzig, could have been smashed. We could have widely popularised and correctly estimated the results of the election among the masses and also analysed the special character of the electoral struggle in Danzig.

The results of the elections in Danzig, as we have already stated, can by no means serve as a measure to prove the decline of the wave of nationalism which continues to rage over Germany under the influence of the Nazis. But Danzig shows that when there is the slightest relaxation of "totality," the majority of the proletariat openly demonstrate their anti-fascist line. Danzig has exposed the whole lying deception and character of the alleged "unity of the people," and at the same time reminds us of the necessity of persistently unifying the masses of anti-fascists throughout Germany in the struggle at this particular stage to smash the "totalitarian" policy of fascism, and for the preparation of the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

---

**No. 8, 1934, is urgently required to complete Volumes:  
The Publishers will be greatly obliged if readers who  
can spare this number will return it to them—when it  
will be allowed for at publication price.**

# THE DERBY CONFERENCE OF THE I.L.P.

Easter, 1935

By HARRY POLLITT.

**I**N considering the results of the 43rd Conference of the Independent Labour Party held at Derby from April 20th to 23rd, it is perhaps useful and necessary to recall a few facts in regard to the rôle and evolution of the I.L.P. to its present position.

Prior to the Special Conference of the I.L.P. at Bradford in July, 1932, the I.L.P. had been the leader of reformism and the fight against Marxism in the working class movement for forty years.

It was the I.L.P. who were responsible for placing MacDonald in the position of Parliamentary leader of the Labour Party, and of becoming Labour's first Prime Minister, after which he promptly wiped his feet upon the I.L.P.

But the experiences of the General Strike, two Labour Governments, and the crisis in 1931 wrought great changes among the I.L.P. membership. At the special Bradford Conference in July, 1932, by 241 votes to 142, it was decided to disaffiliate from the Labour Party.

The minority promptly left the I.L.P. and formed the Socialist League, which continues the traditional I.L.P. rôle in the working class movement, under a pseudo-Marxist cloak.

The main cause of the disaffiliation policy carried out at Bradford, was not basic differences of policy, but disagreement with the Standing Orders of the Parliamentary Labour Party Group, which sought to impose a rigid discipline on all its affiliated sections. The I.L.P., in view of the growing disillusionment of the workers with the policy of the National Government, sought to retain the advantages of association with the Labour Party, without the disadvantages arising from the practical operation of Labour Party policy. We shall see later in this article, that this question of the Standing Orders of the Labour Party, is still playing its part in I.L.P. policy, and will in its relations with the Socialist League, assume some importance regarding future development between the I.L.P. and the Socialist League.

After the Bradford Conference a new Programme was adopted. Almost over-night, the world was informed that the I.L.P. had been transformed into a "revolutionary Marxist Party."

The step taken at that time was of great historical importance because of the previous rôle of the I.L.P.. Whilst appreciating this, it was also necessary to make the sharpest distinction between the genuine advance of the membership of the I.L.P. who were approaching towards Marxism and Communism, and the I.L.P. leaders. The latter,

after a life-time spent in preaching reformism, opposing Marxism, and practising every kind of reformist deception and trickery, under the pressure of their own members and by the force of circumstances, suddenly proclaimed their conversion to Marxism.

It soon became clear, that the "Marxism" only meant a means of manoeuvring to stem the advance of the members of the I.L.P. to Communism, and for the slandering of the Soviet Union and the Communist International. The events since July, 1932, culminating in the Derby Conference of April, 1935, have fully justified the analysis of the situation then made by the Communist Party of Great Britain.

At the Derby Conference held in 1933, the fight between the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. and the majority of the I.L.P. leaders became sharper. Important decisions were taken at this conference despite the opposition of the leaders and delegates associated with the Right Wing, still strongly entrenched within the I.L.P. The Conference saw the need for developing mass activity and making a sharper break with purely parliamentary methods of struggle. It realised the United Front was the central task, it broke off association with the Second International, and decided to approach the Communist International with a view to close co-operation.

These developments were the danger signal to the I.L.P. leaders. From that time on, the fight sharpened in the effort to prevent any further real attempts to develop the united front on the basis of day-to-day mass activity with the Communist Party, and for really effective co-operation with the C.I. It was realised that if these two decisive tasks were carried out, the logic of the position would be a single revolutionary Party in Britain affiliated to the Communist International.

At this Derby Conference, the revolutionary implications of the main questions, and especially that of the Communist International were blurred over. This provided the opportunities and excuses the leaders desired to impede any further progress in the development of the policy and influence of those sections of their membership who were associated with the Revolutionary Policy Committee.

The same revolutionary ferment was also expressing itself within the I.L.P. Guild of Youth, who were also in favour of a working agreement with the Young Communist International.

### Comintern Letter to I.L.P.

The Communist Party and the Communist International warmly welcomed the Derby decisions, and in a letter sent to the I.L.P. by the Political Secretariat of the C.I. it was declared:

"The unity of all the revolutionary proletarian forces in Great Britain on the basis of irreconcilable class struggle, upon which the programme and tactic of the Communist International is founded, would be a turning point in the history of the British Labour Movement and would open up an international perspective for the revolutionary workers of the I.L.P."

This great aim, however, was the very last thing that either the open Right leaders led by Sandham, or the "left" leaders led by Maxton and Brockway desired. The Revolutionary Policy Committee, however, openly stated after the receipt of this letter from the C.I.:

"The C.I. had responded to the resolution passed at Derby, in a most friendly and conciliatory way. We must redouble our efforts to see that no unnecessary barrier is raised against this great advance towards international revolutionary unity." (R.P.C. Bulletin, No. 9, 1933.)

The Majority of the I.L.P. leaders certainly re-doubled their activities to prevent any further advance to Communism without a corresponding consistent drive through the I.L.P. as a whole (especially in Scotland where it was most needed) on the part of the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. By the time the York Conference of the I.L.P. took place in 1934, the three distinct political lines within the I.L.P. had become plain to every observer. The open Right Wing group, who were against the united front and any co-operation with the Communist International; the dominant group led by Maxton and Brockway, who tried to occupy a centre position and based their policy on that of the seven "left" socialist parties; and the members around the Revolutionary Policy Committee, who were fighting for the united front and those of the Affiliation Committee who were for sympathetic affiliation to the C.I.

After the York Conference, there was a further split in the I.L.P., and those members and branches who were under the leadership of Sandham and Murray, formed the Independent Socialist Party, whose main centre is in Lancashire, but which is a very small and ineffective organisation.

Again the issues became clearer. The fight between the leadership and revolutionary membership intensified. Two members of the Affiliation Committee who were in favour of the I.L.P. becoming an organisation sympathetically affiliated to the C.I. were expelled. At the same time, the leaders welcomed the formation of an avowed Trotskyist group within the I.L.P. to spread the type of political confusion and slander against the Soviet Union and the C.I., that would be useful to

the Maxton, Brockway group in their efforts to retard the growth of revolutionary influence within the I.L.P. moving towards Communism.

The I.L.P. Guild of Youth at its conference in Norwich in the summer of 1934, recorded a decision for sympathetic affiliation to the Young Communist International in spite of the opposition of the I.L.P. leaders. The National Administrative Council of the I.L.P. then called a special conference of the Guild of Youth with Brockway as its representative, to try and intimidate the Guild to rescind its decision. This was held in November, 1934, but again the Guild of Youth re-affirmed its decision for sympathetic affiliation to the Young Communist International.

And from this time it is easy to see the determination of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. to stop any further flirtations with Communism, and lay aside the mask of platonic friendship that had on so many occasions been used to deceive its members and hide its real aims and policy.

It is necessary to briefly review here, the experiences in the united front activity carried on between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party since 1933. Without question there are many successes to record, and important achievements to register. Great activity has been carried out by the two parties in the fight against the National Government and the employers, fascism and war. Considerable sections of workers in the Trade Unions, Labour Party, and Co-operative Guilds have been drawn into this work.

### Weakness of United Front.

But the outstanding weakness of the united front campaign has been that it has been limited constantly to certain specific campaigns. It was and is not based upon daily joint mass activity in the factories, trade unions and working class localities. This has been due to the fact, that within the I.L.P. leadership there was opposition to any form of united front with the Communist Party on the one hand, and to the fear that the I.L.P. would tend to lose its independent identity, in the united front on the other.

The practical result of this has been that the I.L.P. as a whole, has never been fully mobilised for united activity. Only in London, Glasgow, and certain parts of the Midlands has any sort of sustained joint activity been carried out.

Mistakes of a petty and isolated character have been made by some of our Communist locals. These have been magnified out of all proportion by those I.L.P. leaders who have been more interested in exploiting them to break the united front, than seriously trying to overcome political causes which have given rise to them.

The fight between the I.L.P. and the C.P. in

the Merthyr bye-election also added to the existing difficulties in any further development of united front activity. Every effort must be made to avoid rival candidates at elections in future.

The main drive and mobilisation of the workers through united front activity to develop a mass movement with its basis and support in the factories, trade unions, and streets has come from the Communist Party. Practically every proposal for mass work and suggestion for concrete demands and forms of mass activity has had to be made by the Communist Party. It has been a one-sided partnership in this respect. The proposals for united front activity have come from the Communist Party. The complaints arising out of this have come from the I.L.P. leaders. In addition to which, there have been strong tendencies, particularly expressed by Campbell Stephen, for the limitation of the united front to platform meetings and occasional demonstrations.

After the decision of the I.L.P. Guild of Youth last November to continue their association with the Y.C.I., our Central Committee received a letter from the I.L.P. demanding a new united front agreement, similar to the one existing between the French Socialist Party and the Communist Party of France.

We expressed our willingness to meet the I.L.P. representatives, but we also sent them a concrete proposal for a joint national conference to discuss the unification of the I.L.P. and the Communist Party into a united Communist Party.

Subsequently a meeting of representatives of the I.L.P. and C.P. was held. Many questions were discussed. We at once agreed to a new united front agreement on the lines of the French one, provided it also contained a clause, pledging both parties to repress any weaknesses in the work of the parties in carrying out the united front agreement. Since then many difficulties and differences have been cleared up. This year has undoubtedly seen many improvements in the carrying out of united front campaigns, especially in the fight against Part 2 of the new Unemployment Act. Of course, mistakes were made and weaknesses shown by both sides, but nothing that goodwill and discussion could not have cleared up. But these mistakes, taking place on the eve of the Annual Conference of the I.L.P. were the very thing certain of the I.L.P. leaders wanted, not only to oppose the whole aim and purpose of the united front, but as demagogic weapons for use against the perspective of complete unification and the formation of a united Communist Party.

At our recent 13th Party Congress, special attention was given to the question of the I.L.P. Maxton attended our Congress as fraternal delegate from the I.L.P. The proposal for a Unity

Conference between the two parties was enthusiastically endorsed. The declared policy of our Congress, that of doing everything possible to strengthen the fraternal relations between the two parties and the early realisation of a single revolutionary party was welcomed and supported by every delegate at the Party Congress.

Before and since our Party Congress, the Communist Party has been making great progress. Indications of this are over 2,000 new members, big increase of the Party in the trade unions, increase in the sale of the "Daily Worker," 10,000 copies of the Congress resolutions, and 40,000 copies of "Soviet Britain" sold. These facts, together with the success in the Urban District Council elections, especially in South Wales, have not escaped the notice of either I.L.P. leaders or members.

They are in such marked contrast to the well-known facts of the steady decline in the I.L.P. membership and influence.

This contrast has played an important part in the I.L.P. before and during their annual conference. At rockbottom it is these facts which rouse the wrath and anger of the McGoverns, and led to the old Tory diehard propaganda of "Moscow gold" and anti-Soviet slander being let loose; to the full applause of the yellow press, and the disgust of the more far-seeing and thoughtful members of the I.L.P.

What, of course, lies behind this resurrection of Lord Banbury's anti-Soviet propaganda, is the desire for an international in which the C.P.S.U. would have no place. Whatever the I.L.P. leaders say now to the contrary, it is becoming crystal clear that behind all their talk about "revolutionary unification of all international groupings," is the idea ultimately of a return to the Second International

In preparation for their last Derby Conference, the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. had prepared a Statement of Policy. We doubt if any policy statement has been issued by the leadership to which so many amendments have been presented in the history of any serious working-class political party. But the main thing to be noted in this regard is that no amendments came from Glasgow, the only place in the country to-day where the I.L.P. has any numerical strength and influence. This placed the N.A.C. in a very strong position for carrying through its political line. What was that line?

(1) To limit the United Front to specific issues, and day-to-day mass joint activity.

(2) To prevent any unification of the I.L.P. and the C.P. in a single revolutionary Party.

(3) To attack the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union.

(4) To retain association with the Seven Left Parties, as the best means of continuing the struggle against the Communist International.

(5) To side-track the Conference by the perspective of a new workers' party, which will turn out to be the means of effecting a return for the Labour Party.

There is no need, in this article, to go into any detailed analysis of the N.A.C. Statement of Policy already being prepared in the light of the amended version that emerged from the Congress. It will be enough to quote the opinions of the I.L.P. members themselves to show what this Statement represents.

#### **The Revolutionary Policy Committee's Appraisal.**

The Bulletin of the Revolutionary Policy Committee, issued in connection with the Derby Conference, states in reference to the Policy Statement as a whole,

"This is the only comprehensive Policy Statement issued by the N.A.C. since 1933, and we might therefore expect that such a statement would show a careful analysis of the present situation, arising from an understanding of the fundamentals that form the basis of what is often rather loosely termed Revolutionary Theory.

These fundamentals involve an understanding of the nature of capitalist production, the nature of state power and the function of state institutions, the process of the class struggle; the rôle of the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the relation of the Revolutionary Party to the working class and its task in the revolution.

It is no exaggeration to say that in all these respects the document shows that the N.A.C. is content, consciously or unconsciously, to appear hopelessly muddled, and so quite unable to answer the questions it poses." (*Revolutionary Committee Bulletin, April, 1935.*)

There is no point in adding anything to this criticism. The whole character of the discussion bore out the correctness of this I.L.P. criticism of the I.L.P. leaders. To watch the antics of a few Trotskyists (not one of whom has a vestige of influence in any working-class organisation in the country) and how joyous the I.L.P. leaders were at others doing their dirty work, was an interesting study of that oft-lauded theme—"The I.L.P. Mind and Spirit."

But, of course, it was on the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union, that the Leaders and their supporters had their field-day. A field-day on which the coming months will reveal how much they have lost. After a few paragraphs in the Policy Statement on "The Danger of War," "Foreign Policy of Soviet Union," "Class Struggle must go on," we come to a paragraph which is headed "Defence of the Soviet Union," and read as follows:

"At the same time revolutionary Socialists must not be deterred from rallying to the defence of Soviet Russia if threatened with attack. The Soviet Union is the Socialist citadel in a hostile capitalist world, and must be defended at all costs."

But, already flushed with their "Victories" over the revolutionary delegates, and so dizzy with success, the N.A.C. proudly announced their withdrawal of the sentence "The Soviet Union is the

Socialist Citadel in a hostile Capitalist world and must be defended at all costs." No wonder the delegate Hilda Vernon declared this as "Extremely significant."

"Why," she asked, "has the sentence been withdrawn, a sentence representing the view we have held of the U.S.S.R. since 1917?"

Comrade Hilda Vernon had already supplied the answer to her own question, in her article written before the Derby Conference, where in dealing with Brockway's notorious Anti-Soviet article she had declared:

"Why does Fenner Brockway find it necessary always to be criticising the Soviet Union—always finding some fault to magnify for the edification of the workers of this country?

We believe it is because Brockway, by reason of his bitter hatred of the C.I. and the C.P.G.B. has allowed his judgment to become warped on any matter that, if dealt with in a more friendly way, would bring the Party closer to the C.I. and C.P.G.B. and further away from the 'Left' revolutionisation of Brockway's friends of the Resisters' International and 'Left'-Trotskyist-Bureau."

\* \* \* \*

"The recent articles in the *New Leader* by Fenner Brockway on the Soviet Union now display clearly the attitude that will be forced on to the Party as a result of its relations with the Paris Bureau.

We cannot allow the I.L.P. to be drawn into becoming a predominantly anti-Communist 'anti-Soviet Union' organisation, under the disguise of the honest Socialist having to answer the honest doubts of the workers. This attitude does not answer them—it feeds them and soon may be in the position of creating them." (*Revolutionary Policy Committee Bulletin, April, 1935.*)

It is always a favourite trick of the I.L.P. leaders to compare the democracy of the I.L.P. with the terribly dictatorial methods of the Communist Party. But it appears that when Comrade Jack Gaster, one of the Revolutionary Policy Committee leaders, and a member of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P., wrote an article criticising Brockway's anti-Soviet line in the "New Leader" of April 5th, this article was rejected on the grounds that:

"Comrade Gaster's article would be interpreted inside and outside the Party as opposition to the line contained in Brockway's article on April 5th and the leader of April 12th—which the Inner E.C. has endorsed." (*Revolutionary Police Committee Bulletin, April, 1935.*)

There was nothing the majority of the I.L.P. leaders wouldn't do, to ensure Brockway's line consideration. Some comment was made on Brockway's silence, in the Conference, on what is regarded as his special preserve. We understand that this modesty was to prove to the I.L.P. that the N.A.C. were behind him. It certainly proved it as far as the majority of the leaders were concerned.

We have heard remarks about some of the anti-Soviet expressions used by McGovern and Campbell Stephen as "unfortunate—but made in the heat of the moment." Not at all. The position was exquisitely explained by Maxton, who, faced

with angry delegates demanding to know if the statements made by McGovern and Stephen, expressed the opinions of the N.A.C., declared in the famous Maxton manner that "He wished they would be as discreet as himself." So it is clear, from the Chairman of the I.L.P. that what is blurted out by certain I.L.P. leaders is in the thoughts of the majority.

We believe, however, that the resolution put forward by the Derby branch of the I.L.P., in relation to the Soviet Union more correctly expresses the views of the I.L.P. membership as a whole, even though it was defeated. This resolution reads as follows:

"This Conference congratulates the U.S.S.R. on its tremendous achievements in the sphere of Socialist planning and construction. The Conference is of opinion that if the Soviet Union is given the opportunity to continue its work without interruption by capitalist aggression it will soon achieve a classless order of society. The Conference welcomes the peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union and recognises that such a policy is in the best interests of the working class throughout the world.

We regret that the forces of the working class throughout the world are not as yet prepared for vital struggle. We realise, therefore, that the Soviet Union's policy allows for more time for the preparation and consolidation of the working class forces.

Finally, this Conference notes that at the same time as Socialist construction is increasing, capitalist decay is increasing. Therefore, with every month the U.S.S.R. has for construction, the strength of the Socialist movement is increasing, not only in Russia, but throughout the world."

#### **I.L.P. Members Behind Soviet Union.**

The above accurately reflects the views of the vast majority of the British working class. We have no doubt at all that there will be a strong movement inside the I.L.P. against the vicious anti-Soviet policy, its leaders managed to get adopted at Derby. All the fancy phrases and beating of breast by Jennie Lee on behalf of the N.A.C. about how they will defend the Soviet Union, cannot hide the fact that the majority of the N.A.C. at Derby were playing the game of the counter-revolutionaries, a game which has for its object the destruction of the Soviet Union. But they will fail, because the British workers and all that is best in the I.L.P. are solid behind the Soviet Union, and welcome its Peace Policy as the greatest contribution to preventing war in our time.

I was present at the Derby Conference as a fraternal delegate of the Communist Party. It needs to be explained, that I was allowed only ten minutes to convey the message of the Communist Party, and had to do so immediately the Conference opened. In the course of my speech I stated:

"The Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party deputed me to carry to the forty-third Conference of the Independent Labour Party warmest fraternal greetings and to express the hope that within a short space of time

the complete unification of our two Parties will be realised.

For the first time in the history of either the I.L.P. or the Communist Party, this year has seen an exchange of fraternal delegates at our respective Party Congresses. It is both an indication of the changed economic and political situation, and of the relations between the two Parties arising from this.

We believe the united front activity that has been carried out between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party, is of historic importance, not only because of what has been achieved through this for the British workers, but the effect it has had throughout the international labour movement.

It was perhaps inevitable, in view of our previous relations, that there should have been certain shortcomings and weaknesses in our joint work, but we should set ourselves to overcome them. However, really big things have been accomplished and a new hope given to large sections of the British working class movement. Whatever differences, distrust and suspicion there may have been, whatever political differences on fundamental questions of revolutionary theory and practice have existed, our joint activity in support of the German, Austrian and Spanish workers, the great Hunger March and National Congress of 1934, the militant fight against war and fascism, especially the successful mass struggles against Mosley's Blackshirts, the mass fight against Part 2 of the Unemployment Act, are great achievements, which have rallied tens of thousands of workers into united activity, and had a profound effect inside the trade unions, the Labour Party and the Socialist League and Labour League of Youth as the growing opposition to the official policy within these organisations proves.

But, because of the grave character of the present situation at home and abroad, we cannot be satisfied with these undoubted achievements. There are still millions of workers under the influence of the reformist leaders, and who have not yet been drawn into active participation in the united front.

The British Labour leaders to-day are the chief opponents of the united front, both on a national and international scale. They have opposed the acceptance of the appeal for united action made by the Communist International to the Second International. They have opposed the appeal for international trade union unity made by the Red International of Labour Unions to the International Federation of Trade Unions. They are opposed to any form of class struggle that undermines their avowed policy of class co-operation, and unless we can break down this resistance by our consistent day-to-day activity in the factories, trade unions, and working class localities, by our joint activity, continually drawing in wider sections of their rank and file, the British working class may experience serious set-backs and defeats.

The Communist Party is confident that we can win the workers in the Labour Party, Trade Unions and Co-operatives, and in so doing force their leaders to change their present opposition to the united front.

The fighting united front of the working class can only have real meaning if it is developed as a result of daily activity against the attacks of capital and against fascism and war.

If we have a common policy on the trades unions, effective preparation for the winning of all elective posts and for the various trade union conferences, for the unification of the wages demands and preparations for economic struggles; a common policy for the Trade Councils, for work in the Co-operatives, for work amongst the unemployed and building up a mass N.U.W.M., by our joint fractions and panels of candidates, in all these activities we can help the employed and unemployed workers secure great victories.

If alongside these we can work out an agreement for an election policy, that will by our joint activity result in the return of a strong revolutionary group in the next Parliament, and help forward the growing opposition within the Labour Party itself, then a new perspective opens for the whole working class, and for our two Parties.

It strengthens the necessity for the complete unification of our two Parties in a single revolutionary Party. We believe this great aim transcends in importance every other issue before your present Conference. We have noted and welcomed the growing tendencies within the I.L.P. towards Communism and the Communist International.

You all know where the Communist Party stands on this question. Our recent Thirteenth Party Congress declared:—

‘The fight for the united front, and the ever more revolutionary issues facing the working class struggles, make to-day more urgent than ever before the unity of all militant workers in a single revolutionary party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. With this aim in view the Communist Party has proposed to the Independent Labour Party the holding of a joint Congress for the formation of a United Communist Party.’

We believe the programme and policy of the Communist International, to which our Party is proud to be affiliated, is the only one to which revolutionary workers can subscribe. We are convinced that for such workers there is no other alternative, neither is there a middle course between the Second and Third Internationals, and attempts to find one may easily result in not going forward to revolution, but back to reformism.

The Communist International—the International created by Lenin—has for the first time in history created a World Revolutionary Party, uniting and leading the activities of revolutionary workers and peasants in every country in the world. It is the International to which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is affiliated, the Party building Socialist construction in a way that has resulted in the Soviet Union becoming one of the most powerful countries in the world and whose Peace Policy has won unstinted support of every genuine lover of peace and hater of war, who recognise in this Peace Policy the unswerving determination of the Soviet Union to prevent and retard war and thus give the workers of the world a breathing space in which to complete their preparations not only to effectively fight war, but to carry through the revolutionary struggle for power.

The creation of a single revolutionary Party in Britain based upon the programme of the Communist International and firmly and wholeheartedly supporting the Soviet Union, especially its Peace Policy, will not only result in a tremendous strengthening of the revolutionary forces in Britain, but will at once result in thousands of unattached revolutionary workers at present outside the ranks of the I.L.P. and the C.P. joining up and bringing further force and power to our United Party.

The unity of action on immediate issues must be strengthened, in addition we believe, that if joint meetings of the representatives and memberships of both Parties in every area were regularly taking place, discussing not only immediate issues connected with the united front, but the fundamental revolutionary questions, associated with the development of the struggles for power, this would mark a very big advance in all phases of our current work and towards the unification of our two Parties.

The Communist Party is ready and willing to meet your representatives to discuss the practical measures to be taken to achieve this great aim—the creation of a mass United Communist Party in Britain affiliated to the Communist International.”

Immediately after I had concluded, Maxton gave his Chairman’s address, the only noteworthy point being where he stated:

“I cannot say that I feel, as Pollitt has expressed it, that we are ready for unification of the Independent Labour Party and the Communist Party. But I do feel that already things are shaping so that the possibility of the formation of a new working class party in this land with the I.L.P. and the Communist Party as its central core is not in the far distant future, but very near to us.” (Maxton at I.L.P. Conference, 20.4.35.)

We consider it very important that this avowed aim of creating a new Workers’ Party has been declared. That it is the aim of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. also, is made clear in the leading article of the *New Leader* on April 26th, 1935, where it states:

“It sets out to form a new Workers’ Party in which all the growing revolutionary forces of the working class will be combined.” (Editorial, *New Leader*, 26.4.35.)

#### New “Workers’ Party a Trap.

The “New Workers’ Party” is to be the red herring across the path of those who sincerely desire to see the complete unification of the whole of the revolutionary workers on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist Revolutionary Programme and Policy.

There cannot be any opportunist unification. There can be no possibility of some *ad hoc*\* Workers’ Party, each Party to which has its separate political programme and policy.

The United Front of struggle against the attitude of the employers and National Government, against Fascism and War, provides the basis for united activity and co-operation, into which every section of the working class movement can be drawn.

The Labour Party and The Socialist League have a programme and policy, which is one of Reformism.

The Communist Party has a programme and policy. It is based upon the interests of the working class and the carrying through of a revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and of Soviet Power.

Between these two clearly defined programmes of Reformism and Revolution there is no half-way house. Finally, the issue before every worker is one or the other.

False notions and illusions about the possibility of harmonising conflicting views, of romantic revolutionising, of uniting into a new workers political party, various sections of workers without a clearly defined Marxist-Leninist Programme and Policy may sound specious and attractive, and seem to fit in with our “peculiar British traditions and conditions.” Fundamentally it is not only

\* For this particular purpose, especially.

dangerous because it retards the advance to Communism, but finally leads back direct into the camp of reformism.

The N.A.C. have not outlined the basis and programme on which the proposed new Workers' Party would be established as yet. But the whole line of the Derby Conference decisions reveals the probable approach. It is obvious that such a Workers' Party would be asked to accept:

(1) A programme of "Left" Socialist muddle-headed reformism.

(2) Opposition to the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union.

(3) Either no international associations at all; or association with a group of "Left" parties, largely comprised of renegades from Communism, whose false policy has been exposed by events, and who have only one common link, hatred of the Soviet Union and the Communist International.

As the situation develops, this line will be found to be the cover for leading the I.L.P. step by step to the Labour Party. The proposal of the I.L.P. to the Labour Candidate in the Perth bye-election, for giving support on condition that he oppose the existing Standing Orders of the Labour Party is no accident. The appeal of certain members of the Socialist League to I.L.P. leaders, and the Editorial of the "Daily Herald," after the Derby Conference, appealing to certain sections of the I.L.P. to return to the Labour Party fold, are all intimately connected. The basis on which the Bradford Conference of the I.L.P. disaffiliated, is neither forgotten, nor is it likely to be an inseparable barrier for a later family reunion.

We make it clear. We are absolutely against Maxton's idea of a Workers' Party, which is to be the alternative to a united Communist Party. There is no place for the kind of loose workers' Party comprising all sorts of affiliated organisations that Maxton has in mind. We are for a Workers' Party as visualised by Lenin, a Party of Revolutionary Working men and women firmly moulded on revolutionary theory and practice, affiliated to the Communist International.

To-day this Party already exists in Britain, it is the Communist Party. There is no half-way house between the Labour Party and the Communist Party. There is none between the Second International and the Communist International.

The real issue before the I.L.P. is now as clear as daylight. It is either forward to Revolution—or back to Reformism.

The majority of the N.A.C. leaders have shown where they stand.

It is now this issue which faces every member of the I.L.P. The gauntlet has been thrown down by the leaders, it has to be challenged, exposed and fought against, otherwise there is no future before the members of the I.L.P.

It has been very revealing to note the summing up of the Derby Conference of the I.L.P., by the more responsible sections of the Capitalist Press. We have only space to give two views:

"The Communists would not play the I.L.P. game with the result that in 1935 Mr. McGovern got on his feet at Derby and talked about Russian gold in almost the same terms used by Lord Banbury fifteen years ago.

The I.L.P. may drag on for another year or two, but no one will bother about it any more. It is dried and done for, and only the personality of Mr. Maxton gives a look of life to the bones." (*News-Chronicle*, 25.4.35.)

"This prediction of something less dignified than death was not difficult to make. We cannot but feel that among the best elements of the I.L.P., the catastrophic error of 1931 is now fully and bitterly realised. And we cherish the hope yet that they will rejoin the Labour Movement and give their best to it.

The Derby Conference has made plain that there is no possibility of co-operation between the Labour Party and the members of the I.L.P., who dabble in revolutionary slogans and do not seem to know whether they are democrats or not.

There are others than such in the I.L.P. and it is to these that we suggest that rejoining the Labour Party is the only condition upon which the restoration of their political influence is possible." (*Daily Herald*, 24.5.35.)

#### Tasks of the R.P.C.

Our view is that if the revolutionary members of the I.L.P. now fearlessly face the fundamental issue that the Derby Conference has raised, which is forward to a united Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International; or decay and disintegration of the I.L.P. until finally the remnants make their peace with the Labour Party and return to the camp of Reformism, there is great hope for the future.

But it means an open fight. It means closer active association with the Communist Party, joint membership meetings to discuss the fundamental questions of the revolution, utilising press and platform for carrying on the fight against the Derby decisions and policy.

It means making contacts all over the country by personal visitation, by gaining a mass circulation for the R.P.C. Bulletin, ending the tactical manoeuvring to out-manoeuvre those whose lifetime has been spent in Parliamentary manoeuvring and expediency.

It means bold and open popularisation of the Soviet Union, its Peace Policy and rôle as the fortress of the world revolution. It entails full support for the Programme and Policy of the Communist International and for the 21-Points of the C.I.

It will be a hard struggle. Every latitude and facility will be given inside the I.L.P. to the poisonous vapourings of a few nondescript Trotskyists, but the class struggle will sharpen, the battle for a revolutionary unification will continue and gather strength.

The members of the Revolutionary Policy Committee need to ponder the fact that they have little influence and authority outside London. The only mass basis of the I.L.P. is in Glasgow. That is where the future struggle lies and needs to be carried out. In carrying it out many comrades will be amazed at the fundamentally reactionary character of the ideas propagated by some of the Glasgow leaders, the logical development of which is back to the Labour Party.

The ideological struggle within the I.L.P. has still to be fought out in Glasgow. When it is undertaken seriously not Moscow, but Rome will be found to be the main obstacle to the creation of a united revolutionary Party affiliated to the Communist International. The leaders of the fight against Communism, will be found to be those who, while privately holding anti-religious views, are not prepared to fight for Parliamentary and Municipal positions on a clear-cut revolutionary political line, for fear of losing the support of masses still under reactionary religious influences

But the Communist Party, too, has serious responsibilities.

In carrying out the united front activities an end must be put to mistakes and tactics that estrange I.L.P. workers who are taking full part in the fight. We don't take part in the united front for separate Party aims, but for the strengthening of the whole working class fight. We work in comradesly association with all workers, and their organisations, aiming at a common division of work, leadership and responsibility. We also have to carry out much more effective propaganda and explanation of our Party aims and programme. We must explain the Soviet Union's Peace Policy, and the magnificent work being

carried out by the Communist International and its affiliated sections all over the world. The members of the Communist Party should cultivate the most comradesly relations with I.L.P. members, exchanging common experiences, working together for common aims in the factories, trade union branch, and co-operative guilds, in the trades councils, and amongst the unemployed. Political discussion must ensue on current events, and fundamental revolutionary questions. There is now a great wealth of revolutionary literature, that can be made the basis of common study, and is invaluable in helping to explain the political meaning of the Derby Conference decisions for example. Only by such methods can we break down existing barriers, sweeping away every existing suspicion and distrust and proving our sincerity, seriousness and determination, not only to strengthen the mass movement through united front activity, but of helping forward the struggle against those who stand in the way of uniting the revolutionary forces in this country into a united Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International.

Finally, I could not help contrasting the recent Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party held in Manchester with the Derby Conference of the I.L.P.

In the former unity behind a political line; great mass experiences, life and enthusiasm, confidence and pride in the Party. In the latter disunity, lack of faith in the working class, no clear line that unites the whole Party, no enthusiasm and no pride in the Party.

It is the difference between advancing Communism and trying to have a foot in each camp, reformist and revolutionary.

---

# THE DAILY WORKER

An ever-growing circulation !

An ever-widening influence !

THE NEWSPAPER of TO-DAY and TO-MORROW !

Get it NOW. A fruitful field for getting an audience !

SO ADVERTISE THAT MEETING.

THE DAILY WORKER is the newspaper that's read by the politically-minded, by the thoughtful, and the serious, and by the student-workers.

SO ADVERTISE THAT BOOK, THAT LECTURE, THAT FILMSHOW.

There is no better way than to advertise ALL YOUR WANTS regularly and frequently in the well-known "WHAT'S ON" columns of

# THE DAILY WORKER

Write Advert. Manager, DAILY WORKER, Nelson Place, Cayton St., E.C.1, for full particulars and terms.

# DISCUSSION ON QUESTIONS FOR THE VII CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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

PREVIOUS ARTICLES WERE:—	No.
Problems of the Standard of Living of the Working Class - - - - -	By Sinani, Vol. XI 20
The Question of the Middle Strata of the Town Population - - - - -	By P. Reimann. 20
Basic Lessons of the Struggle of the C.P. of Italy. - - - - -	By K. Roncolli. 22
The Question of Communist Cadres - - - - -	By Chernomordik. 23
The Nature and the Sources of Sectarianism in the Communist Party of Italy - - - - -	By Tunelli. 24
How to Prepare for the Seventh Congress of the C.I. - - - - -	By Al. Berg, Vol. XII 1
Decision of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany - - - - -	1
Resolution of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia - - - - -	1
The Struggle to Establish Inner Soviet Regions in the Semi-Colonial Countries By V. Myro. - - - - -	3
Decisions of the C.C. of the C.P. of the U.S.A. Regarding Preparations for the Seventh Congress of the C.I. - - - - -	4
The Conditions for Establishing Soviet Districts in the Interior in Semi-Colonial Countries - - - - -	By Li. 4
The Process of Development Towards Fascism - - - - -	By M. Galas. 5
Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland on the Preparatory Campaign of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International - - - - -	5
Some Problems of Fascism (Part I.) - - - - -	By R. P. Dutt. 8
Jugoslavia Pol Bureau Decision - - - - -	8
Some Problems of Fascism (Part II.) - - - - -	By R. P. Dutt. 9
Our Fight Against German Chauvinism - - - - -	By Rudolph Gerber. 9
Resolution of the Political Bureau of the C.P. of Spain on the Preparations for the Seventh Congress - - - - -	9

## FASCISM AS INTERPRETED BY COMRADE PALME DUTT\*

By A. DE LEOV.

**I**N Comrade Palme Dutt's book, "Fascism and Social Revolution," we find for the first time an extensive study of the whole process of fascism, its causes, roots and forms of manifestation, made by a Communist theoretician possessed of a Marxian-Leninist training. The appearance of this book, which contains a wealth of material, painstakingly selected and treated, should be welcomed. Palme Dutt has not contented himself with describing the external events. He begins with an outline, extending over several chapters, of the significance of the economics of imperialist capitalism, especially in recent times, as a source of bourgeois strivings towards fascism. On the

basis of this theoretical research, Dutt answers the question—what is fascism—and proceeds with a narrative of the onslaughts of fascism in Italy, Germany and Austria.

In these chapters Comrade Dutt describes in detail the methods whereby fascism conquered power in three big European countries, and why the workers were unable to frustrate this calamity. On the basis of indisputable facts, Dutt establishes the responsibility of reformism for the temporary triumph of the fascist dictatorship, and exposes fascism which has everywhere violated its own demagogic promises and only worsened the conditions of the masses.

A special chapter is dedicated to the interrelations between Social-Democracy and fascism, and to the "Theory and Practice of Fascism." Comrade Dutt then defines the essence of fascism as "an organisation of social decay," and traces the tendencies towards fascism in Western Europe and America. In that chapter he convincingly proves

\*Comrade Palme Dutt's book adds considerably to the wealth of Communist literature on fascism. Comrade De Leov has touched here only upon some of the questions dealt with in the book. A general discussion of the questions raised by De Leov as well as of the material contained in Palme Dutt's book is necessary in the columns of the "Communist International." (Ed. Board. "Communist International").

that there is fertile ground for fascism in Great Britain, France and the United States.

The factual material given by Dutt concerning the fascist tendencies of the National Government of Great Britain and of Roosevelt's New Deal is edifying, as is also the material concerning the latest methods of agitation used by Lloyd George, and the public appearance of fascism in Great Britain as represented by Mosley's Blackshirts.

Finally, Comrade Dutt poses the question of struggle against fascism, a struggle, the ultimate aim of which must be the socialist revolution.

On such an important problem as that of the essence of fascism there is no room for unclarities. It is, therefore, expedient to subject some of the phases of Palme Dutt's theoretical analysis to criticism. To begin with, let us review Palme Dutt's criticism of a pamphlet on fascism written by the American author, Scott Nearing.

Scott Nearing holds the well-known Social-Democratic point of view that fascism in its class character is **PETTY-BOURGEOIS**. He even regards fascism as a "petty bourgeois revolution," and says:

"At the centre of the Fascist movement is the middle class, seeking to save itself from decimation or annihilation by seizing power and establishing its own political and social institutions. It therefore has the essential characteristics of a social revolutionary movement, since its success means the shift of the centre of power from one class to another . . ."

"Fascism arises out of the revolt of the middle-class against the intolerable burdens of capitalist imperialism." ("Fascism and Social Revolution," p. 79).

Palme Dutt finds the same theory in Brailsford, the Labour Party theoretician, in Calverton, the American pseudo-Marxist, and in the English Social-Democratic press. Dutt quite justly criticises this incorrect theory which is highly dangerous for the anti-fascist struggle in the following words:

"Fascism, although in the early stages making a show of vague and patently disingenuous anti-capitalist propaganda to attract mass support, is from the outset fostered, nourished, maintained and subsidised by the big bourgeoisie, by the big landlords, financiers and industrialists." (page 80).

Scott Nearing from his incorrect theory draws corresponding conclusions. However, in his criticism of these conclusions, Comrade Dutt is much less consistent

Scott Nearing raises the question: "WHERE WOULD VICTORIOUS FASCISM LEAD SOCIETY?" And he gives the following reply:

"The search for a self-sufficient economic unit will lead the fascists, as it led those of their predecessors who helped to liquidate the Roman Empire, to a splitting up of economy units until they reach the village, the manor and the local market town. Autarchy implies the abandonment of national specialisation in production . . . Mass-production will be drastically restricted.

"The abandonment of national specialisation will go hand in hand with the decline of international trade . . .

Automatic machinery will be abandoned with the abandonment of mass-production. The village will rely on hand-agriculture and hand-crafts. Railroads will disappear . . . Mass wage-labour will disappear with the disappearance of specialised mass-production. The modern proletariat will be eliminated by war, disease, famine and the flight back to the land, quite as effectively as the proletariat and the slave masses of Imperial Rome were eliminated by the same means . . ." (pp. 227-228).

This is the picture which Scott Nearing gives of the future if fascism is victorious: **AUTARCHY in the long run leads to the most PRIMITIVE NATURAL ECONOMY — MASS PRODUCTION VANISHES, MACHINES ARE DESTROYED—and with all this there disappears also the BOURGEOISIE AS WELL AS THE MODERN PROLETARIAT!**

This is the same picture as we are given by the German fascist Oswald Spengler, or H. G. Wells in his latest books. It is the picture of the new "twilight epoch" which occurred after the fall of the Roman Empire. Scott Nearing writes: if fascism is victorious, then Spengler will be right with his "sunset of the West"!

Clearly this theory is closely connected with the view of fascism as a petty-bourgeois revolution. If, as Scott Nearing assures us, fascism were really an anti-capitalist movement of the middle strata, it could be understandable that the victory of fascism must sooner or later lead to the abolition both of the world market and of mass production, both of the bourgeoisie and of the proletariat.

Palme Dutt denies this definition of fascism as "petty-bourgeois revolution": but what does he write about Scott Nearing's "picture of the future"?

"This picture is an imaginative picture of a hypothetical process — deliberately leaving out of account the dialectics of the proletarian class struggle which will defeat its realisation. But it is essentially a correct picture of what would happen if the innermost tendencies of Fascist economics and politics were worked out to their final conclusion. **IT IS ESSENTIALLY A CORRECT PICTURE OF THE ONLY FINAL ALTERNATIVE TO THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION.**" (p. 228, my emphasis.—L.).

Thus, Palme Dutt sees two mechanically directly opposed forces: fascism—and the struggle of the working class. Either the working class will be victorious—and this would mean the realisation of socialism—or, there is another ALTERNATIVE, i.e., another ACTUAL POSSIBILITY—fascism will conquer—and in that case Scott Nearing's perspective is correct, in that case "the innermost tendencies of Fascist economics and politics" will lead to autarchic isolation, to the destruction of mass production, machines and the proletariat, to purely natural economy!

In order to prove that this is not a question of an accidental utterance, we will give a few more quotations:

"Fascism, developing since little over a decade, has no long past behind it, and in all probability—from the

very nature of its reactionary rôle, from its violent inner contradictions, and from the whole character of its desperate attempt to throw up a dam against the advancing social revolution—is likely to have no long future before it. Fascism is likely to be remembered only as an episode in the long-drawn class-war advancing to the final victory of the socialist revolution.

"But if Fascism were able to have the opportunity to continue over a longer period, were able to maintain its power and to dominate as it dreams, a whole epoch of social history, then it is evident from the whole foregoing analysis what its historical rôle would be, and what kind of society it would produce.

"The society of a 'stabilised Fascism'—if such a contradiction in terms can be imagined, if, that is, for the sake of analysis we try to imagine the possibility of such a society and ignore for the moment the inner dialectics of break-up and revolutionary upsurge which would make such a stabilisation impossible — would be a society of ORGANISED DECAY!" (p. 223).

We find similar views in the introduction to the book, where we read:

"The modern development of technique and productive power has reached a point at which the existing capitalist forms are more and more incompatible with the further development of production and utilisation of technique. There is war between them, increasingly violent and open since 1914, and entering into a new and extreme stage in the world economic crisis and its outcome. One must end the other. EITHER THE ADVANCE OF THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES MUST END CAPITALISM, OR THE MAINTENANCE OF CAPITALISM MUST END THE ADVANCE OF PRODUCTION AND TECHNIQUE AND BEGIN A REVERSE MOVEMENT. IN FACT THE DELAY OF THE REVOLUTION HAS MEANT THAT THE REVERSE MOVEMENT HAS ALREADY BEGUN THROUGHOUT THE WORLD OUTSIDE THE SOVIET UNION.

"Only TWO PATHS are therefore open before present society.

"One is TO ENDEAVOUR TO STRANGLE THE POWERS OF PRODUCTION, to arrest development, to destroy material and human forces, to fetter international exchange, to check science and invention, to crush the development of ideas and thought, and to concentrate on the organisation of limited, self-sufficient, non-progressive hierarchic societies in a state of mutual war—in short, to force back society to a more primitive stage in order to maintain the existing class domination. This is the path of Fascism, the path to which the bourgeoisie in all modern countries where it rules is increasingly turning, the path of human decay.

"The other alternative is to organise the new productive forces as social forces, as the common wealth of the entire existing society for the rapid and enormous raising of the material basis of society, the destruction of poverty, ignorance and disease and of class and national separations, the unlimited carrying forward of science and culture, and the organisation of the world communist society in which all human beings will for the first time be able to reach full stature and play their part in the collective development of the future humanity. This is the path of Communism, the path to which the working masses who are the living representatives of the productive forces and whose victory over capitalist class domination can alone achieve the realisation of this path, are increasingly turning; the path which modern science and productive development makes both possible and necessary, and which opens up undreamt-of possibilities for the future development of the human race.

"Which of these alternatives will conquer? This is the sharp question confronting human society to-day.

"Revolutionary Marxism is confident that, BECAUSE THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES ARE ON THE SIDE OF COMMUNISM, COMMUNISM WILL CONQUER; that the victory of Com-

munist, which is expressed in the victory of the proletariat, is ultimately inevitable as the sole possible final outcome of the existing contradictions; that the nightmare of the other alternative, of the "Dark Age," whose creeping shadow begins already to haunt the imagination of current thinkers, will yet be defeated, will be defeated by the organised forces of international Communism.

"But this inevitability is not independent of the human factor. On the contrary, it can only be realised through the human factor. Hence the urgency of the fight against Fascism, and for the victory of the proletariat, on which the whole future of human society depends. THE TIME GROWS SHORTER; THE SANDS ARE RUNNING THROUGH THE GLASS." (pp. viii-ix, my emphasis.—L.).

One might give several more quotations from the same book in which again and again with more or less clarity, with more or less consistency, this same idea is developed: modern society is faced with two possibilities, two prospects of future development—either the FINAL victory of socialism or the FINAL victory of fascism. But the victory of fascism, by virtue of its inner nature would mean the return to pre-capitalist conditions, to a new Middle Age, to primitive natural economy and to the downfall of modern society\*.

Yes, this downfall throughout the capitalist world has already begun—"throughout the world, except the Soviet Union"—production and technique has ceased to progress and the "way back" has already been started.

Of course, there are places where Comrade Dutt calls socialism INEVITABLE and, moreover, for the reason that "the productive forces are on the side of Communism." But here Palme Dutt asserts—and this is the basis of his whole conception—that FASCISM DESTROYS PRODUCTIVE FORCES and thus, consequently, destroys the premises for the victory of Communism!

Hence Palme Dutt's solemn warning: "Time grows shorter," "there is death in delay," "the sands are running through the glass"!!

This is absolutely consistent, for if fascism, according to Dutt, rules for a more or less long period of time, it will inevitably lead to the destruction of the productive forces, the "dark ages" will come and then . . . all hope for the victory of socialism will vanish!

(Incidentally: what sort of perspective does Comrade Palme Dutt offer to Communists in countries where fascist dictatorship is already established and where fascism has already acquired a considerable mass basis?!)

\*See, for example, on page 24: "One is to throttle the development of the productive forces in order to save class-society, to destroy material wealth, to destroy millions of 'superfluous' human beings in . . . starvation and . . . war, to crush down the working-class movement with limitless violence, to arrest the development of science and culture and education and technique, to revert to more primitive forms of limited isolated societies, and thus to save for a while the rule of the possessing classes at the expense of a return to barbarism and spreading decay. This is the path . . . of Fascism."

As regards this theory, one must first of all say that facts contradict Comrade Dutt's views. Fascism has been in power in Italy for 13 years. Has it during this somewhat long period of time displayed even the slightest tendency of abolishing mass production, of destroying the big workshops and factories, of rejecting the world market, of making the transition to handicrafts and natural economy?

Everybody knows that this has not happened.

On the contrary, the Fascist state has accelerated to the utmost the process of concentration of production and the centralisation of wealth; it encouraged the introduction of rationalisation in factories at the expense of the proletariat, it supported large-scale industry and carried on a struggle in favour of exports.

The same is true as regards Germany, Poland, and all those countries where fascism has been in power for a more or less long period of time. Propaganda of small-scale production, attacks against capitalism and modern technique are all so much fascist DEMAGOGY for the purpose of deceiving the petty-bourgeois masses! And autarchy, besides preparing for war, merely aims at safeguarding the home market, in order to carry on the struggle for the world market with still greater force.

Secondly; is it really true that capitalism has already become incompatible with technical progress, that it has already taken the "backward path"?

Lenin wrote:

"It would be a mistake to imagine that this tendency to decay excludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism certain branches of industry, certain strata of the bourgeoisie and certain countries betray to a more or less degree one or other of these tendencies. On the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before, but it is not only that this growth is becoming more and more uneven; this unevenness manifests itself also, in particular, in the decay of the countries which are richest in capital such as England." (Chap. 10).

This was written during the world war in Lenin's book "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." And is this not true with regard to post-war imperialism?

Comrade Mendelson, in the book "New Material to V. I. Lenin's work 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism'"\* on the basis of an enormous accumulation of facts writes the following:

"... figures and facts concerning capitalist economics of the last 20 years not only confirm the same tendencies as the data introduced by Lenin, but show a further

\*"New Material to the Work of V. I. Lenin's 'Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism'" prepared by the Institute of World Economy and World Politics of the Communist Academy. Edited by E. Varga, L. Mendelson, and E. Khmel'nitskaya. Partisdat, Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., 1935. Russ. Ed.

development and intensification of these tendencies. First and foremost, they show a further enormous increase in the power of monopolies and their oppression, and an increase on this basis of parasitism and the decay of capitalism." (p. 249).

However, this on no account means that all the progress of technique has ceased. Comrade Mendelson writes:

"The basis of the increase in technical decay in the post-war years is the general retarding of the growth of capitalist production. We are not speaking of the destruction of productive forces of capitalism during the years of the world economic crisis. This process of technical decay is extremely uneven, being accompanied by big technical changes in several branches of capitalist production." (p. 285).

Thus, we have a retarded growth of production, a rapidly increasing tendency to parasitism and decay, but no ABSOLUTE STAGNATION and no "return to the middle ages"! And we know that even during the years of deep economic crisis, rationalisation went on in new forms that were particularly painful for the proletariat; that even during these years definite technical achievements were observed in some places and that the crisis considerably encouraged the further concentration and centralisation, the breakdown of small production in town and village! This is the state of affairs during the period of the general crisis of capitalism, and under fascism as well, which on NO ACCOUNT REPRESENTS A NEW STAGE IN THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM, although fascism is, on the one hand, the consequence of the intensification of the general crisis, and on the other, the cause of the increased growth of tendencies towards parasitism and decay. Obviously Comrade Dutt's viewpoint was arrived at under the one-sided influence of the period of most intense crisis and of the particular conditions in England where, as Lenin remarked, the tendency to stagnation and parasitism is especially marked.

Of course, we should depict the devastating effect of fascism in all spheres and especially point out that fascism brings in its train new, terrible wars; and it is a shortcoming of Palme Dutt's book that comparatively little attention is paid to just this connection that exists between fascism and war

Of course, we should emphasise most definitely that the victory of fascism (a temporary victory) is not inevitable in any country, and that the proletariat, and all toiling humanity, should be interested to the highest degree in preventing fascist dictatorship and making fascist dictatorship impossible once and for all by means of the socialist revolution. But even where the bourgeois set up fascist dictatorships, it is not their lot to find a "way back" out of the contradictions into which dying capitalism is being entangled. On the contrary, it is just fascism that sharpens these contradictions more than anything else. Fascism

inevitably disillusion the petty-bourgeoisie, among whom it can find a mass basis only for a time. It brings in its train still further impoverishment for the working-class. It both complicates and accelerates revolutionary development, at one and the same time. Fascism means new, cruel wars, which weaken the capitalist system and make it possible for a break through to be made again. And under fascism also the bourgeoisie gives birth to "its own grave-digger." Can one, in that case, say, as Palme Dutt does, that there are "two alternatives," two real possibilities of social development over a whole epoch?

We have all possible grounds for revolting against the propaganda of the "sunset," preached by the Spenglers and other fascist or social-fascist ideologists for the express purpose of discouraging the toiling masses, and diverting them from the revolutionary struggle.

Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin talk about the INEVITABILITY of the victory of socialism. In the "Communist Manifesto," the document testifying to the birth of the revolutionary working class movement, Marx and Engels wrote that PAST epochs and class battles, each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes. In regard to the bourgeoisie, the ruling class of capitalist society, we read the following in the "Communist Manifesto":

What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

Of course, this inevitability can be "proved" only in the practice of the class struggle.

"The impossibility (of restoring capitalist conditions of production.—L.) is proved only in practice," wrote Lenin in his notes to N. I. Bukharin's Book, "The Economics of the Transition Period."\*

This is just why it was essential to raise the question of the future of capitalism CONCRETELY in connection with the modern international situation.

How is it possible to raise (as Comrade Dutt does) the question of the perspective of fascism in the capitalist world and at the same time not even to make any mention of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, of the historic significance of the Soviet regions in China, or of the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries? It is precisely the final victory of socialism in the Soviet Union—the fulfilment of the First and Second Five-Year Plans, collectivisation of the rural districts, and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class—that constitute the strongest bulwark in the struggle against capitalism throughout the whole world; it is just these things that constitute the clearest proof that capitalism, even by means

of fascist dictatorship, will not be successful in maintaining power for any long period of time.

The influence of the incorrect line which we have already criticised may similarly be felt in several other questions. Comrade Dutt writes:

"Wherever capitalism is able to reach towards FULLY SECURED CLOSE MONOPOLY, WHICH IS THE WHOLE TENDENCY AND AIM OF MODERN CAPITALISM (THOUGH NEVER FULLY REALISED), and the whole essence of the economics of Fascism, the inevitably inseparable tendency to retrogression of technique and decay is at once visible." (p. 53, my emphasis.—L.)

Thus, according to Palme Dutt, the WHOLE tendency of modern capitalism is directed towards fully secured close monopoly, although this tendency is not realised "fully" and entirely.

But according to Lenin,

"Monopoly which has grown out of free competition, does not abolish the latter, but exists alongside it and hovers over it . . . gives rise to a number of very acute antagonisms, friction and conflicts." (Chap. 7).

It is clear that Comrade Dutt has not reached all the depth, all the dialectic wealth of thought that is contained in the Leninist teachings on Imperialism.

And Dutt's viewpoint on the world economic crisis is linked up with this:

"The short-lived 'revival' of world production in certain branches of industry in the summer of 1933 . . . bore no relation to any solving of the basic contradictions underlying the crisis, which on the contrary became intensified. The disparity between production and consuming power increased. The 'revival' was in fact openly a reflection of the gathering war process, a direct outcome of typical war-measures of inflation, state mobilisation of industry and increase of production of armaments and of industries associated with armaments." (p. 68).

It should be borne in mind that the book "Fascism and Social Revolution" was finished in the summer of 1934, when it had become quite clear that the increase in production in the capitalist world in 1933-1934 should be looked upon NOT ONLY as preparations for war, and when Comrade Stalin's theses at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. on the transition to a depression of a special kind had already been confirmed by facts. And in this case, Palme Dutt actually holds the viewpoint of "permanent crisis," of the absolute stagnation of capitalist production.

The shortcomings that have been pointed out here do not signify that we should not welcome the appearance of this new theoretical work of Comrade Dutt. We must hope that the book will be worked upon still further and that this will lead to the elimination of the shortcomings indicated; and if, at the same time attention be given to the extensive new accumulation of facts that are available, then we shall get a very valuable, general investigation of the development and essence of fascism in the main capitalist countries of the world.

\*Leninist Miscellany, Vol. XI, p. 362. Russ. Ed.

## STRUGGLES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF SOUTH AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

### The Results of the 3rd Conference of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America

**D**URING the period that has elapsed since the 6th Congress of the Comintern, the Communist movement in South and Caribbean America has achieved considerable successes. At the time of the 6th Congress, there were Communist Parties and Communist groups in 12 countries, of South and Caribbean America, while at the present time they exist in 19 countries. Communist Parties have been founded in Peru, Paraguay, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Panama, Porto Rica and Haiti, and Communist groups in Bolivia and San Domingo. In 1933 the Communist Party of Paraguay, which ceased to function in 1930, was reorganised. The Communist Party of Salvador, which arose in 1930, and in 1932 was crushed by the government, at the present time is also being rebuilt. The Communist Party of Guatemala, which was formed prior to the 6th Congress, had practically collapsed by 1932. It is now also being revived. Thus the only countries without Communist organisations in 1934 were Nicaragua, Guiana and the West Indies.

#### The Situation in South and Caribbean America.

The countries of South and Caribbean America, with a population exceeding 100 millions, of whom more than half consist of nationally oppressed Indian and Negro peoples, exist in semi-colonial dependence on the imperialist countries. All the commanding positions in the economy of these countries are in the hands of foreign capital. South and Caribbean America contain approximately 40 per cent. of all the colonial investments of imperialist countries. Out of the 14-15 billions of foreign capital invested in these countries, approximately 12 billions are, at the present time, about equally divided between England and the U.S.A.

Japanese imperialism has recently shown increased activity in these countries. This can be seen from the considerable increase in Japanese trade with South and Caribbean America, in Japanese emigration, in the widening of military and political connections with various countries and attempts to establish contacts with bourgeois landlord groupings in Mexico, Cuba, Brazil and a number of other countries.

Foreign imperialism in the countries of South and Caribbean America bases itself on the "national" bourgeois landlord ruling parties and groups, subjects the toiling masses of these coun-

tries to barbarous exploitation, combining "advanced" capitalist forms of exploitation with the relics of pre-capitalist (semi-feudal and semi-slave) forms.

Imperialist rivalry in South and Caribbean America sharpens the war danger. In their struggle against each other, the various groups of imperialists utilise and deepen the historical contradictions existing between the various countries dependent upon them to bring about military conflicts between these countries. For example, the war that broke out in the middle of 1932 between Bolivia and Paraguay was primarily the result of the Anglo-American struggle; the war between Peru and Colombia, which began in 1932 and ended in 1933, was the consequence not only of Anglo-American but also of Japanese-American contradictions (the influence of the U.S.A. is stronger in Colombia, while that of Great Britain and of Japan is greater in Peru).

Simultaneously, the imperialists try to utilise South and Caribbean America as a rear base, in their counter-revolutionary struggle against the Soviet Union (e.g., the Japanese purchases of agricultural raw material and minerals for equipping and supplying its army).

Imperialist rivalry leads to the sharpening of group struggles in the camp of the local ruling classes, assuming the form of coups d'état. The struggle of the competing bourgeois groupings, connected with one or the other of the imperialist powers, increases the political instability in the countries of South and Caribbean America tremendously. In Brazil, this struggle, in which about a hundred thousand people participated in 1932, took on the form of open war between the "Paulistas" and the Brazilian government. In Guatemala in December, 1930 alone, three governments were overthrown, and in Chile five governments were overthrown in 1932, etc.

The transition of the economic crisis into a depression of a special type caused some increase in the demand for raw materials, war orders, etc. In a number of countries (especially in Chile and Mexico, partly in Argentine) this led to a partial and very unstable increase in output and some revival in foreign trade. At the same time, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the prolonged agrarian crisis, the absence of a real

improvement and development of industry in the leading capitalist countries, the increased exploitation, in connection with the crisis and depression, of the colonies and semi-colonies by imperialism, proves the impossibility of securing a very considerable improvement in the economic situation of the countries of South and Caribbean America and the continuation of the ruination and impoverishment of the toiling masses. The standard of living of large sections of the working class and of the peasantry is lower than the starvation existence minimum.

#### **Increasing Radicalisation of the Masses.**

The years of the world economic crisis were simultaneously years in which the revolutionary movement rose to new heights. During the recent years, the mass revolutionary movement has been characterised by huge class struggles of the proletariat (the biggest economic and political struggles in the history of South and Caribbean America), intensification of the peasant movement, which included partisan battles of the peasantry (Brazil, Paraguay, Chile, Ecuador), mass uprisings of the Indians (Peru, Mexico, Bolivia, Chile, etc.), revolutionary manifestations by the Negroes (Cuba), a series of mutinies in the armies and fleets (Chile, Peru, Cuba, Salvador, etc.) and revolutionary activity by the students and the urban petty-bourgeois almost everywhere. This upsurge took place with extreme unevenness. For example, in 1931, the greatest upsurge of the revolutionary movement took place in Peru (big economic and political strikes, rebellion of the Indians), in 1932 in Chile (formation of Soviets in large centres), in 1933 in Cuba (the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship as the result of the powerful development of revolutionary struggles), and in 1934 in Brazil (the tempestuous development of the strike movement, the formation of a wide national anti-imperialist front) and in Cuba.

The growth of the discontent of the broad masses of the toilers caused a number of new phenomena to appear in the political life of South and Caribbean America. In particular it should be emphasised that in the recent years the overthrow of governments in many of the countries of South and Caribbean America (due to the group struggles within the camp of the ruling classes) was partly the result of mass revolutionary actions and was almost everywhere accompanied by such actions (especially the overthrow of the Ibanes government in 1931, Monterey in 1932, Chile and the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship in Cuba in 1933).

The sharpening of class contradictions accelerated the bankruptcy of those petty-bourgeois

organisations that had tried to lead the mass revolutionary movement. Thus, the petty-bourgeois elements in the Mexico revolution displayed their inability to solve the revolutionary tasks and slid into the camp of bourgeois national reformism, which is irreconcilably hostile to the agrarian revolution of the peasantry. In 1930 the process of the disintegration of "Prestism" in Brazil led to the situation where the greater part of the leaders passed over to the side of various bourgeois landlord parties, while the minority, headed by Prestes, came into the ranks of the Communist Party. And it was only in the last few months, in connection with the big revolutionary upsurge, that these Right elements of the former Prestist movement once more took up an intermediate position between the revolution and the camp of imperialism, a national reformist position. In Nicaragua, the rebel bands of Sandino had carried on the struggle against the armed intervention by the U.S.A. since 1927, and it ended in 1933 by the capitulation of Sandino and his passage over to the side of the counter-revolutionary Secasa government.

The rapid radicalisation of the masses and the sharp intensification of the class struggle accelerated and deepened the process of disintegration of the traditional parties. It aided the differentiation of the liberal bourgeois landlord parties and the petty-bourgeois groups. Their upper ranks, openly leaning on imperialism, support the reactionary governments (e.g., the support of the Justo Government by the Alverarist wing of the Argentine radicals, the support of Benavidis in Peru by the top leaders of the A.P.R.A.,\* etc.). At the same time a considerable part of these parties and groupings strive to preserve and widen their influence on the masses, resort to national-reformist manoeuvres, and even to "socialist" camouflage (the declaration of a "socialist republic" by the Grove Government in Chile in June, 1932). Finally, petty-bourgeois trends and groupings arose in the traditional radical bourgeois parties (the "Radical Bolsheviks" in Argentine, "Left" Batlistas in Uruguay, Socialist groups in Brazil, "Apro-Communists" in Peru, "Giteristas" in Cuba, etc.), wavering between national reformism and the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. At the same time, independent parties of the petty-bourgeois arose in some countries (e.g., "Tenientistes" in Brazil), which put forward the incomplete and inconsistent programme of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Simultaneously there was a strengthening of reaction, which made ever wider use of the

\* People's Revolutionary Association of America, organised in 1929 and led by the national reformist bourgeoisie.

experience and methods of European fascism and frequently formed semi-fascist organisations or similar to fascist organisations, as subsidiary organisations of the reactionary landlords, the church and the compradore (middlemen) bourgeoisie in the struggle which, with the aid of imperialism, they carried on against the proletariat and the peasantry. With the aid of nationalist "anti-capitalist" demagoguery, they try to win the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie ("Integralists" and the "National Evolutionary" party in Brazil, the "National Socialists" in Chile, the "Civil Legion" in Argentine, the blocs of the Catholic "Revolutionary Youth" in Mexico, etc.). These organisations, as the agents of foreign monopolist capital, directly connected with the reactionary section of the landlords, the bourgeoisie and the church, have not yet been able to establish any significant mass base for themselves. In a number of countries of South and Caribbean America, intensified attempts are made to turn the trade unions into government apparatus, e.g., the government trade unions as the sole trade union organisations in Brazil, the formation of the so-called labour chambers in Mexico, etc. Moreover, some of the trade unions entering into these trade union amalgamations oppose the government in a united front with the revolutionary trade unions (Brazil).

The growth of the discontent of the masses and their resistance to the offensive of the local ruling class and imperialism has sharpened the process of the disintegration of the Socialist, anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist organisations.

Since the 6th Congress the influence of anarcho-syndicalism within the working class movement in South and Caribbean America has considerably decreased. In some countries, the best elements of the anarcho-syndicalist movement came over to the Communist movement as in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Cuba, where the revolutionary trade union amalgamation, which is under the leadership of the Communist Party (C.N.O.C.) has taken in a considerable majority of the former anarcho-syndicalist workers. In other countries the weakening of anarcho-syndicalist influence is accompanied by a strengthening of the Socialist and reformist organisations (Argentine), the national reformist parties ("National Revolutionary Party" in Mexico, "Revolutionary Party," of Grau San Martin in Cuba).

During the last few years, the general crisis in the Second International found its reflection also in the increasing confusion in the ranks of the biggest and most influential Socialist Party in South and Caribbean America, the Socialist Party of Argentine (e.g., the fierce struggle which took

place primarily around the demand advanced by the masses of the members of the party for the organisation of the united front with the Communists, the rise of groupings in opposition to the party leadership, the actual expulsion of the entire Socialist Youth League and various party groups from the Socialist Party under the pretence of "reorganisation," etc.). In the process of this internal struggle, in the Socialist Party of Argentine as well as in other Socialist Parties, groups have arisen, the leaders of which, hiding behind "Left" opposition phrases, have often, and not without some success, held back the workers from joint revolutionary struggle with the Communist workers, as, for instance, the group of Marianetti in Argentine. In connection with the accelerated breakdown of the Socialist Parties and the revolutionising of the masses, Left Socialist groups and organisations spring up which on the basis of the united front, are developing in the direction of Communism. There has also been an increase in the urge towards direct entrance into the revolutionary trade unions and into the Communist Parties (especially in Cuba, Brazil and Paraguay).

In connection with the growing radicalisation of the working class, the Pan-American Federation of Labour (an open agent of American imperialism), which had tremendous influence in Caribbean America, has lost almost all of its influence in these countries (in South America it never had any influence).

#### **The Condition and Work of the Communist Parties.**

Since the 6th Congress, the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America have made serious and considerable steps along the path of conversion into real Communist Parties, freeing themselves from the influence of bourgeois national reformism and petty-bourgeois ideology, which in the past was quite strong. For a number of the Communist Parties, the above period was a period of difficult and far from completed struggle against hostile class ideology, which had rooted itself deeply into their ranks, against bourgeois-liberal, social-reformist, anarchist, syndicalist, populist and other types of influences. During this time, a stubborn though not always sufficiently energetic and successful struggle was carried on in the ranks of the Communist Parties against Right and "Left" deviations inside the Communist Parties themselves, against renegade groups, including the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites, etc. A number of Communist Parties for the first time raised the question of the nature and driving forces of the revolution in South and Caribbean America, and, although in a general form, realised the necessity for the struggle for

the hegemony of the proletariat, led by the Communist Party, in the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution. A particularly successful struggle in this direction was carried on by the Communist Party of Argentine, which played a big rôle in the struggle for the working out of proletarian ideology also in the ranks of the other Communist Parties.

At the same time, some of the Communist Parties (especially the C.P. of Cuba, Brazil, Chile and Peru) widened their contact with the masses and became factors of such strength that the ruling classes were forced to reckon with them. Under the leadership of the Communist Parties, a number of big economic and political struggles were carried on (e.g., in Cuba, Brazil, Argentine, Chile, Peru, Salvador). Work was carried on in the sphere of popularising the successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and for mobilising the masses to defend the U.S.S.R. In the sphere of the struggle against the war danger, special mention should be made of the calling of a Continental Congress in Montevideo in 1933 on the basis of the united front, and in connection with this congress, the holding of a number of demonstrations and meetings (particularly those in Argentine and Uruguay). A wide anti-imperialist campaign was conducted in all the countries of South and Caribbean America (especially in Central America), when the Sandino rebels were carrying on an armed struggle against the intervention by the U.S.A. In December, 1933, in connection with the calling of the 7th Pan-American Conference in Montevideo for the purpose of strengthening the influence of the U.S.A., a mass protest campaign was carried on (particularly in Argentine, where an Anti-Pan-American Conference was held). Mention should also be made of the campaign against the intervention by the U.S.A. in Cuba and in defence of the Cuban revolution. The campaign of solidarity with the German revolutionary proletariat after the seizure of power by Hitler, and demonstrations in connection with the trial of Comrade Dimitrov also merits attention.

The first conference of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America in Montevideo in 1929 was of great significance for the development of the Communist movement on the continent. The basis was laid here for the strengthening of contact between the Communist Parties to ensure the unity of their struggle. The discussion of a number of questions of principle at the conference, for the first time in the history of the Communist movement of South and Caribbean America, was of tremendous positive significance, in spite of a number of very big mistakes in the formulation of these questions.

In the same year (1929) a congress of revolutionary trade union organisations of South and Caribbean America took place, which was called by the so-called C.E.S.L.A. (Amalgamation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of South and Caribbean America). This congress had approximately the same significance for the revolutionary trade union movement as the conference of the Communist Parties in Montevideo.

In spite of the successes that have been attained, the main reason that the development of the revolutionary crisis in South and Caribbean America is being delayed is the fact that the Communist Parties continue to lag behind the big tasks necessitated by the level of development of the mass movement, and that the proletariat is poorly organised. The Communist Parties are not sufficiently ready for decisive revolutionary struggles for power.

In some countries (e.g., Colombia, Ecuador and Panama) the Communist Parties are still greatly contaminated with hostile class elements, and their activity is not yet of a consistent Communist character. In a number of countries, the Communist Parties have still very weak contacts with the masses and have by no means eliminated their sectarian tendencies (especially in Mexico).

Even the strongest and most firmly welded Communist Parties are characterised by more or less considerable fluctuation of membership, inadequate ideological maturity of the leading cadres, insufficient ability to consolidate successes organisationally. Work in the mass organisations, especially in the reformist and anarcho-sindicalist trade unions is weak in most cases. In some countries there is even regression to be observed (e.g., Mexico). The help which the Communist Parties give to the revolutionary trade union organisations is altogether inadequate. In most of the countries, our opponents, the leaders of the reformist, anarchist, governmental and other trade unions still succeed in carrying the vast majority of the organised workers with them. The majority of the Communist Parties still carry on poor work in the countryside, especially among the Indian peasants (only a few Communist Parties, notably Peru and Paraguay, can show any successes in this work).

The leadership of the Parties in the Y.C.L. organisations is extremely weak. Young Communist Leagues do not exist in all the countries. Though there are some successes in the work, the existing Y.C.L. organisations are lagging far behind the Parties in their development. In a number of cases they receive practically no help from the Parties. No noteworthy successes have been obtained in work among women.

The anti-war work of the Communist Parties,

with a few exceptions, has not yet assumed a systematic character (in Paraguay the Party was in actuality created in the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the war; the Communists in Peru conducted a heroic struggle against war).

Not a single Communist Party has yet adapted itself sufficiently to illegal conditions, and been able to make full use of legal possibilities.

The basic weaknesses of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America have made themselves particularly sharply felt in the carrying out of the united front. In most of the countries, the struggle for the united front assumed the form of a series of campaigns with the participation of organisations directly connected with the Communist Parties. The work in the opponent mass organisations is very weak and divorced from the struggle for the united front. In a number of cases the adoption of the tactics of the united front has met with direct resistance from various elements and units of the Communist Parties, and was subjected to the grossest Right and "Left" opportunist distortions.

For instance, in Peru the Communist Party does not carry on a struggle for the formation of the united front with the "Aprist" workers, regarding them as if they were responsible for the slanders being spread by their leaders against the Communists; in Argentine, the task of the struggle for the united front with the Socialist Party is replaced by the task of attracting the best of the Socialists into the Communist Party. When carrying on joint activity with the reformist organisations, the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions often prove to be incapable of keeping the leading rôle in their hands (e.g., in Mexico in 1932).

Alongside with this, recently we can note increased struggle of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union movement for the wide application of the united front and the people's anti-imperialist front (Brazil).

The Third Conference of the South American and Caribbean Communist Parties was held in Uruguay in October, 1934. The special features of the revolutionary movement in the South American and Caribbean countries and the question of the revolution in Brazil and Cuba in particular, were concretely and thoroughly discussed by the Conference; the weaknesses and mistakes in the tactical line of the South American and Caribbean Communist Parties were subjected to fundamental criticism; concrete tasks were given to the most important Parties for the overcoming of these weaknesses and the further moulding of these parties into real mass Bolshevik Parties, capable of bringing the broad

toiling masses to revolutionary struggle for power and to lead this struggle.

The Conference of the South American and Caribbean Communist Parties concentrated its attention chiefly on the question of the tactics and revolutionary strategy of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

The intensified imperialist offensive, which is further deepening the semi-colonial dependence of the South American and Caribbean countries, is under the conditions of the world economic crisis, further transforming these countries into appendages of the imperialist metropolises to serve as sources of agricultural products and raw materials, inflicting a serious blow at the relatively weak national industries. Simultaneously, this imperialist offensive has drawn the South American and Caribbean countries into a number of prolonged sanguinary wars (the war between Bolivia and Paraguay which is still going on, the war between Colombia and Peru which has been interrupted, at present the direct instigation of a war between Colombia and Venezuela, the threatening war between Chile and Bolivia, the severely tense relations between Brazil and Argentine); it has chained the South American and Caribbean countries to a number of predatory treaties (the so-called "treaties of reciprocity" between the U.S.A. and Cuba, the trade agreement between the U.S.A. and Brazil, the Rocco Pact between England and Argentine, etc.), which further enslave the South American and Caribbean countries and expose the broad toiling masses to unlimited exploitation.

The strike struggles of the proletariat have, in the past few years, assumed proportions unknown in the history of the South American and Caribbean countries. The rôle of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement of all South American and Caribbean countries has grown considerably, while in certain countries (Brazil, Cuba, sections of Peru and Chile) the struggle of the proletariat is the backbone of the entire revolutionary movement.

The struggle against imperialism has embraced the widest masses in each country. This national liberation movement is hastening the ripening of the revolutionary crisis; is increasing the discontent of the worker and peasant masses, is lending mass spontaneous force to the revolutionary actions and is drawing the national masses into the struggle for national liberation.

The uprisings of the Indians, the regional movements of the peasant masses in several countries, are developing unevenly, and, in most cases, are not yet leading toward the expropriation and distribution of the landlords' lands and of the

imperialist latifundia. Often these activities do not take place simultaneously with the rise in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and, therefore, end in defeat. The Communist Parties have not yet learned sufficiently well to follow up the revolutionary movement in the countryside with the great attention that it demands. They have not yet thoroughly understood this prime duty — to give conscious revolutionary direction to this movement from its very start, to link it up with the general struggle of the people for national liberation.

The Conference has, therefore, with particular emphasis placed a number of new tasks before the Communist Parties of the South American and Caribbean countries.

Under these conditions the most decisive task is to insure a decisive turn from agitation and propaganda to the organisation and leadership of the revolutionary battles. Agitation and propaganda work was the prevailing form of work, corresponding to the period of consolidation and formation of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America, when they had as yet very little contact with the worker and peasant masses.

The national liberation struggle against imperialism has brought forward the necessity of organising the national revolution quite sharply by systematically drawing the broadest national masses into the struggle against imperialism and its agents at home, and thus forming the widest national anti-imperialist front. In this connection, special attention must be paid to the task of drawing the widest Indian and Negro peasant masses into the national liberation, anti-imperialist front; i.e., to decisively overcome the backwardness that has existed in this respect. The struggle for national liberation can truly become the cause of the masses only by drawing the peasantry into the struggle for the liberation of the South American and Caribbean countries from the imperialist yoke. This means leading the struggle against imperialist exploitation and enslavement, against the latifundia of the imperialists and the native landlords who betray the interests of the struggle for national independence. The agrarian peasant revolution against feudalism, for the confiscation of the landlords' lands without compensation and the transfer of this land to its tillers, can develop to its full strength only by widening the struggle for national liberation. The proletariat of the South American and Caribbean countries can definitely develop into the leading forces, its vanguard—the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America can become mass Communist Parties capable of fighting for the hegemony of the pro-

letariat in the bourgeois democratic revolution not in words but in deeds only in the fire of this struggle.

Taking the uneven development of the revolutionary movement in the South American and Caribbean countries into account, and the concrete conditions of each country, the Conference placed these tasks firmly before the countries which are rapidly approaching the national liberation, anti-imperialist revolution (Brazil and Peru), or which have already embarked on this revolution (Cuba).

The Conference threw all the opportunist, sectarian and Right-opportunist views which hinder the struggle for a real change in the tactics of the South-American and Caribbean Communist Parties overboard. In particular, those views which, by counterposing the task of exposing the demagogic bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders, to the task of leading the masses into the struggle, came to the conclusion that one must *first* expose the national-reformist leaders, and then begin the struggle. Views such as these led in actual fact to rejecting the revolutionary struggle, to passivity, to the inevitable strengthening of the bourgeois national-reformist influence and the petty-bourgeois groupings.

On the basis of the experiences of the mass struggles, the Conference explained to the Communist Parties, that only by bringing the broadest masses into the struggle, by freeing them of their illusions, vacillations and prejudices in the course of this struggle, and learning from their own revolutionary experience, will these Parties be able to systematically free the masses from bourgeois influence and thus gradually win themselves decisive influence in the revolutionary movement.

The Communist Parties will be able to solve this most important task correctly only by regarding the question of proletarian hegemony in the revolutionary movement in the light of the revolutionary tasks at the given stage of the struggle, which is directed especially against imperialism, having in view the formation of a national revolutionary anti-imperialist front. They can do this by systematically drawing the Indian and Negro peasant masses into the anti-imperialist front and creating the necessary conditions for the development of a powerful agrarian revolution. They must fight to strengthen and broaden the positions held by the proletariat in all the various stages of the struggle, by transforming themselves into consolidated mass Parties closely connected with the broadest worker-peasant masses. In doing so they must not view the task of winning the hegemony of the proletariat as one which has already been solved, must not detach it from the course of revolutionary development.

### National Reformism.

On the question of national-reformism the Conference took the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the C.I. for its basis. As regards the national reformist opposition, as is well known, these do not exclude "temporary agreements" and the co-ordination of certain actions in connection with definite moves against imperialism if the activity of bourgeois opposition can be utilised to develop the mass movement, and if such agreements do not limit the freedom of the Communist Parties in the agitational work among the masses and their organisations in any way.

For the Parties of South and Caribbean America such a way of dealing with the question represented a serious tactical turn. The inability of these Parties to correctly distinguish and differentiate the rôles of the various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in the growing anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution led occasionally to the revolutionary perspectives being toned down, and to an over-estimation of the forces of the counter-revolution. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, which differed in the political rôle they played, in their class character and social composition, were regarded as a single reactionary front which would inevitably take action against the anti-imperialist revolution. The national-revolutionary petty-bourgeois parties, which had not yet outlived their illusion regarding the independent leading rôle of the petty-bourgeoisie in the bourgeois democratic revolution, were characterised either as counter-revolutionary national reformist parties, or else as outright reactionary fascist parties (the so-called Officers' Party in Brazil, the Giterists in Cuba, etc.). The national-reformist parties, which at the moment when the mass movement was on the upsurge, issued radical anti-imperialist, and "socialist" slogans (the Left liberals in Brazil, the Left radicals in the Argentine, the A.P.R.A. in Peru, the Grovists in Chile, etc.), to divert the masses from the revolution, and to come to an agreement with imperialism at the expense of the interests of the masses, were regarded by the Communist Parties in South and Caribbean America as an inseparable part of the feudal imperialist camp. The Communist Parties under-estimated the special importance of bourgeois national-reformism, which has great influence over the petty-bourgeoisie, peasantry and partly even over the working class in the countries in South and Caribbean America. As a result of this, they frequently adopted a "neutral" position when big mass struggles took place, fell into a passive attitude, and isolated themselves from the masses of the toilers at times when big political events took place (as for instance in the Argentine during the Uriburi coup d'état in 1930; in Brazil

during the coup d'état brought about by the Liberal Alliance; during the war between the state of San Pablo and the federal government in Uruguay; during the coup d'état in Terra in 1933, etc.).

At the very moment when a very wide revolutionary upsurge of the people was taking place, accompanied by a tremendous strike struggle waged by the proletariat and directed against American imperialism and its local reactionary agents, the Communist Party of Cuba absolutely incorrectly raised the question of differentiating between the camp of counter-revolution and the camp of the national liberation struggle, characterising the national reformist party, the "Autenticos," the national revolutionary Giteras group as parties moving in the direction of fascism, parties which had gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp. The inability to make a distinction between national reformism and the feudal imperialist camp, and the lumping together of the national revolutionary Giteras grouping with the "Autenticos" national reformist party, may become a hindrance in the further elaboration of a correct tactical line, and a serious barrier in the way of establishing a national liberation anti-imperialist front.

The conference was very clear in stressing the fact that basing their orientation on the revolution, and on the active rôle of the Communist Party in the growing mass struggle, demands an unceasing struggle for the consolidation of the allies of the workers' and peasants' revolution around the proletariat, and for the establishment of a national liberation front of the people. What is more, there must be no exclusion of agreements with those national reformist elements, which, while they have influence over wide masses, are compelled, under the pressure of these masses at the beginning of the struggle to declare their agreement with the slogans of the national revolutionary liberation front. Only such a tactic can really draw in the many millions of the masses of the people. The conference took the fact that this tactic is bound up with serious dangers into account. At the conference, the delegation of the Communist Party of Brazil devoted serious attention to the dangers which threaten the mass revolutionary movement in connection with the treachery of the national reformist elements of the bourgeois and of the generals and liberal governors (Interventos) who assume the colours of the people, which is inevitable with the development of the mass revolutionary struggles. These elements will undoubtedly attempt to split the national liberation alliance and capitulating to imperialism, will attempt to draw the masses of peasants away from the proletariat, and split the ranks of the prole-

tariat by the aid of provocative counter-revolutionary, Trotskyist and renegade groupings. These elements will undoubtedly pass over to the side of imperialism and of the landowners, and will attempt to stand at the head of the counter-revolution, especially when the plebian agrarian revolution develops under the leadership of the proletariat. The Communist Party of Brazil was especially sharp in stressing the task of consolidating the ranks of the proletariat as a class, the task of systematically defending their interests, of mustering their allies in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution around the Communist Party. It emphasised especially the task of transforming the Communist Party of Brazil into a consolidated mass Party, linked up by a thousand threads with the broadest sections of the oppressed and exploited masses.

At the same time the conference decisively rejected the line taken by various comrades, who, under the cover of false "Left" phrases to the effect that the Communist Parties in South and Caribbean America were still incapable of defending the independent class rôle of the proletariat with sufficient consistency, attempted to drag in a clearly incorrect and mechanical line. They talked about the necessity of "putting an end" to the process of formation of the Party and that it would be possible to establish a broad anti-imperialist front and to actively participate in mass struggles only after taking such a step. In actual fact such a line leads to passivity and to a rejection of the struggle.

\* \* \* \*

#### **The Achievements of the Brazilian, Cuban and Peruvian Parties.**

Of all the Parties in South and Caribbean America, the Communist Party of Brazil is the only one which has actually succeeded in energetically setting about the application of the decisions of the conference, by becoming the initiator in establishing the national liberation alliance. In the short period of its existence, the National Liberation Alliance has succeeded in drawing into its ranks very wide masses of working class organisations, of office employees, students, important sections of the army and navy, various peasant organisations, the petty bourgeois "travailleurs" and "tenientists" parties, some national reformist groups, numerous socialist "parties" big trade unions, and mass young peoples' organisations, etc.

The struggle against the vicious law on the defence of public safety drafted by the reactionary Vargas government, developed into mass strikes, which involve approximately one and a half millions of workers, and into mass demonstrations of protests, etc. The popular Commission of Investigation which came into being as a result

of the murder of the young Communist Varshafsky, finds support in millions of the people, and is a serious support for the National Liberation Alliance. Very wide masses of people were drawn into the struggle against the reactionary Vargas policy, and the government was compelled to put a number of reactionary measures into practice. The martial law which was introduced, is being broken through by mass strikes, meetings of protest, and action by the people. The police are frequently compelled to retreat, especially in connection with the fact that a big section of the soldiers and officers side with the people. The Communist Party of Brazil has correctly estimated these deep changes that have taken place in recent years in the country, especially the important growth of the part played by the proletariat in the revolutionary movement (the strikes in 1934 and 1935, involving over one and a half million workers are assuming an increasingly tense political character) and the speedy growth of a broad mass popular movement directed against militarism and reaction.

The manifesto issued by the Alliance states that "the year 1934 marks the entry of Brazil into an exceptionally important historical phase," and that "the wrath of the people against the economic and political slavery which exists in Brazil is growing."

By extending the social base of the National Liberation Alliance and fighting against all attempts to bring about premature splits and separations from it, by directing the whole force of the movement for the struggle to overthrow the reactionary Vargas government, and against imperialism and for the establishment of a popular revolutionary government, the Communist Party at the same time is proceeding to muster the forces of the proletariat with determined energy, and to the extension of its contacts with the peasantry. The fight for trade union unity, the calling together of local trade union unity congresses in the various states, and the preparation of an all-Brazilian trade union unity congress, drawing to these congresses the trade unions which have the greatest mass character, the so-called legal trade unions, all this represents a serious step in the struggle for the united front and for the establishment of trade union unity in Brazil. Of exceptional importance is also the preparation for the first national congress of the proletarian students and other youth in Brazil. Steps have been taken, but only the first steps, to carry out decisions regarding drawing in the widest masses of the peasants and the oppressed Negro Indian masses into the general struggle of the people, and wide support for the struggle of the peasants for their urgent demands.

After the conference, certain successes were also

achieved by the Communist Party of Cuba, which supported the revolutionary peasants of Realengo, in their fight against the efforts of the landowners and the foreign capitalists to drive them off the land. The peasants in Realengo formed a revolutionary committee taking over the local power. The mobilisation of the widest masses of working peasants compelled the reactionary Mendieta government to give up the armed offensive against Realengo, to make concessions, and to conclude a non-aggression pact with the revolutionary peasants for a period of a year.

In Peru the Party succeeded in linking itself up with the wide masses of the Indian people, and in placing the question of the struggle for the national

liberation of the Indians as a most important task of the anti-imperialist people's front in Peru correctly. The Party has succeeded in linking up the work in the mines, and the factories, with very energetic work in the Indian communities. The active participation of the Communist Party of Peru in the struggle for the urgent interests of the masses of the Indians, the action undertaken against the seizure by the imperialists and feudal lords, of the cattle and land belonging to the Indians, are of tremendous importance in drawing in very wide masses of Indians in Southern and Caribbean America into the revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the whole continent.

## IN THE SOVIET UNION

# (a) THE HISTORIC IMPORTANCE OF THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (B)\*

On the Occasion of the 30th Anniversary of the Third Congress  
April 25, 1905—April 25, 1935.

By E. YAROSLAVSKY.

**T**HE thirtieth anniversary of the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. is a most important landmark for the entire international working class movement.

The fact that a party of revolutionary Marxism, a Leninist Party, began to be established in Russia, the "dungeon of the peoples" at the end of the nineteenth century was of tremendous world importance. This was a period when the social-democratic parties were growing extensively and were becoming more and more penetrated by the plague of opportunism. This was, to use Comrade Stalin's phrase, a period of the almost undivided domination of opportunism.

THE APPEARANCE OF LENIN ON THE POLITICAL ARENA REPRESENTED A NEW STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT. Lenin began to build a party of a new type, for it was impossible, without such a party, to destroy Tsarism, the most powerful buttress of European and Asiatic reaction, and to solve the tremendous historical task with which the Russian Marxists were faced.

History has shown that Lenin succeeded in rallying the most determined and bold revolutionary Marxists, those most devoted to the cause of the international proletariat, around the banner of revolutionary Marxism. These people succeeded in filling millions of people with enthusiasm

\*Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (of Bolsheviks), renamed the Russian Communist Party in 1918, and again renamed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.) in 1925.

and with a supreme determination and energy which not only destroyed Tsardom but also overthrew the power of the capitalists—they established the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it was necessary to establish a new type of Party to achieve this. Tsardom could not be defeated, and the landowners and capitalists could not be overthrown without

"a new party, a militant party, a revolutionary party, bold enough to lead the proletarians to the struggle for power, with sufficient experience to be able to cope with the complicated problems that arise in a revolutionary situation, yet sufficiently flexible to steer clear of any submerged rocks on the way to its goal. Without such a party it is futile to think of overthrowing imperialism and achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat. This new party is the party of Leninism." (Stalin. Foundations of Leninism, §viii.)

From the very outset when Lenin began to build our Party, he attributed the greatest international importance to the struggle against opportunism, which he carried on in the ranks of social-democracy. The St. Petersburg "League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class" which came into being 40 years ago, was the embryo of the Bolshevik Party. But before our Party arose as a POLITICAL ORGANISATION after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.,\* Lenin had to clear the ground for this Party and to show wherein lay the distinction between this new type of Party and the remaining parties in the

\* The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. took place in London in 1903.

Second International. And when, after the Second Congress of the Party, the Bolsheviks came to the forefront of the political struggle as an independent political organisation opposed to the Mensheviks, THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY IN THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONDEMNED THE BEHAVIOUR OF THE BOLSHEVIKS. THE RISE OF THE NEW PARTY AND THE REALLY REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST PRINCIPLES OF THE BOLSHEVIKS PROVED TO BE IN SHARP CONTRADICTION TO THE POLICY AND PRACTICE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.

The figure of Lenin brought alarm to the opportunists in the Second International. Even those of them who were on occasion inclined to recognise the correctness of the Bolshevik estimate of the character and driving forces of the revolution, and of the Bolshevik methods of struggle, took fright at the consistency of the Bolsheviks, at the finished character of their revolutionary mode of thinking, and at their tactics.

FROM THE VERY OUTSET, LENIN STROVE TO GATHER TOGETHER A CORE OF CONSISTENT REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS WITHIN THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL. Lenin pursued a line aiming at a break with the opportunists in the R.S.D.L.P. and the Second International.

The Mensheviks utilised their international contacts so as to support the idea in the West-European working class movement that the Bolsheviks were "disorganisers," "splitters," "anarchists," "Jacobins," etc. They had among them a sufficient number of literary men of the type of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Trotsky, Ryazanov, Potressov, Martov, Parvus, etc., who had contacts with the West-European Social Democratic parties, and they made use of these contacts so as to cast mud at the Bolshevik Party which came into being in the year 1903. Even Rosa Luxemburg, who of all the Left German Social-Democrats, occasionally came closest to an understanding of Bolshevism, "even she sometimes could not completely understand the Bolshevik line," and as against Bolshevism put forward the Centrist opportunist ideas of "organisation as a process," "tactics as a process," etc.

The present-day Mensheviks—reformists of all shades, are doing all they possibly can to prove that all that the Bolsheviks of to-day, the Parties of the Communist International, are occupied in doing is to split the ranks of the workers and their organisations, thus handing them over helpless to the ferocity of the fascist bourgeoisie. These accusations are as worthless as those which the Russian Mensheviks vainly fabricated in the period of the first Russian revolution. Life has shown that the so-called Bolshevik "splitters" rallied the majority of the working class to their banners,

and overthrew Russian Tsardom and the Russian bourgeoisie, and are now in the vanguard of the world working-class movement. The Menshevik woebegotten "unifiers" on the other hand, by participating in counter-revolutionary interventions against the workers' state have sunk to the depths of the backyard life of political emigration and supply "materials" to the bourgeois governments for use against the fatherland of the international proletariat, against the U.S.S.R. Workers in all countries will find it highly instructive to study and get an understanding of how Russian Bolshevism assumed tremendous influence in a very short space of time after the Second Congress. Bolshevism continued the line of the old "Iskra" (Spark) which had done great work up to the Second Congress in uniting the majority of the then Marxists on a definite organisational and tactical platform, which at that time already assumed the characteristics of Leninism. The struggle which took place before the Second Congress between the revolutionary and opportunist wings of the R.S.D.L.P. flared up after the Second Congress with still greater force. IT WAS A STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONARY AND LIBERAL WINGS FOR INFLUENCE OVER THE WORKING CLASS. The one who inspired this struggle of the revolutionary wing of the Marxists in Russia was Lenin. There were not a few conciliatory elements in the ranks of the then Bolshevik Party, and even in the Central Committee of the Party itself elected at the Second Congress. There was a time when Lenin was in a minority in this Central Committee. But he was prepared to remain alone rather than make any concessions in principle whatsoever to the Mensheviks.

The Second Congress (in 1903) played a tremendous rôle. It gave the Party a programme, and laid the foundation for the existence of the Bolshevik Party.

"Previously," wrote Lenin, "our Party was not a formally organised whole, but was only a sum of private groups and therefore there could not be any other relations between the groups than those of ideological influence. Now we have become an organised party . . ." (Lenin, Vol. VI., p. 291, Russian edition.)

The Bolsheviks defended THEIR ORGANISATIONAL LINE at the Second Congress. They elaborated their TACTICS which later found their expression in the resolutions of the Third Congress (1905). For the first time, all shades of social democratic thought came into conflict at the Congress and the main tendencies in the working class movement were defined.

" . . . the division into majority and minority," wrote Lenin, in connection with the split at the Second Congress, "is the direct and inevitable continuation of the division of social-democracy into revolutionary and opportunist, into the Mountain and the Girondists, who did not appear only yesterday in the Russian working class party

alone, and which no doubt will not vanish to-morrow." (Ibid., p. 272.)

"What a fine thing our Congress is! Open free struggle. Opinions expressed. Shades of opinion cleared up. Groups indicated. Hands raised. Decisions adopted. A stage passed forward!" (Lenin, Vol. VI., page 274, Russian Ed.)

The question that arose after the Second Congress of the Party was as to who was to lead the movement in its new stage, the opportunists Plekhanov, Zasulich, Martov, Axelrod and Potressov on the one hand, who had established their nest in the R.S.D.L.P., or alternatively Lenin, the leader of revolutionary Marxism.

"The change proved to be fatal for five members of this group.\* They fell out of the truck. Lenin remained alone . . . It is now clear to every Bolshevik that our Party would not have been capable of rallying its forces as a party of the Bolsheviks, and of leading the proletariat to the revolution against the bourgeoisie, had not Lenin carried on a decisive struggle against and driven out this group of five." (Closing remarks of Comrade Stalin on the report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. at the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. Published C.P.G.B.)

After the Second Congress of the Party not only did Bolshevism and Menshevism take shape but so also did a special variety of Menshevism, namely Trotskyism, which always camouflaged the opportunist character of its world-outlook with Left phrases. Trotskyism came forward between the Second and Third Congresses with a sort of manifesto, a pamphlet entitled, "Our Political Tasks," in which was fully developed the opportunist programme of the Mensheviks, and the opportunist views of the Mensheviks on organisational and tactical questions. These opportunists scared the West-European Social Democrats by making use of such words as Jacobin, when referring to Lenin. The reply Lenin gave to them was that

"A Jacobin who is indissolubly connected with the ORGANISATION of the proletariat which has recognised its class interests, is a REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRAT. A Girondist who is in anguish about secondary school professors, who is afraid of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and who talks of the absolute value of democratic demands is an OPPORTUNIST."

As against the opportunism and intellectual anarchism of the Mensheviks and Trotskyists, Lenin counterposed the firm militant organisation of the Bolshevik Party armed with revolutionary Marxism, and bound together by an iron discipline.

"The proletariat have no other arms in the struggle for power than organisation."

This is how Lenin concluded his splendid work written at that time, entitled "One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward."†

\* The group of six which were at the head of the Party, composed of Lenin, Plekhanov, Zasulich, Axelrod, Martov, and Potressov.

† Lenin's pamphlet, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*, devoted to an analysis of the split begun at the Second Congress between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, was written in May, 1904, and published in Geneva in the summer of 1904.

"Though torn asunder by the domination of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, oppressed by work done in subjection to capital, constantly cast down into the depths, full of poverty and degeneration, the proletariat can and inevitably will become an invincible force only thanks to the fact that their ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of their organisation which welds together millions of toilers into the army of the working class. Neither the decrepit power of the Russian autocracy nor the power of international capital which is becoming decrepit, can stand up to this army. This army will draw its ranks closer and closer together, in spite of any zig-zags and steps backward, in spite of the opportunist phrases of the Girondists of modern social-democracy, in spite of the self-satisfied eulogies of the backward worship of study circles, and in spite of the sparkle and clamour of INTELLECTUAL anarchism. (Lenin, Vol. VI., p. 328, Russian edition.)

The events which followed the Second Congress showed the necessity for a further step, the necessity for a complete break with the Mensheviks. A BIG PART IN THIS BREAK WITH THE MENSHEVIKS WAS PLAYED BY THE BOLSHEVIKS OF THE CAUCASUS ORGANISATION, IN THE SHAPE OF THE CAUCASIAN COMMITTEE. At the end of the '90's a movement of revolutionary Marxism came into being in the Caucasus. Comrade Stalin who had participated in the Marxist movement since the year 1897 and who worked alongside comrades older in years, such as Ketskhoveli, Tschakaya, and Makharadzi, played a great rôle in the Caucasian movement. Tiflis, Batum and Baku, which were the main centres of the revolutionary working class movement in the Caucasus were towns which constituted Comrade Stalin's first revolutionary school, and were the first points of the Bolshevik movement, where Comrade Stalin, along with other Bolsheviks, laid the foundation of the Bolshevik fortresses, built the Bolshevik committees and led the struggle of the Caucasian Bolsheviks.

The idea of establishing an independent Bolshevik Congress arose soon after the Second Party Congress when a section of the conciliators in the Central Committee of the Party actually handed over the leadership of the Central Party organ, the *Iskra*, and of the Central Committee to the Mensheviks. The idea of the Congress arose simultaneously in the ranks of the Bolshevik Committees, and so the "Conference of 22 Bolsheviks abroad" (held in Geneva in August, 1904) decided to call on the local organisations to summon a new Congress. In this call made by the 22 Bolsheviks we read the following:

"The heavy crisis in our Party life continues to drag on, and we can see no end to it. . . While the historical situation advances such tremendous demands on our Party as never before . . . We see the practical way out of the crisis in the immediate convocation of a Third Party Congress."

At three Regional Congresses in Russia (the Northern, Southern and Caucasian) held in November, 1904, a Bureau of the Committee of the

Majority was elected in which the local organisations confided the entire work of the convocation of the Congress and which in actual fact led the whole of the work prior to the Congress. The B.C.M. (Buro of the Committee of the Majority) selected an Editorial Board for its newspaper, the *Vperyod* (Forward).\*

The conciliators still continued to hope that they would succeed in calling together a joint congress of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

"... what is the use of hypocrisy and hiding the facts?" wrote Lenin on February 11, 1905, in a letter to S. Gusev and A. Bogdanov, having in mind the efforts of the conciliators in the Central Committee to call together a general congress of all Social-Democrats. "What a comedy! ... either we rally together those who are anxious to carry on the struggle in a real iron organisation and with this small but firm party destroy the crumbling monstrosity composed of the mixed 'New Iskra' elements, or we will show by our behaviour that we deserve our doom as out and out formalists. . . . We have announced a SPLIT, we call the followers of the *Vperyod* to the congress, we want to organise a *Vperyodist* Party, and are breaking, immediately breaking, all relations whatsoever with the disorganisers, and people are harping to us about loyalty, and pretending that it is possible to hold a joint congress of Iskra and *Vperyod* supporters. . . . and if we don't wish to show the world a most disgusting example of a shrivelled and anaemic old maid, proud of her fruitless moral purity, we must understand that what we need is war, and a military organisation." (Lenin, Vol. VII., p. 101, Russ. Ed.)

The Third Congress was called together at the end of April, 1905† when the revolutionary movement in Russia had risen to a new level. It is true that events had not yet developed as clearly as they did in the autumn of 1905. But we already had "Bloody Sunday" of 1905 and the broad development of the working class and peasant movement which followed it. The revolt on the cruiser "Potemkin" showed a new development of the revolutionary wave, for it was a fact of exceptional importance that an entire military unit had risen up against Tsardom, and the working class and peasant movement had won supporters in the army and navy.

The Third Congress therefore placed questions on the agenda which were linked up with this development of the revolutionary movement so that the movement could make a new step forward. THE MERIT OF THE THIRD CONGRESS CONSISTS ABOVE ALL IN THAT IT GAVE ORGANISATIONAL SHAPE TO THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY BY ADOPTING THE STATUTES

\* The editorial board of the *Vperyod* was composed of Lenin, Vorovsky, Olminsky and Lunacharsky.

† The Third Congress of the Party took place in London attended by representatives of twenty Bolshevik Committees, representatives of the C.C. of the "Buro of the Committees of the Majority" and of the Editorial Board of the *Vperyod*. There were no representatives at the Congress from the nine Menshevik Committees which, together with the Editorial Board of *The Iskra* and the Party Council called a separate conference which met at the same time as the Party Congress.

WHICH LENIN HAD PROPOSED AT THE SECOND CONGRESS. These statutes later constituted the foundation of the statutes of the Communist International. Lenin formulated the very task of the convocation of the Third Congress as the task of "ORGANISING THE PARTY."

"We must," he wrote in the *Vperyod*, in February, 1905, "immediately call together a congress of all those Party workers who are desirous of organising a Party. We must not limit ourselves to giving convincing arguments and exhortations, but must place an ultimatum before all those who are wavering and shaky, who are uncertain, and in doubt. We must ask them to choose. Beginning with the first issue of our newspaper, we have set precisely this ultimatum in the name of the Editorial Board of the *Vperyod*, in the name of the whole of the mass of Russian Party workers who have been reduced to unheard-of hatred of the disorganisers. Hurry up and throw them out, comrades, and get down to joint organisational work. Better a hundred revolutionary Social Democrats who have adopted the organisational plan than a thousand intellectual Tryapitchkins, who chatter about the organisational process." (Lenin, Vol. VII., p. 129, Russ. Ed.)

As we see, the organisational decisions of the Third Congress are of world importance because they gave organisational shape to the first Party of the new International, which arose at the Second Congress.

THE SECOND TREMENDOUS SERVICE OF THE THIRD CONGRESS WAS THAT THE QUESTION OF THE ARMED UPRISING WAS DEALT WITH IN FULL AT THE THIRD CONGRESS. That we would have to carry on an armed struggle against the Tsar, the landowners and capitalists, was clear prior to the Third Congress of the Party. The slogan, however, of the armed uprising had not yet been put forward in the decisions of the Second Congress. At the Third Congress the question of the armed uprising was put forward not only theoretically, but quite definite, practical instructions were given in the decisions of the Congress. In these pages of the history of Bolshevism, workers throughout the world will find a great wealth of experience, one exceptionally valuable in the present conditions of transition to a new round of revolutions and wars. How many unnecessary and heavy sacrifices have the European proletariat borne during the years following the October Revolution alone as a result of the fact that the Communist Parties have not learned to master the art of the armed uprising; and this art, so necessary for proletarian revolutionaries cannot be mastered without a thorough study of the experience of the Bolsheviks, and of the teachings of Lenin which give a basis to and generalise it. The Congress instructed all the Party organisations:

(a) "To make clear to the proletariat, by propaganda and agitation, not only the political importance, but also the practical and organisational side of the forthcoming armed uprising; (b) during the course of this propaganda and agitation to make clear the rôle of mass political strikes which can assume great importance at the beginning of and in the course of the uprising; (c) to take most

energetic measures to arm the proletariat, and also to elaborate a plan of the armed uprising and of the direct leadership of such, for which purpose special groups of Party workers to be set up according as they are necessary."

THE PARTY NOT ONLY CONDUCTED PROPAGANDA OF THE IDEA OF THE UPRISING. IT PLACED THE QUESTION OF THE ARMING OF THE PROLETARIAT ON A PRACTICAL BASIS. The Party established military and fighting organisations. The Party took on itself the task of obtaining and supplying arms. The Party prepared explosives for the armed uprising, whereas the Mensheviks chattered about the necessity for arming the workers with the burning thirst of self-armament. In one of his letters, Comrade Litvinov made sport of the Mensheviks as being in a very happy position as compared with us, because the transport of the "burning thirst of self-armament" did not require such means as were required for the transport of arms. The military organisations established in the army and navy by the Bolsheviks in the period of the first revolution played a tremendous rôle not only in the uprising of 1905. They undoubtedly made it possible for the Bolsheviks to accumulate that military experience which came in handy in the year 1917. As far as the West-European working class was concerned, the armed uprising was all the more important in that the Mensheviks made sport of the very idea of organising the uprising, and even such leaders of the working class movement as Rosa Luxemburg, defended the Menshevik point of view, regarding the uprising as a spontaneous process. Trotsky also, during the period of the trial of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, defended the Menshevik point of view that the uprising is not something prepared or organised, but arises spontaneously.

OF SIMILARLY GREAT INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE WAS THE WAY THE QUESTION OF THE GENERAL POLITICAL STRIKE WAS RAISED AT THE THIRD CONGRESS. We must not forget that, at that time, the West-European Social-Democrats took up a negative attitude towards the general political strike. It is well known that the German Menshevik, Auer, gave currency to the expression that "The general strike is general nonsense."

"If," declared Auer, "a general strike is possible so as to compel the capitalists to make concessions of one kind or another, then a revolution is also possible. And if we can bring about the revolution, then why do we need the general strike?"

The "Left" Social-Democrats Henrietta Roland-Holst and Rosa Luxemburg defended the idea of the strike very inconsistently. In any case, they did not understand the need to raise the strike into an armed uprising. At the Third Congress the Bolsheviks raised the question of the general political strike as of that type of means of struggle

as may serve as a stepping-stone to the armed uprising. Has not this Bolshevik political estimate of the general political strike been confirmed in the process of the further development of the revolution?

The fourth question which was raised at the Third Congress of the Party, a question of tremendous political and international importance, WAS THE QUESTION OF THE PARTICIPATION OF THE PARTY OF THE PROLETARIAT IN A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT during the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. At that time the Bolsheviks considered it possible to take part in a Revolutionary Provisional government as the organ of a victorious popular uprising so as to be able to carry the revolution forward to its conclusion.

SUCH A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT AND PEASANTS. A refusal on the part of the proletariat to participate in such a government could only be of service to the bourgeoisie, for then it would not be the proletariat but the bourgeoisie who would take the lead of the peasants. But since the Mensheviks made their starting point the view that the bourgeoisie must lead the bourgeois revolution, they were hostile to the participation of the proletariat in a Provisional government. THE HISTORY OF 1917 SHOWED THAT THE MENSHEVIKS PARTICIPATED IN A GOVERNMENT REPRESENTING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE AGAINST THE PROLETARIAT AND PEASANTRY.

THE THIRD CONGRESS GAVE THE PEASANT MOVEMENT A REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME, and advanced the demand of the confiscation of the land in the possession of the landowners, the state and the monasteries, and called for the organisation of Revolutionary Peasants' Committees which were to be the organs in the localities of the revolutionary government, and for seizing and dividing up the land belonging to the landowners. At the same time the Party did not forget for one minute that in all cases and circumstances it must "unswervingly strive to bring about the independent organisation of the agricultural proletariat, and explain to them the irreconcilable opposition of their interests to the interests of the peasant bourgeoisie."

The Third Congress defined the tactics of the Bolshevik Party towards the liberal bourgeoisie. The Congress set the Party the task of exposing the half-hearted and conciliatory position of the liberals, and counterposed the revolutionary slogans of the Party to the liberal slogans of conciliation with Czardom. The whole further process of events confirmed how correct was the lack of faith in the liberals which Lenin insisted on, as against the Mensheviks who stood for a bloc with the Liberals.

The Third Congress adopted a special resolution in connection with the events taking place in the Caucasus, and despatched hearty greetings to the heroic proletariat and peasantry of the Caucasus, and instructed the Central Committee and the local committees to spread the information about the situation in the Caucasus as widely as possible. The Congress greeted the courage and the determination of the brother proletariat of Poland in connection with the revolutionary events in Warsaw and Lodz.

Such were the most important decisions of the Third Congress of the Bolshevik Party. These decisions were of tremendous importance for the further development of revolutionary events. The Party entered the struggle after the Third Congress, consolidated organisationally and with clearly indicated tactical decisions. It gave a fighting reply to all the questions facing the Russian revolution. A study of these decisions in

the light of the revolutionary events following the October period shows that the general "rehearsal" which the 1905 revolution was, brought such results to the Russian proletariat and the proletariat throughout the world precisely because this "rehearsal" was carried out under the leadership of the Leninist Party armed by the decisions of the Third Congress of the Party. The Third Congress of the Party, therefore, has gone down in the history of the world working-class movement as the first congress of the Bolshevik Party, where the Bolsheviks gathered together by themselves, without the Mensheviks, and where they issued their Bolshevik decisions with which they armed the proletariat for consistent revolutionary struggle. The Third Congress has gone down in the history of the international working class movement as a congress which prepared the Party to take the lead of the first uprising of the workers and peasants against the Tsar, the landowners and the capitalists.

## (b) CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

### I. TRANSPORT IN THE U.S.S.R. CAN AND MUST BE VICTORIOUS.

THE network of railways of the Soviet Union exceeds 100,000 kilometres. During the years of the First Five-Year Plan the length of the railway lines increased by 11,000 kilometres, the capacity of the freight locomotives yards increased by 43 per cent., the number of cars increased by 83,000, or 17 per cent. Freight turnover has increased from year to year. By the end of the first Five-Year Plan it amounted to 179 per cent. as compared with 1928, and almost 300 per cent. when compared with 1925.

Passenger traffic has also grown during these years. In 1928 passenger traffic covered 291 million, while in 1932 it amounted to 967 million persons. However, these achievements in the work of Soviet transport do not coincide with the achievements of the national economy as a whole. Transport, as Comrade Stalin stated at the Seventeenth Party Congress in January, 1934, is the weak spot in the national economy.

The transport industry systematically failed to fulfil its plan. The month of April, however, brought renewed life to the work of the railways. Daily car-loadings, as compared with last year, increased by 7-9 thousand cars. On some days the figure of car loadings amounted to 62,000 cars as against the plan figure for 61,500 cars. The April transport plan was fulfilled for the first time in the last few years. In May there were even better figures. On May 1st the loadings were 75,934 cars, a record figure. On May 2nd, 67,500 cars.

Comrade Stalin, in his splendid speech at the graduation of the students from the Academies of the Red Army on May 4th,\* 1935, where he raised the slogan—"Cadres decide everything"—in speaking of the achievements of the Soviet Union, declared that we already have "a growing and improving transport system."

In order to fulfil the annual plan and to cover the deficit for the first three months of 1934, the railwaymen will have to load 67,000 trucks per day in the second half of 1935. The ever-increasing requirements of national economy demand that this should be done.

In the beginning of April (April 1st-4th) a meeting of workers of the railway transport took place, in which Comrades Stalin, Molotov, Ordjonikidze, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, Andreyev, Chubar, Yezhov and others took part.

The meeting heard and discussed reports of the railway chiefs on the instructions of the new People's Commissar of Ways and Communications, COMRADE KAGANOVICH, concerning the struggle against collisions and breakdowns; the question of increasing the turnover of cars, and of construction work in 1935 was also discussed.

THE STRUGGLE TO ELIMINATE COLLISIONS AND BREAKDOWNS AND INCREASE THE TURNOVER OF CARS is the key to the improvement of transport. These were the questions upon which the meeting concentrated its attention, because as the result of breakdowns and collisions, 150 to 200 cars drop out

\*See Leader.

of the turnover daily, and considerably more cars are stranded at the spot where the breakdown occurs, and cannot be sent along for timely loading.

On April 15th, Comrade KAGANOVICH, People's Commissar of Ways and Communications, issued an order to INCREASE THE TURNOVER OF CARS. This order demands that all railwaymen pay primary attention to the freight trains, and to the increasing of the turnover of cars.

"Many of the railway workers on the line . . . think that freight trains are tortoises, which, by their nature, cannot and should not move rapidly."\*

A bolshevik struggle to realise Comrade Kaganovich's order to increase the car turnover and the struggle against breakdowns and collisions will undoubtedly secure the fulfilment of the plans for car loadings and will bring the transport industry out of its difficulties.

Transport can and must be victorious! The bolsheviks will guarantee victory in the transport industry.

\* \* \*

## II. THE STATE PLAN FOR DEVELOPING LIVESTOCK RAISING IN 1935.

The reorganisation period in the village (1929-1933) was felt most severely in connection with livestock raising. In the years of collectivisation, the kulak elements, in whose hands a considerable part of the livestock was concentrated, were successful in destroying a large number of their own cattle. During the years when agriculture was being reorganised, kulak agitation among the collective farmers and individual peasants to kill off cattle also took place, and instead of an increase in the head of cattle, there was a decline in livestock raising in the U.S.S.R. over a period of almost five years.

In his report at the Seventeenth Party Congress, Comrade Stalin gave the following table which showed the situation as regards livestock raising during the years of most violent class struggle in the village:

LIVESTOCK IN THE U.S.S.R. (in millions of head)

	1916	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933
(a) Horses ...	35.1	34.0	30.2	26.2	19.6	16.6
(b) Large horned cattle ...	58.9	68.1	52.5	47.9	40.7	38.6
(c) Sheep and goats ...	115.2	147.1	108.8	77.7	52.1	50.6
(d) Hogs ...	20.3	20.9	13.6	14.4	11.6	12.2

With Leninist frankness, Comrade Stalin revealed the extent of the lapse in the sphere of livestock raising and the defects in the work of the

\*Quoted from the Order of April 15, by Comrade Kaganovich, People's Commissar of Ways and Communications.

land departments. As can be seen from this table, the decline in livestock raising continued until 1933, when the reorganisation period had already come to an end. True, as the table shows, the extent of this decline was noticeably less in later years, and there were already signs of a steady rise in hog-raising in 1933 (11.6 million heads in 1932 and 12.2 million in 1933).

This gave Comrade Stalin, the great leader of the proletariat, the inspirer of all the victories of the Soviet Government, grounds to declare at the Congress that the year 1934 must and can be the turning-point towards a rise in the livestock raising economy.

Comrade Stalin mobilised the Party to liquidate the lapse that had occurred in the work of livestock raising, just as in 1933, at the Plenum of the C.C. and at the first Congress of Collective Farm Shock Brigade Workers, while condemning the shortcomings in agriculture, he mobilised the Party to liquidate the lapse in the grain economy. And the words of Comrade Stalin were indeed fully confirmed. In 1934 and 1935 the considerable decline in young livestock came to an end, the collective stock farms were consolidated, by the efforts of the Party and with the help of the proletarian state, and millions of collective farmers acquired cows for their own personal use.

There are 200,000 collective stock farms in the Soviet Union and over 2,000 large Soviet livestock farms. By further developing and strengthening the collective commodity farms and Soviet livestock farms — the main channels for increasing the herds, and also by developing livestock raising on the individual farms of the collective farmers and individual peasants—the livestock raising problem will be solved. The year 1935 must become the year of a further decisive rise in livestock raising—the most backward, difficult, section of national economy.

On April 28th the central newspapers published a decision of the Council of People's Commissars and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. on the State plan for developing livestock raising in the U.S.S.R. in 1935.

The State plan for developing livestock raising, having the same authority as a law, has become possible only in consequence of the final victory of the collective farming system in the village.

The State plan reckons that by January 1st, 1936, a total of 11,288 thousand calves, 16,965 thousand young pigs, 16,212.2 thousand lambs and kids, 2,055 thousand young horses will be raised on the Soviet farms, collective livestock raising farms, and on the private allotments of the collective farmers and individual peasants. In order to give a clear idea of the growth of livestock raising in

1935, we give here the following data for the collective farms:

On January 1, 1935.

On January 1, 1936.

The following should be forthcoming.

7.4 million head.	<i>Large-horned cattle</i>	11 million head	
3.5 " "	<i>Pigs</i>	5.15 " "	
10.2 " "	<i>Sheep &amp; goats</i>	14 " "	
276 thousand "	<i>Horses on the horse breeding collective farms.</i>	478 thousand "	

By the end of 1935, throughout the Soviet farms of all types, there will be 3,789,900 head of livestock, of which 1,688,300 head will be cows.

A decision of the Party and the government provides for various privileges to collective farmers and individual peasants who take upon themselves the obligation of rearing calves and giving them to the collective farms or to collective farmers who have no cows. The state plan for developing livestock raising covers a special point in connection with the production of fodder. According to the decision of the Central Committee and the Council of People's Commissars, the network of state seed nurseries, and seed commodity farms will be considerably enlarged; the number of zootechnical and veterinary cattle raising cadres will be increased. The decline of livestock raising is now a thing of the past. When all the measures indicated in the decisions of the C.C. and the Council of People's Commissars are carried out in practice, then a decisive change in the development of livestock raising will be assured. The people of the Soviet Union, who have overcome more than one obstacle in the way of achieving the tasks before them, will be able to

overcome the last obstacles in the development of agriculture, and victoriously solve the livestock raising problem as well.

\* \* \* \*

#### THE SOVIET ARCTIC.

On April 13, 1934, the heroic airmen of the U.S.S.R. saved the Cheluskinites. During the last year, the mastering of the Arctic has gone far afoot. The eternal ice of the Arctic is being conquered.

Not only has scientific work been widely developed in the Arctic, but also considerable economic activities have been set afoot to master the inexhaustible wealth of the Arctic expanses.

A new coal basin is growing up in Yakuts (Norilkstroi); in the North, big deer raising and agricultural Soviet farms have been created; big maritime ports are growing up (on Dixon Island and Providence Bay); river shipbuilding wharves are already open (on the Lena, Ob and Yenisei rivers); two canning factories, Ust port and Andadyr, have been opened, etc.

In the Arctic there are now industrial trusts, Polar stations, automobile depots, mechanical workshops, Polar observatories, a large number of ships built from Soviet materials made in Soviet plants.

On the North coast of the Soviet Union 46 Polar wireless stations are operating. The number wintering there amounts to 1,130 persons.

For the first time this year, FREIGHT TRANSPORT will be started along the Northern sea route.

The government has proposed to the Chief Board of the Northern Sea Route, whose activities spread over a territory covering one-fourth of the whole of the U.S.S.R., that it transport 200 thousand tons of freight during this year.

Two new freight steamers and six powerful ice-breakers are under construction for the Arctic.

**THE BOOK OF THE YEAR!**

**ORDER NOW**

# THE GREAT CRISIS

and its Political Consequences

By PROFESSOR E. VARGA

Sometime Professor of Political Economy at University of Budapest; Director of Institute of World Economy and World Politics, Moscow.

A penetrating, exhaustive and comprehensive analysis of the entire present World Economic and Political Situation.

"Not a history—but an analysis looking towards the future."—*The Author.*

**CLOTH 5s.**

**PAPER 2s. 6d.**

## MR. BRAILSFORD ATTACKS PROPERTY

H. N. Brailsford, "Property or Peace."

REVIEWED BY MARY SMITH.

MR. BRAILSFORD is a free Briton. He does not want to accept the teachings of either Darwin or Marx blindly. It suits him much better to doubt both, and approach their theories "with violent scepticism." For otherwise, "life would go out of . . . Darwin's generalisations," and as to Marx, if everybody were to "join in the honours that Russians pay to Marx," the world would turn into a "medieval monastery" unless it is "free to doubt and to deny every word Marx uttered" (last page of the book).

And so Mr. Brailsford voluntarily and according to his own free choice, as it suits a fully-free Briton, enters the ranks of those representatives of the dark realm of religion who attack Darwin with such "violent scepticism," and puts himself "on an equal footing" with those men of science who, defending the interests of the bourgeoisie, "deny every word Marx uttered."

The main point of Brailsford's own theory is "planning," that is, the planning of capitalist economy. He even invents a special theory of planning, which is a very simple one, and is entirely based on the equation.

"Consumers' income—potential output" (p. 100). This equality makes it possible to attain "equilibrium" or "the right proportion between saving and consumption" (p. 99).

Making use of statistical data on consumption and production, we must effect "control" over these two economic phenomena, and in order to achieve "equilibrium" we must introduce suitable "adjustments" into their working. The author does not bother at all about the sources of accumulation. For if consumption is strictly "adjusted to the "potential output," where would accumulation come from? And has not Marx proved long ago that capitalist accumulation leads to a fall and not to a rise of the consumption of large masses? These questions do not trouble our learned author.

And of course HE DOES NOT EVEN MENTION THE TWO MAIN PREREQUISITES OF PLANNING—THE SOCIALISATION OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION, AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

For his plan is manifestly a plan destined to save capitalist society from the proletarian revolution.

Following the path of his political friends, Brailsford suggests, of course, the "nationalisa-

tion" of banks and of the so-called key industries with compensation to their owners. "To attempt to nationalise without reasonable compensation would be to give the signal for civil war" (page 279), says our author, making haste to ease the minds of the magnates of capital. He also warns us against going on too fast, and emphasises the necessity to "consider the interests and even the prejudices of the investing classes" (same page).

Thus, "the socialist government" of Mr. Brailsford's making bows down before the interests of the capitalists, and at the same time it tries to bribe them, on one hand, by promising them solid subsidies by way of compensation for backward non-paying enterprises, and on the other hand, by making sure that the well-paying units won't be touched: "The relatively prosperous modern industries rarely appear on the early agenda of the socialist movement . . . because they are already rationalised and competently run" (p. 281). Here Mr. Brailsford quotes the so-called new industries: electricity, chemistry, automobile plants, artificial silk and others relatively better off than the older branches of British industry.

And of course the "nationalisation" of the non-paying inefficient plants must be also effected with great precautions: "The companies should remain in being, receiving income calculated on that of recent years, with which they would satisfy their shareholders and creditors. The final process of liquidation and compensation might well be postponed for two or three years." This, notwithstanding the fact that these industries must "pass at once into the government's hands to be organised as promptly as possible as national services" (p. 277).

The matter is perfectly clear. The postponement of the "final liquidation" for "two or three years" is nothing else but a diplomatic move. When they are over, a new postponement will appear necessary, and meanwhile the backward non-paying enterprises will be considered as "national services" and as such get subsidised. According to Cole's and Brailsford's familiar terms such a transaction with the bourgeoisie is called "planning."

But do not confuse that sort of "planning" with what they call planning in the U.S.S.R.: "Russia has set an inspiring model for socialist planning,

but her problem is not ours, hers was mainly concerned with production. Ours (save agriculture and in some backward industries that need re-equipment) is mainly a problem of distribution and consumption" (p. 283). Such a statement follows clearly from Brailsford's faulty and reactionary ideas on the "equilibrium" of production and consumption, while the "plan" itself reveals the sheer hypocrisy of that theory. For what does Mr. Brailsford propose practically in his "plan" for a different "distribution" of the national income and the rise of the consumption of the toiling masses? Not a word does he say on the liquidation of unemployment, and as to wages, there is only a very vague statement: "*Part of the solution is evidently to raise the general level of wages.*" But having uttered this, Mr. Brailsford at once proceeds to other arguments and remembers the "*embarrassed overseas debtors, who dare not buy*" (p. 273) and the generally difficult condition of Britain. The plan as a whole is nothing else than a promise of subsidies to the capitalists, while the workers are not even promised anything.

Turn your eyes eastwards, Mr. Brailsford, and look at the U.S.S.R., where the abolition of unemployment, and the huge rise of the material and cultural conditions of the toiling masses go side-by-side with a rise of production, unheard-of in the whole history of mankind. Do not these facts show how very correct Lenin was, when he said that: "*You cannot even talk about consumption, if you have not grasped the meaning of the whole process of reproduction.*" (Lenin's Works, Russian Edition, Vol. 3, p. 36.) And, of course, after the proletarian revolution in Britain, its new government will have the task of reconstructing the many backward industrial plants so that they may approach the level reached by the U.S.S.R.\*

As for distribution, one can easily see from Mr. Brailsford's "plan" how, and in whose interests, the national revenue of Britain will be distributed by his "socialist government," whereas in the U.S.S.R., where distribution is not considered separately from production, they have as the basis of distribution the principle of payment according to the quantity and quality of the labour furnished by each citizen to society. This is the formula for the period of transition from capitalism to communism, including its first stage, whereas during the second stage of communism the corresponding formula will be: from

\*Thus for instance, in 1932 at the end of the First Five Year Plan the percentage of coal raised by mechanised processes, was according to official statements, 38 per cent. in Britain and 65 per cent. in the U.S.S.R. In 1937, at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, this percentage is to be 93 per cent. in the U.S.S.R.

each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. For in the U.S.S.R., there are no capitalists who devour the lion's share of the national income, as the case is to be in the socialised paradise of Mr. Brailsford.

Mr. Brailsford also discussed international problems in his book. To his great regret, "*the spectre of war has swept back to its post as the familiar . . . of our civilisation . . .*" (p. 132). And he starts to discuss war, taking it at its surface value without giving himself the trouble to go into an analysis of its causes. This brings him to rather queer conclusions and proposals. To make war impossible, he suggests that "*military power must be internationalised*" (p. 186). And further: "*It is not the national state, but the world Federation that ought to own power*" while "*the making and rationing of arms ought to be a federal service.*" For otherwise, "*the more advanced industrial state would enjoy an undesirable advantage . . . over backward or agricultural states.*" But this is not yet all. Mr. Brailsford can invent still better things. The aforesaid "federation" must "*regulate our economic life—currency, emigration, raw material, international transport and tariffs*" (p. 187). That means that Brailsford proposes to create a regular capitalist international as a weapon against war.

And what are the ways and means by which Mr. Brailsford wants to get his plans realised? Everything must be of course attained through "constitutional means" by way of using "democracy as a weapon."

On page 295 he makes the proud declaration: "The purpose is to win power so that we create order." But power must be won by "constitutional means," for "*socialists who had the good fortune to inherit a democratic constitution would be guilty of criminal folly if they sought to achieve their ends by any other means*" (p. 299).

It is true that the bourgeoisie will resist this "winning of power" and, declares the author, with pride, "*no abstract respect . . . for the effective dictatorship of property forbids us to step outside it.*" But there are two other considerations. First, if "the socialists" will not be victorious on the polls, then, "*they could not hope to carry a change of system successfully during the trials of the period of transition.*" And secondly, if things go as far as civil war, Brailsford has no hope in the victory of the proletariat, for, "*if money can buy opinion, much more easily can it buy arms. The mechanisation of modern warfare has rendered popular insurrections hopeless.*"

The example of Russia does not convince him, since, "*She had no democratic conditions . . . her middle and upper class formed a negligible frac-*

tion of her population" (p. 250). And many other arguments of that kind.

Brailsford knows that "money can buy opinion" and votes. He knows that democracy is "*practically a dictatorship of the owning classes*" (p. 90). But he pushes aside these facts, mentioning them only in order to show what a fine radical he is, and urges the workers towards a victory at the polls. Is that contradiction a mere accident? Most certainly not. First comes a show of radicalism and "Left" phrases, and then by a sudden turn he jumps to the conclusion: Nevertheless, let us hope for the polls; if not, the capitalists will make a clean sweep of us. But since, according to his own words, mere polling cannot lead far, the bourgeoisie may, of course, sleep quietly.

Brailsford, of course, cannot see that "modern warfare" is practically in the hands of the workers dressed in military uniforms, and that the seizure of power by the proletariat releases and brings new forces to the forefront.

Old Russia, says he, had no "democratic traditions," but did he not himself state that in modern Britain, democracy means the buying and selling of votes and a "dictatorship of the owning classes."

Then comes the well-known argument on famine, which, in a country like Britain, that depends so much on imported food, must needs threaten the population in case of a revolution.

And yet this is a problem of the efficient utilisation of stocks on the one hand, and of revolutionary contacts with other countries on the other, which means that it is a problem of revolutionary tactics and of revolutionary leadership. Each country has its own peculiar character in respect to the problem of food supplies. But that means that the revolutionary leadership has very peculiar problems to deal with in each case.

Nevertheless, only the revolutionary seizure of power by the proletariat can release a new power of action, that will help the proletariat to step over electoral bribery and the dictatorship of the present ruling class. This kind of dictatorship can be abolished only by that of the proletariat, and not by mere electioneering.

Brailsford makes a show of criticising MacDonald: the latter first adopted the "*cloudy doc-*

*trine of the necessary evolution*" and afterwards became the head "*of a capitalist coalition*" (p. 255). Then, under cover of such "Left" opinions, Mr. Brailsford starts about his proper business. Marx, he declares, was mistaken when he maintained that the pauperisation of the proletariat leads towards the workers becoming revolutionary. According to Brailsford, no such thing as pauperisation exists under capitalism and Marx had no business to say that the proletariat have "nothing to lose but their chains." For in reality, "*they have much else to lose—houses bought by instalments and in America, motor cars . . . they have in addition to their chains, post-office savings, bank accounts. Their chains indeed assume that form*" (p. 256).

One cannot help but feel ashamed to read these impudent treacherous words in a book published in 1934, at a time when the pauperisation of the British proletariat reached such terrifying dimensions. The fact is openly acknowledged by the bourgeois press in a series of articles published by the *Daily Mail* and in a special article in the *Economist* (June 27, 1934).

Such are real facts, Mr. Brailsford! "Labour" camps have taken the place of home for thousands and thousands of British workers. The heavy chains of distress, starvation, despair and misery untold are those that the proletariat of the oldest industrialist country are doomed to bear. But the heavier this burden, the higher the tide of upheavals, whatever Mr. Brailsford chooses to say. The sailors of Invergordon, the strikers of South Wales and Lancashire, the Hunger Marchers who come to London from all parts of the country, those who fought against fascism in Hyde Park — they all bear living witness to the utter falsity of Mr. Brailsford's statements.

The workers of the "United Kingdom" have nothing to hope for, and nothing to lose but their chains of misery and subjugation. But they can win the Soviet Socialist Federation of Great Britain, where, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the different peoples forming its population will become able to develop their material and cultural resources on a socialist basis.

**VERBATIM REPORT of the Negotiations**  
**Between the**  
**SECOND AND THIRD INTERNATIONALS**  
**on the Question of Supporting the Spanish Workers**  
**WORKERS BOOKSHOP, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C. 3d.**