

The COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

TEN CENTS

PUBLISHED BY
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK.

PRINTED BY THE DORRIT PRESS, LTD. (T.U.),
68-70 LANT STREET, LONDON, ENGLAND

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VII. No. 2-3

TEN CENTS

Workers Library Publishers
New York

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Violent Attack Along the Anti-Soviet Front	37
The Task of the Moment	44
The "Holy Father" and the Liquidation of the Kulak Class... ..	49
The Need for Bolshevik Municipal Work	52
The Economic Crisis in Latin America and the Tasks of the Communist Parties. <i>M. Garlandi</i>	60
Decaying Capitalism and the Fascisation of the Bourgeois State. <i>A. Martinov</i> ...	67
The International Revolutionary Working Women's Day. <i>Moiroua</i>	82
The Lessons of the Strikes in Paris	91
The Theory of Bonapartism. <i>Hermann Remmele</i>	93
The Problems of Fascism and Social-Fascism in the International Communist Press. <i>A. Fogarashi</i>	100

The Violent Attack Along the Anti-Soviet Front

DURING the last few weeks incidents have occurred in all the capitalist countries which witness to an unprecedented intensification of the "normal" antagonism between world capitalism and the Soviet Union. A series of facts piling one on top of another point to a colossal extension of the aggressiveness of the imperialists towards the U.S.S.R. Not since the time of the blockade and intervention has there been so ruthless and systematic a working up of anti-soviet public opinion, such an accumulation of hostile demonstrations against the Soviet Union, such an open preparation for armed attack. The organs of the bourgeoisie and the social-fascist press, the princes of the church and the bourgeois magistracy, the British diehards and the German social-democrats, are all acting as the various divisions of the single anti-soviet army. The anti-soviet campaign of the world bourgeoisie and world socialism has acquired a universal character and an unprecedented intensity. Before our eyes it is developing into a series of interlocking and mutually complementary organised demonstrations against the U.S.S.R., developing along several different lines. The simultaneousness and similarity of these demonstrations leave no doubt that

they are all parts of a single general plan, of which the ultimate aim is the overthrow of the Soviet Union.

The first feature to attract one's attention is the organised and planned campaign being developed by the churchmen of all denominations, in close alliance with other reactionary forces, around the successes of the anti-religious movement in the U.S.S.R., which is falsely represented as a persecution of Christianity. The bases for this campaign were laid down last December by the British diehards who sought thus to hinder the restoration of normal relations between the U.S.S.R. and Britain. Later on it acquired a universal and all-denominational character. All the dark forces of the international churchmen and leaders of obscurantism, with the Pope of Rome himself at their head, were brought into action against the Union. The Pope issued an epistle in which he attacked the Soviet Union for its anti-religious policy and waxed indignant with the European governments which from material considerations had effected a reconciliation with the U.S.S.R., despite its atheism. As was to have been expected, this epistle served as the signal for a whole chorus of anti-soviet speeches and writings on the part of the churchmen of all denominations. It was immediately taken up by the reactionary bourgeois press of all countries, which demanded the intervention of the capitalist governments in the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R. The French "Journal des Debats," "Figaro," "Echo de Paris" and "Victoire" welcomed the Pope's epistle as an example which ought to be followed by not only the various churches, but also "all the governments which still maintain relations with the Soviet Union out of egotistic economic considerations." The Italian "Tribuna" supported the Pope's demonstration, which in its opinion was all the more necessary since "the Russian example is undermining the fundamental bases of the social order."

The British diehards and even the moderate Conservative newspapers are uniting in one the campaign against the so-called "persecution" of Christianity and the campaign against the policy of liquidating the kulaks, which of course has enraged all the international bourgeoisie, and is represented as a mass

terror against the peasantry. And thus their anti-soviet campaign is being renewed with fresh energy. The united priesthood of all cults and sects, including the Hebrew rabbis, are demonstrating with joint prayers and services which simultaneously constitute anti-soviet meetings; their petty domestic differences are forgotten in the excitement of a general attack on the U.S.S.R. The true character of all this campaign, concealed behind a hypocritical prating about the defence of religious freedom which the policy of the soviet government is said to threaten, is best of all manifested in the pronunciamento of cardinal Faulgaber, in Munich, in which he declared that the "Russian problem is a problem of the fate of all Europe and all the world," demanded the defence of Western civilisation against bolshevism, and reproached Germany for its excessive friendliness with the Soviet Union. It is easy to see that these demonstrations of the representatives of the black international are by no means directed merely against this or that real or imaginary policy in the Soviet Union in regard to the church, but against the very existence of the soviet country. World imperialism, through the mouths of its churchmen, is mobilising "its masses" for the war against the U.S.S.R.

IN addition to the church, imperialism is employing its bourgeois justice as a weapon of opening the struggle with the U.S.S.R. Within a few days of each other two verdicts of "not guilty" have been pronounced in Paris and in Berlin in criminal trials in which the wronged party was the U.S.S.R. In Paris took place the trial of rogues who had forged the bill of exchange of one of the Soviet trading missions; in Berlin we had rascals of a higher calibre, who had counterfeited Soviet chervontsi with a view to both their personal enrichment and the organisation of armed risings in the U.S.S.R. Both these trials were characteristic by the exceptional partiality of the judge for the accused. Despite this the guilt of the Paris rogues was demonstrated with absolute certainty, while the Berlin accused did not even dare to deny it. The judgements passed on both these cases were correctly estimated by the white guard and reactionary bourgeois press itself, as a proclamation

that the Soviet Union was outside the law and deprived of all right to legal protection. By pronouncing impunity for any crime against the U.S.S.R., the bourgeois judge gave a direct incitement not only to the organisations of all kinds of anti-soviet conspiracies, but even to any criminal so long as his victim was the Soviet Union. The judgement of the Berlin judge was especially monstrous since it was explained by the political character of the accused's activities, which were represented in the judgement in innocent and almost attractive terms ("the desire to liberate their country and to establish economic relations with Germany"). This judgement once more emphasised the active participation of Germany in the imperialists' anti-soviet front. It is characteristic that the German bourgeois and social-fascist press not only did not condemn a judgement which constituted an essential violation of the Rapallo treaty, but exploited it for intensifying the campaign which it was developing against the Soviet Union.

Parallel with this mobilisation of the judges and priests throughout the world, there is developing an organised imperialist attack on soviet commerce and commercial organisations. In Britain the diehards are carrying on a systematic campaign against the extension of the system of export guarantees and credits to operations with the Soviet Union. In Germany for several weeks now the U.S.S.R. commercial mission has been subjected without any justification whatever to systematic fire from the bourgeois and social-fascist press, which is inventing all kinds of fantastic stories concerning the connection which they allege exists between the mission and the German revolutionary movement. On the basis of this campaign the Bavarian police have broken into the building of the local representative of the Soviet embassy and have carried out an unjustifiable and fruitless search. In Germany also, with the aid of the white guards and the social-fascists, a scandalous agitation is being developed against soviet export, which is particularly revolting by the hypocrisy of the arguments with which it is fortified. In Germany too the plan is being boomed of an oil monopoly directed purely against the soviet export, and subjugating the German market to the world trusts. Independently of this, from the

hints and suggestions of the various organs of the world bourgeois press, it is evident that under the pretext of struggle against so-called "dumping" export the imperialists are preparing measures having as their object the establishment of a blockade of the Soviet Union, and the barring of its access to foreign markets. Of course these measures are dictated not by economic but by political motives, and constitute part of the general system of offensive activities being pursued by world imperialism against the Soviet Union.

Of course imperialism is directing its chief attack along the line of politically isolating the Soviet Union, i.e., of breaking off the existing diplomatic relations with capitalist countries, which has to serve as a prologue to open war action. In one country the imperialists can already register a definite success. As is known, the Mexican government, acting on the direct suggestions and under the pressure of American imperialism, has broken off relations with the U.S.S.R., and moreover has emphasised its servile readiness to obey the orders of its master by carrying out an impudent police descent on the soviet ambassador as he was leaving Mexico, and on the building of the former soviet mission. In another part, in China, the imperialists, despite the defeat they have suffered in the recent Sino-Soviet conflict, have also succeeded in arousing its agents into a demonstration which virtually closes the road to the restoration of normal relations between the U.S.S.R. and China. Under the pressure of the imperialists and in connection with the general menacing situation being developed around the Soviet Union, the Nanking militarists have decided cynically to reject the very Khabarovsk protocol which has only just been signed by their own representatives in the course of regulating the Sino-Soviet conflict.

IN Europe the struggle for the breaking off of relationships is only in a stage of development. In Britain it is being carried on in the form of a systematic slandering of the Soviet Union by the diehards in Parliament and by all the conservative press—a slander which is supported under every possible pretext and every possible falsehood which the fertile inventive faculties of the enemies of the U.S.S.R. can engender. In France the cam-

campaign for breaking off relations has acquired a particularly determined and ruthless nature in connection with the notorious Koutepov affair. The disappearance of one of the dead souls of the white guard emigration, which was most probably specially organised by the white guards and the French secret police, is being deliberately exploited to justify monstrous slanders against the Soviet Union and its representatives. Despite the complete absence of clues pointing to even the most distant connection between any soviet organ and the disappearance of this unwanted white-guardist, the contemptible anti-soviet campaign developed over this issue is not only not ceasing, but is growing more intense. The shameless and unpunished attacks on the soviet legation, the howls of the French bourgeois and Russian white guard newspapers over the alleged activities of the G.P.U. on French territory, the attitude of all the leading organs of the French bourgeois press—all this orgy, which has established a position in which the legation is openly threatened with the prospect of a white-guard or police attack, witnesses to the fact that the French reactionaries have taken a determined course for the breaking off of relations.

Of course this breaking of relations cannot be an isolated phenomenon, an end in itself. The roar of welcome which has been given to the Koutepov affair only witnesses to the fact that French imperialism has taken on itself the rôle of the advance column of world reaction and world imperialism in the active struggle against the Soviet Union. The French premier Tardieu, in an answer to a question on the Koutepov affair, made a noteworthy statement to the effect that the question of Franco-Soviet relations was an international and even a world question. The Koutepov affair, which threatens to become a new Dreyfus case, has become the concern of a number of other countries, where the Paris boulevard sensation is exploited in order to intensify the anti-soviet campaign. In connection with the Koutepov affair such a campaign is being carried on in the Italian, German, Polish press, and in the press of all the petty states of Eastern Europe, which are the vassals of French imperialism. A curious, yet most indicative fact, characterising the manner in

which the anti-soviet orders of French imperialism are received in these countries, is provided by Czecho-Slovakia, where the deputy of the national-democratic party, Hein, has had the impudence to propose in parliament the summoning of an international conference for the smothering of communism and the annihilation of the Soviet Union—a proposal which is now being used by his party for a campaign of agitation throughout the country.

Thus we have every justification for declaring that we are confronted not with the ordinary "seasonal" accentuation of the anti-soviet tendencies, but with something rather more serious, smelling of definite preparations for the renewal of the blockade and for armed intervention. This preparation is revealed not only in the anti-soviet campaign which we have just reviewed. It is definitely indicated in the systematic development of the attitude of German capitalism, which owing to its specific position as a vanquished capitalism has so far not completely attached itself to the united anti-soviet front. In this regard considerable importance attaches to the laws, now being passed through the Reichstag, which are necessitated by the Young Plan, and which the German C.P. has correctly characterised as a pact for the oppression and starvation of the German toilers, and for war on the Soviet Union. With the realisation of this plan Germany will be placed in still greater dependence than before on the finance capital of America and the allies, and will subjugate its foreign policy more than ever to their instructions. Another essential feature is the recent Polish-German agreement for the liquidation of claims, which is being strongly supported by the French press, thus laying bare its importance as a new factor drawing Germany into the single anti-soviet front.

THE preparations for intervention find a reflection in those countries directly adjacent with the U.S.S.R., for whom world imperialism has prepared the role of pioneer in the war on the Union. It is no fortuitous circumstance that the idea of a Baltic alliance, directed against the U.S.S.R., has recently been resurrected. This idea is being urged from two angles. The Finnish and Swedish press are talking of the necessity to ensure

the safety of the Baltic sea by the organisation of such an alliance with the participation of Sweden; and meantime the Esthonian president Standman is in Warsaw, on a visit which is being given unusual political importance. The Polish press, on the one hand, and the communicative Esthonian general Laidoner on the other, are removing all the parentheses by emphasising that co-operation between Poland and the Baltic States is indispensable in peace time in order to ensure co-operation in the coming war. If to this be added the revival of the aggressive anti-soviet attitude in Roumania (the recent demonstration of General Drag with a call to the intensification of armaments for defence against the alleged threat from the U.S.S.R.) the picture of war preparations becomes clear.

It goes without saying that all the capitalist world is moved by an unchangeable and irreconcilable hostility towards the Soviet Union. The world bourgeoisie has never ceased to dream of crushing the U.S.S.R. There is no need to point out that despite the breakdown of the blockade and intervention, the front between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries, between the world revolution and world capitalism, has not for one moment ceased to be an active front. At the present time it is merely a question of world imperialism making an attempt to pass to an offensive on this front after enforced comparative passivity.

These hostile tendencies, which before our very eyes are being crystallised into very definite action, are not in the least accidental. They arise first and foremost out of the perceptible intensification of the crisis of capitalism, which is engendering an extensive economic crisis. In the conditions of this crisis the world bourgeoisie is striving more actively than ever before to annihilate the Soviet Union or to force it to capitulate, and so enable world imperialism to obtain the breathing-space so vitally necessary to it. It is a matter of obtaining a temporary mitigation of the capitalistic antagonisms—the development of which is engendering the direct menace of a final catastrophe of the capitalist world—by an intensified exploitation of the Soviet Union.

The world economic crisis is engendering an enormous intensification of class antagonisms in the capitalist countries. Moreover the crisis is giving extreme form to the antagonisms among the imperialist powers, which are developing along the lines not only of a struggle for markets, for sources of raw materials, etc, but along that of a direct preparation for an armed conflict. By bringing nearer the fatal moment of a new international clash, the crisis is forcing the imperialists into desperate attempts to achieve a temporary agreement among themselves at the expense of the hated Soviet Union, and thus to postpone the conflict. The connection between these two features—the prospect of world war among the imperialists, and the attempts to organise a world war against the U.S.S.R.—is quite obvious.

But the decisive factors which determine the choice of the present moment for an attempt to organise a direct attack on the anti-soviet front spring from events occurring not in the world of capitalism but in the Soviet Union, and are directly connected with the successes of the U.S.S.R. on the road of socialist construction. The unprecedented, the enormous dimensions of that construction involve a decisive and irrevocable transference of all the economy of the Soviet Union on to socialist bases. It is inflicting a mortal blow to the fantastic dreams of the “degeneration” of bolshevism. The world bourgeoisie realises quite clearly that the correlation of forces is swiftly changing—and not in its favour; that the final victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. involves in the last resort the shattering of capitalism throughout the rest of the world.

THE key to all these designs is to be found essentially in the question of the five-year plan, which is never out of the bourgeois press of the last few weeks. It is no accident that the present anti-soviet campaign developed shortly after the results of the first year of realisation of the five-year plan became known. The French bourgeois economist Albert Aftolion (“Le Capital,” 29th Jan.), made an analysis of these results and was forced to admit that “the socialistic experiment has proved successful.” Aftolion’s article definitely reveals an understanding of the menace of this fact for capitalism: he tries to console

his readers by arguing that the Soviet Union, like America and Canada, is under special conditions of a naturally swift development, and that its economic successes have to be ascribed to these conditions. He also tries to prove that the experience of Soviet Russia is inapplicable to the western European States on the ground that "authoritarian socialism" rules in the U.S.S.R., whereas only "democratic socialism" is possible in Western Europe; this brand of socialism, in distinction from the first, being incapable of ensuring a development of the productivity of labour and of general production. From Aftolion one comes to the conclusion that the Western European workers are reconciled to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but will not allow a dictatorship of the proletariat! It is doubtful whether the French economist himself believes in such amiable stupidities. We know that the American bourgeoisie do not flatter themselves with such beliefs: a number of highly influential organs of American capitalism admit that the soviet five-year plan is not merely one of the most gigantic enterprises in the world's history, but is a direct menace to world capitalism. If it continues like that, declares one American newspaper in commenting on the results of the first year, within a short time only two masters will be left in the world: the United States and the U.S.S.R. The political conclusions which emerge through these American commentaries once more show that the economic successes of the Soviet Union are driving world imperialism not into an agreement, but into hostile activities. The hostility of the capitalists is intensified by the further factor that the realisation of the five-year plan in regard to the production of a number of commodities is freeing the Soviet Union from dependence on abroad, and on the other hand is increasing the competitive power of Soviet export on the foreign markets, which strikes at the interests of definite circles of the world bourgeoisie.

And in fact the immediate aim of the imperialists is undoubtedly the breakdown of the five-year plan. It is to this end that all the monstrous uproar which the enemies of the Soviet Union in all the capitalist world have raised, along various lines and on various pretexts, are directed. And to this witnesses the

unconcealed hostility of the German bourgeoisie, which is closest of all to the problems of the soviet market. And finally this is witnessed to by the ruthless struggle against the soviet export, the normal development of which is one of the necessary prerequisites of realising the five-year plan.

Together with this task the world bourgeoisie is openly attempting to exploit the specific conditions of the present moment, when their allies inside the U.S.S.R., the kulaks have realised their imminent destruction as a class, but are not yet driven out of all the positions they occupy. It is quite indisputable that the hysteria of the sycophants of world reaction over the notorious "protection of Christianity" is in reality a campaign directed towards the defence of the kulaks. The world bourgeoisie is attempting to frustrate the attack on the kulaks and simultaneously is putting its hopes in a kulak rising. They realise clearly that the kulaks will be liquidated and that this liquidation will strengthen the power and authority of the Soviet régime enormously. In this connection the declaration of the London "Times" in its leader for February 5th is extraordinarily noteworthy: "The consequences of this attempt to drive the peasantry along a road leading to serfdom" (that is what the organ of world imperialism chooses to call the collectivisation of agriculture in the Soviet Union) "will be awaited with the greatest interest and agitation." Then come the usual objurgations representing the Soviet Union as a tyranny over 120 million peasantry. This kind of discovery is not new; the imperialist press has been full of it ever since the first days of the October revolution. What is new—for recent years at least—is the agitated expectation, the direct counting on a renewal of civil war in the U.S.S.R., which evidently has to be the signal for armed intervention from without.

We repeat that the picture is absolutely clear: it is an undoubted fact that the war danger has become far more acute and has come much nearer. Of course at the moment it is only a question of plans, of serious attempts at an offensive, of active preparations. Whether these preparations will lead now and at once to the end of the breathing-space depends on

a number of factors, among which an extraordinarily important rôle is played by that of the extent to which the world proletariat is awake and ready for determined resistance. That resistance can and must be such that the world bourgeoisie will not dare to raise a hand against the fatherland of the international revolutionary working class.

IT is obvious what enormous importance the activity of all sections of the Comintern has in such conditions. On them is laid the highly responsible obligations of directing the struggle of the toiling masses against the attacks made by the international bourgeoisie in the U.S.S.R. The preparation for this struggle must be carried on at the same feverish rate, and as thoroughly, as that of the imperialists for the crusade against the Soviet Union. The task of the C.P.'s is to unmask in the most definite fashion the provocation campaign of the imperialists and socialists against the U.S.S.R. The toiling masses of all the world must definitely realise what the world bourgeoisie is preparing in regard to the land of the soviets. Under the leadership of the C.P.'s, the revolutionary proletariat must hinder imperialism from giving practical effect to its attempts to break off relations and to make a new intervention with a view to "smothering of communism and the annihilating of the U.S.S.R."

In these conditions the struggle against social-fascism acquires special importance. The social-fascists are taking a most active part in these preparations for an attack on the Soviet Union. Together with world imperialism, together with the churchmen, together with the bourgeois judges, they are spinning intrigues and are preparing an attack on the Soviet Union. In Germany the most miserable of all social-fascist organs, the "Vorwaerts," is virtually heading the anti-soviet campaign which is developing on the basis of the outrageous judgement of the Berlin court. In France the "Populaire," the organ of the

socialist party, is vieing with the bourgeois press in the publication of the most ridiculous legends concerning the Koutepov affair, accompanying them with commentaries which are in essentials completely at one with the provocative attacks of the capitalist newspapers; whilst the socialist leader Leon Blum fulminates in the name of imperialist France against the protests made by the soviet ambassador, utilising the opportunity to make filthy anti-soviet attacks. But whilst entering into a touching alliance with the priests and the white guard monarchists, the Second International is simultaneously attempting to conceal the preparations for attacking the U.S.S.R. under pacifist phrases. In Belgium Vandervelde has made a speech in parliament, in which, whilst attacking Soviet Russia, he demands the renewal of relations with the U.S.S.R. In Britain a woman member of the Parliamentary Labour Party tabled a resolution in the House of Commons demanding the strengthening of commercial relations and a speedy conclusion of a trade agreement, and the resolution was passed by a majority. This double-dealing is in complete accord with the rôle which world imperialism has predestined for social-fascism in the general plan of struggle against the U.S.S.R. Needless to say, the social-fascists are most dangerous of all in those very countries where they do not make open statements as direct agents of imperialism and allies of the white guards, but resort to pacifist talk, and when they fulfil the function of stupifying the world proletariat and drugging their attention. The primary task of the Communist party is that of unmasking of the real rôle of social-fascism and of exposing its manoeuvres to the light of day. But that work is only a necessary part of the mobilisation and organisation of the masses in the defence of the Soviet Union, for the development of revolutionary battles against the social and political offensives of capital, and for the preparations for the revolutionary battle against the whole capitalist system.

The Task of the Moment

THE enlarged E.C.C.I. Presidium set before the sections of the Comintern the tasks of getting closer contact with the working masses of pulling up the parties which had lagged behind in one way or another, of preparing the proletarian divisions for the forthcoming great class battles, and of bringing the working class up against the most important tasks of revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Sixth Congress of the Comintern, and later the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., in characterising the present "third period," spoke of the increasing disturbance of capitalist stabilisation and of the accentuation of the internal and external antagonisms in the capitalist world. During the period which has elapsed since the Tenth Plenum this process has proceeded considerably further. Two new extraordinarily important factors have been added to those existing at the time of the Tenth Plenum. The first is that on the background of the general crisis of capitalism an economic crisis has developed in the U.S.A. which is developing into a world economic crisis. This economic crisis, which has sprung out of the general crisis of capitalism and is considerably intensifying the latter, has shattered a number of legends which the social-democrats and the opportunists in the ranks of the Communist Parties had built up—the legend of "American exceptionalism" (Lovestone-Pepper) the Trotskyist legend that "the U.S.A. has placed capitalist Europe on rations," and the general legend of "organised capitalism." Secondly, the enormous successes achieved in the U.S.S.R. during the first year of the Five-Year Plan—successes which have far surpassed all the original designs—the vigorous development of collectivisation in the countryside, and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class which is inevitable upon complete collectivisation, have struck at the partial stabilisation of world capitalism a powerful blow. Both these factors have considerably strengthened and advanced the danger of war, and first and foremost

of war between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R.

WHILST the economic crisis in the United States considerably increases its imperialist aggressiveness, accentuating its antagonisms with the European capitalist states, and first and foremost with Britain, the complete collectivisation and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class in the U.S.S.R. is swiftly consolidating the world anti-soviet front, and making the danger of intervention in the U.S.S.R. extraordinarily actual. For the abolition of the kulaks as a class together with the collectivisation of the countryside, coming at a time when the crisis in the capitalist world is growing more acute, connotes a tremendous victory for socialism; and moreover the abolition of the kulaks as a class simultaneously connotes an extraordinary increase in the defensive power of the Soviet Republic. The drive for the abolition of the kulaks as a class and for the complete collectivisation of the countryside is all the more terrifying the world bourgeoisie because it can no longer delude itself as to the success of that drive. The correspondent of the "New York Times," Duranty, for instance writes: "The Europeans are afraid that the success of the Soviet Union is no less probable than its failure, and the first fruits of that success would involve a serious danger to the European capitalist régime. . . . The most far-sighted men of Europe are foreseeing that the creation of a socialist state with a dictatorial government and with its own currency may be victorious over capitalist enterprises."

THE increasing disturbance of capitalist stabilisation is accompanied by a rise in the revolutionary tide. That tide is rising unequally. It is strongest wherever the action of the economic and agrarian crisis is combining with the various forms of oppression—feudal oppression, colonial oppression, the oppression of finance capital. It is weakest in those countries which at the moment occupy the strategic points of the capitalist world. Correspondingly we can affirm the existence of

a complete gradation of countries in regard to the strength and the height of the revolutionary movement at the present time. We observe the severest form of revolutionary movement in the colonies, and then in a number of European countries where the economic crisis is combined with the oppression of foreign financial capital or with the vestiges of feudalism. We observe a very strong accentuation of the situation, and an increase in the ferment among the working class, in Germany, in which country the unemployed now exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ million, and in which as the result of the Young Plan $3\frac{1}{2}$ milliard marks will be extorted from the working class every year in addition to what its own native capital extorts from it. We observe an extremely acute crisis in Poland, revolutionary incidents in Spain, an intensification of the revolutionary struggle in Roumania, Greece, and Hungary. The situation is relatively less severe in Britain and France, but there also we observe an elemental increase in the strike movement over the past year—in the one case a doubling, and in the other a tripling of the number of strikes by comparison with the previous year. The beginning of the breakdown of fascist stabilisation in Italy is highly symptomatic of the present moment.

PARALLEL with the rise of the revolutionary tide there is an acceleration in the process of the fascist development of the capitalist states and the social-democratic parties. Very characteristic of the latter at the present moment is the fact that the more actively they participate in the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, in the economic offensive on the working class, in the slander of the communists, in the preparation of war on the U.S.S.R., the more closely they combine their activities with the open national-fascists, so the more do they throw up their "left" wing as a covering, affording to these "lefts" every opportunity for talking, whilst they themselves are doing the work. Thus in France the Paris district has been given over to the "left-wing" of the socialists, headed by Zyromski, at the same time as for the first time at meetings in Dieppe the socialists jointly with the gendarmes have beaten up worker communists. Thus for instance in Germany,

the "left-wing" social-democrats are at the moment allowed to be especially noisy in denunciations of the bourgeoisie's financial programme at the very time when the German social-democrats are putting that programme into force, are preparing for the prohibition of the Communist Party, and jointly with the priests, headed by the Pope of Rome, are preparing the "crusade" against the U.S.S.R. Thus again in Poland, the members of the Polish Socialist Party are now playing a comedy of "opposition" to Pilsudsky, even to the extent of talking about "rising," whilst they are jointly with Pilsudsky preparing more feverishly than ever before for a war on the U.S.S.R.

THE revolutionary tide is rising unequally. Whilst in certain countries we observe only a development of economic strikes, in others we already see the application by the proletariat of the most severe forms of struggle. Especially is there inequality between the development, on the one hand, of the movement in the colonies, and on the other of the movement in the metropolises which resort to an intensified exploitation of colonies in order to relieve the crisis at home. But there is much greater inequality, much greater disproportion, between the level of the tide achieved in capitalist countries and the enormous revolutionary tide which is flowing at the present time in the U.S.S.R., where along an enormous front the proletariat is carrying out an offensive against the kulaks with a view to eradicating the roots of capitalism; where the age-old stagnation of the peasant husbandry is being overcome at an extraordinary speed and with an extraordinary success, where the refashioning of the economic basis on collective lines is being effected at an extraordinary pace. This inequality must be increasingly taken into account by the Comintern sections as the danger of intervention in the U.S.S.R. becomes the more real. This is the main reason why the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. has set the sections in capitalist countries the task of "straightening out the front" with the U.S.S.R., and bringing up the backward sectors.

But in order to accomplish that task another disproportion, another inequality, has to be

overcome—that between the present great dimensions of the workers' movement in capitalist countries, consequent upon the present intensification of the crisis in capitalism, on the one hand, and the poor capture and direction of that movement by the Communist Parties, on the other. Our parties have consolidated themselves ideologically, but the *practice* of our parties is absolutely far below the level of the present great tasks. For this reason the most actual, the most essential, the most burning question of the day is the raising of the standard of our practice. If the Communist Parties do not now set about that task with the same zeal, the same ardour, the same enthusiasm as the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U. are now showing in the work of building socialism, all the talk of the hegemony of the proletariat in the developing revolutionary movement, and in the marshalling of the working masses for decisive revolutionary battles, will remain simply talk.

WE have no grounds for complaining of the objective conditions. They are extraordinarily favourable. But we are far from doing all in our power to utilise these favourable conditions. For instance there is a vigorous revolutionary development occurring in Spain, the workers are surging towards the barricades, but they are not surging under the leadership of the Communist Party. In India, following on the strong tide in the proletarian movement, we now have the beginning of a rise in the peasant movement. At innumerable conferences the peasants in the Punjab are proclaiming their sympathy for the Soviet Republic. Thus there we have already present conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat over the peasantry, but we do not yet have a Communist Party. And without it of course the proletariat cannot realise their hegemony in the revolution. In a number of countries of Latin America we are still without organised Communist Parties, or where they do exist they lose their distinctive character and are dissolved into the workers' and peasants' blocs. In all these cases the organisation of Communist Parties is an urgent task.

In the European capitalist countries and in

the U.S.A. we do possess quite old Communist Parties. In a number of them on the eve of the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., and especially after it, the Party leadership was strengthened and purged of opportunist elements. The political influence over the working masses possessed by the great majority of these parties has also considerably increased since the Sixth Congress, and especially since the Tenth Plenum. But the membership of these parties, excluding the German and American parties, has not grown, but in certain cases has even shown a decline. In this regard the C.P.G.B. is worst of all, and the French C.P.—despite the strong increase in circulation of its newspapers, despite the great increase in its popularity among the masses—has lost upwards of 15,000 members during the last eighteen months.

CERTAIN Parties seek to explain this extraordinary disproportion between the strong increase in the agitational influence and the stagnation or even fall in membership by the argument, that in the transition from the second to the third period of post-war capitalism, and in the conditions of intensifying class battles, part of the old Party membership is proving unadapted to the new situation, and it is not easy for the new members to replace them. They point, for instance, to the fact that the Swedish party has grown swiftly—that since Hoeglund's departure it has risen from six to eighteen thousand members—but that little advantage has come of this, and that a considerable proportion have proved to be hidden social-democrats, as the split in the Party has shown.

It is an undeniable truth that the quality of the party members is of first-rate importance, and that militant members are required during battles. But it is also indisputable that in a number of militant attacks of recent times many non-party workers have displayed such valour and such self-sacrifice that they could easily have been drawn into the ranks of the Communist Parties if our Parties had given to the question of enrolling new members the attention which it deserves. In this regard one comrade recalled Lenin's words on the question of party ranks in February 1905: "From all sides one hears with equal

frequency passionate appeals for new forces and complaints of the absence of people in the organisations, and at the same time a gigantic offer of services, a growth of young forces, especially among the working class. . . The practical organiser who complains of shortage of people in such conditions cannot see the wood for trees, admits that he is blinded by events, that it is not he, the revolutionary, who dominates them . . . but that they are dominating him or have overwhelmed him. Such an organiser would be well advised to keep quiet, to leave his place free for young forces, which have energy. . . There are people, there is a mass of people. We have only to throw overboard our 'tailist' ideas and teachings, to give space for action and initiative, and then we shall prove ourselves worthy representatives of the great revolutionary class." ("New Tactics and New Forces," February, 1905.)

THE second weakness of our Communist Parties consists in the fact that the mass movements of the proletariat—strikes, demonstrations, unemployed workers' movements—frequently occur without them. Of course our Parties must as before intensify their agitational and propaganda work. But that alone is not sufficient. Long ago the Comintern put the task of leading the mass movements in the forefront. None the less the success of our parties in this work of leadership is still absolutely inadequate. This is explained first by the circumstance that our Parties are still very inadequately established organisationally in the large enterprises, that our factory nuclei are still very few and far between. It is explained secondly by the circumstance that our parties have not learned to put forward such immediate demands, in dependence on the conditions, time, and place, as are capable of mobilising the wide proletarian masses and of carrying them into the struggle for power. The putting forward at the right place and the right time of the appropriate partial demands, which will not depress, but will raise, the level of the revolutionary movement of the masses, is a work demanding great art. In putting forward partial demands we must of course first and foremost start with the question of what is the

basic revolutionary task confronting the proletariat in that particular country. Is it confronted with the task of struggle for proletarian dictatorship, or that of struggle for democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, as is the case in the colonial countries? Of course we cannot put forward sectional demands which will have the effect of thrusting into the background the realisation of these basic tasks, or which are likely to engender the illusion that there may still be certain intervening stages before the realisation of these basic tasks in any country—that in certain leading capitalist countries, for instance, there can yet exist a certain democratic stage before the proletarian revolution. Nor can we take into account the question whether the partial demands put forward are realisable or not within the framework of the existing system. We must take account only of the question whether they are such as will mobilise the masses, whether they will find a vital response in the masses. Here also we must display the greatest sensitiveness to the moods of the masses: must catch every manifestation of dissatisfaction, even for the smallest of reasons, so as thereby to unfetter the movement, gradually accentuating and extending the partial demands we have put forward, and linking them up with the main revolutionary tasks.

THE third weakness of our parties consists in an occasional unsound approach to economic strikes in present conditions of an intensification of crisis. For instance at the present time we see that whilst in Britain and France the number of strikes increased considerably in 1929 by comparison with those of the previous year, in Germany on the other hand the number of economic strikes declined in 1929. Does this mean that the level of the workers' movement is now lower in Germany than in Britain and France? Not in the least. On the contrary, the level of the movement in Germany is for a number of reasons not lower, but much higher, than in France or Britain. Owing to the extraordinary increase in unemployment the number of strikes in Germany last year showed a decrease, but those strikes are taking on a much more severe character. And at the same time we

observe a strong movement of unemployed, and demonstrations which occasionally flood over into the form of street battles with the police. To measure the level of a movement only by the number of economic strikes at the given moment, as do the Brandlerite renegades and all other opportunists, and to declare on the basis of a decline in their numbers that the working class is tired, is tantamount to falling into the purest industrial "economism." In view of the severe unemployment the working class in Germany are now regrouping their forces, and are grouping for new, more effective methods of struggle. We have every justification for expecting that within a short time there will be another great wave of strikes, only they will then have a clearly expressed revolutionary character. Thus the problem of the mass political strike, which was raised at the Tenth Plenum, is now even more than then one of the basic immediate problems, and the Communist Parties are now confronted with the task of popularising this slogan as widely as possible.

THE fourth weakness of our Communist Parties is their failure to wage such an intelligent struggle against social-fascism of all shades as is demanded by the conditions of the present moment in connection with the transformation of the social-democratic into social-fascist parties, the Tenth Plenum set all the sections the task of winning a majority of the working class as an immediate task. Since the Tenth Plenum the fascist development of the social-democratic parties has gone much farther. They are compromising themselves more and more in the eyes of the masses: their manœuvring possibilities are being more and more restricted: the gap dividing them from the open national fascists is growing narrower and narrower. This creates highly favourable conditions for the winning of the working masses away from the social-democrats' influence. But the disillusionment of the working masses with social-democracy does not guarantee their direct transference to the Communist Parties. We have had instances during the past year, even in places where the economic crisis was most acute, in Saxony for example, when the workers left the social-

democrats only to come under the influence of the demagogy of the national-fascists. Consequently we are faced very definitely with the question of the channels along which it is possible to carry the workers who are disillusioned with social-democracy into our Communist camp. It is clear that to do this we need to combine an intensified struggle against social-fascism with a similar struggle against the national fascists and their demagogy. It is clear too that we must show the workers that we know not only how to make a revolution, but also how to lead and direct their movement for partial demands. But the chief thing we must realise, in view of all this, is that the road from the social-democrats to us lies through the trade unions, through the trade union opposition, through the revolutionary trade unions, through the mass organisations (factory committees, strike committees, committees of unemployed, etc.). For the very reason that at the moment there are favourable conditions for inflicting a powerful blow on social-fascists, and for emancipating the mass of the workers from their influence, we must now not weaken, but must intensify our opposition work in the reformist unions.

The *chief task* of the present moment, as the E.C.C.I. reminds us, consists in winning the basic masses of the proletariat, in mobilising the broad masses of toilers (peasants, the ruined petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the oppressed nationalities) around the proletariat and under its hegemony, in ensuring the leadership by the Party of all mass demonstrations, in directing those demonstrations (strikes, unemployed movements, street demonstrations) which frequently are of an elemental character, into the stream of the organised political struggle, especially in the form of mass political strikes, which bring the masses up against the tasks of the revolutionary struggle for power.

THUS the Communist Parties will really lead the working class into the tasks of the revolutionary struggle for power. We need to enlarge our Party ranks: to strengthen our organisational position in the enterprises: to gain the leadership of the mass offensives. We need to win a majority of the

working class in ruthless struggle against the social-facists (especially with the most dangerous "left-wing" in all their varieties), and in the struggle with the renegades of communism—the former right-wingers and the Trotskyists—who are steadily coming closer together, pursuing more and more a social-democratic tactic, striving to fulfil the role of centrists which the "Two-and-a-half International" fulfilled during the post-war revolutionary crisis.

But all that is insufficient. In order to accomplish the enormous and responsible task which now confronts us, we need to intensify the struggle with opportunism in practice in our ranks. The open opportunists of the Party leadership have been flung overboard almost everywhere. But in our parties, especially in

the intermediary links and in separate spheres of work (for instance in the trade union, and especially in the municipal sphere) there are still not only a small number of open opportunists, but also a quite considerable stratum of party workers who vote in favour of all the decisions of their central committee or the Comintern, but who in practice do not carry those decisions out, and even sabotage them. A resolute struggle must be waged against all such. We are living in an epoch of a rising revolutionary tide, in an epoch when active militant elements are more and more coming to the front in the working class. These elements must be attracted into our Parties, must strengthen our Parties, must raise them to the level of those colossal tasks which confront us.

The "Holy Father" and the Liquidation of the Kulak Class

"A SPECTRE is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies."

These words of the *Communist Manifesto* are far more applicable to our day than they were to the days of Marx. Included in the list was the Russian Tsar. But on the other hand a very honourable place is occupied in the united bourgeois front by the new counter-revolutionary force of international social fascism. Pius 11th and Henderson, the well known Roumanian pogromist, Metropolitan Guria, and the editors of the miserable "Vorwaerts," the organiser of the "Union of the Russian People," the bishop Eulogy and Kerensky, all this company are crying to heaven (and to the machine-guns) "to remit the sins and appease the soul of our beloved Russian people," as the letter of "God's vicar on earth" on the "bestialities of bolshevism" tenderly remarks. On March 16th, in the Cathedral of St. Peter in Rome, in an atmosphere of solemnity, the "first prince" of the church will say masses and pray to his God

to send down plague, pestilence and every other Egyptian punishment on the head of the fanatic bolsheviks. Throughout the world will sound the church bells, and the lackeys of the bourgeoisie, with and without cassocks, will open a crusade against the impious soviet power.

WHAT is the meaning of all this? It is significant that all the radical bourgeois intelligentsia, all the "free-thinking" social-democracy, who have been in the habit of boasting of their anti-clericalism and freemasonry, are taking part in this mediæval parade. It is significant that a "religious renaissance" is developing in the ranks of the bourgeois social-fascist intelligentsia. It is significant that it is the Catholic church which is taking the initiative in a "decisive" attack on bolshevism. And it is significant that this attack coincides with the gigantic successes of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class.

When the bourgeoisie came to power it had the encyclopædists, Voltaire, Diderot, Dalmbert and the great atheists of the French revo-

lution. When in the 19th century capitalism was still on the up-grade, the radical bourgeois intelligentsia struggled beneath the banners of atheistic materialism. But when the twilight of capitalism set in, mysticism, priestcraft, and idealism began to unfold their poisonous blossoms, and the bourgeois radicals of all kinds threw themselves into the embrace of "religion the consoler." In the high schools of Paris, the hated Babylon of the Catholic Church, last year thousands of bourgeois students participated in the Easter ceremonial, and the "Union of Catholic Engineers," formerly without following, now numbers over 6,000 members. At his 80th birthday Edward Bernstein announces his return to the old Jehovah, and the social-fascists of all lands carry on endless discussions about religion and make corresponding alterations in their programmes. "Atheism, like belief in God, is scientifically not susceptible of proof," the case-hardened social-fascist Zollmann announces at the Magdeburg party conference, to a thunder of applause.

THE "spirit" of broad individual freedom departs from the bourgeoisie as soon as it meets with the proletariat on a "narrow" platform—i.e., in the class struggle. The Church is an instrument of reaction. And now that danger is threatening the very foundations of the bourgeois state the whole of the bourgeoisie, down to the social-fascists, are clutching at that weapon of reaction in the hope that through concessions to the Church they may be able to dig themselves in for a splendid offensive on the proletarian revolution. And those bourgeois radicals who fought for the separation of the Church from the state, who were proud of their freethinking traditions, have now, when the "liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class" is a serious question to be reckoned with, become "greater papists than the pope himself." The bourgeois materialists used to explain the phenomenon of religion by the backwardness of the masses. But religion has its social roots. The extermination of those social roots is simultaneously an extermination of religion. The Pope of Rome, as God's vicar on earth, is at the top of the class ladder of the bourgeois state. The liquidation of the kulaks as a class,

the abolition of the last capitalist class in the U.S.S.R., is cutting the roots of all religion, all priestcraft, in the land of proletarian dictatorship.

IN 1909, in connection with the speech of the social-democrat deputy Surkov in the Duma during the consideration of the Church Synod estimates, Lenin gave a brilliant analysis of the social roots of religion :

"Marxism is materialism. As such it is as ruthlessly hostile to religion as was the materialism of the Encyclopædists of the eighteenth century or of Feuerbach. This is incontestable. But the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels goes further. . . . It says : We must combat religion, and to enable us to do that we must explain the sources of the faith and religion of the masses from the materialist point of view. The fight against religion must not be confined to abstract preaching. . . . The fight must be linked up with the concrete practical class movement directed towards eradicating the social roots of religion."—"The Workers' Party and Religion," Lenin, selections Vol. 2, pp. 273-4.)

This concrete practice of the class movement is now leading, on one-sixth of the world's surface, to a swift liquidation of religion. Of course, the fade-out of religion cannot be assured by a simple ignoring of the phenomenon. It is realised by mobilising the masses on the basis of social emancipation. The work of eliminating superstition from the soviet village has as its mighty basis the collectivisation of agriculture. Hence we have the shrieks of all the priests of all countries and religions in the world. That is why the catholic inquisitors, the pogromist Eulogy, and the Rabbi Hertz are displaying such unexpected "broadness of mind" and tolerance one toward another.

THE masses are moving leftward. The bourgeoisie finds it necessary to retain its hold on the masses. To this end it is exploiting both national and social fascism. But the agrarian crisis in the capitalist countries and the rise of the peasant movement are forcing it to seek yet other methods of holding back the peasantry. And it needs this first and foremost for the sake of

the new war intervention in the U.S.S.R. The military imperialist press is now openly announcing that the imperialists must hasten before the realisation of the Five-Year-Plan and the complete collectivisation of agriculture. For afterwards it will be "too late." The peasantry are tired after the "great" imperialist war. They must be set afire. And the church is taking that mission on itself, working on the darkness and backwardness of the village, and on the world kulaks first and foremost.

The catholic church has always been outstanding for its skill in refined deception of the masses and ability to adapt itself to new conditions. When a mass workers' movement began to appear, Pope Pius 9th, in the nineties, issued an encyclical on the "new causes" which served as a starting point for christian workers' organisations. The Pope, the "child of poor people," appealed to the poor. It was affecting to the point of tears!

Almost simultaneously the "holy father" stood with face towards "capitalist production." In the second encyclical, which quickly followed, the Pope reduced the number of church festivals, because "the increase of commerce and the acceleration of the tempo of industry are hindered by the numerous holidays." When the New Economic Policy was announced in Soviet Russia the Pope, in conjunction with all the European bourgeoisie, drew up plans for the "peaceful indoctrination" of bolshevism. But the victorious construction of socialism and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class has brought him and all the international bourgeoisie a bitter disillusionment. And so the way was prepared for the present "crusade."

TO international bolshevism this open preparation of war on the Soviet Union is, of course, not in the least unexpected. We have even foreseen the forms it would take. Naturally, it had to be a "cultural attack" of civilised Europe against the Asiatic, barbarian bolshevism. The Sixth Comintern Congress noted this in its thesis on imperialist war. And there is nothing surprising in the circumstance that the war for capitalism is combined with the war for religion. It is significant that the arch-bourgeois

correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Paul Schaeffer, again and again emphasises that the Vatican's intervention far from accidentally coincided with the triumph of socialisation over private enterprise. The anti-soviet aggression of clericalism, like the aggression of the international bourgeoisie, arises not from its strength but from its weakness.

That is why they have raked out the legends of the "bloody boys" and the guiltlessly martyred priests, the enforced governmental closing down of the churches, and all the other bolshevik atrocities. Meantime, the nature of those "atrocities" is testified to by the leaders of the Greek Church in the U.S.S.R. themselves, whose testimony is, for some unknown reason, carefully ignored by all the international bourgeois press! The soviet government never had, and still has, no reason whatever to hide the struggle which it is conducting against the bearers of counter-revolution. That is why it is a soviet government, in order to strangle counter-revolution. But it fights against religion not by the methods of administrative repression, as the Greek Church priests did with their religious competitors in Tsarist times, or as the Polish priests are now doing in Western Ukraine and White Russia, but by mobilising soviet social opinion. In the land of proletarian dictatorship hundreds of churches and monasteries have been transformed into institutions of communal service *on the demand of the masses*. In the monasteries and church edifices closed at the beginning of the revolution there are now 48 sanatoria, 168 institutions for social protection, 197 schools, 349 hospitals, and two maternity homes. And wherever there have been repressions against individual priests they have been carried out against them not as the apostles of a religious cult, but as active counter-revolutionaries.

HERE is a brief summary of events of the past year:

At the end of October, 1929, a sect of "name-glorifiers" was discovered in the Northern Caucasus. This sect was composed of remnants of White armies. At the head were former Tsarist officers and gendarmes—staff-captain Grigorovitch, the gendarme officer Butenko, another former officer, Yakovlev. The details of the constitution of the sect

were: 1, struggle against the soviet régime; 2, propaganda of desertion from the Red Army; 3, refusal to say state taxes; 4, participation in a monarchist coup.

In November, 1929, a sect of "Fedorovists" (cross-bearers) was un-nested in Voronezh. At the head of the sect was the former member of a White-guard band, Parkhomenko, a former landowner and gendarme Tushchenko, and a former large landowner and organiser of anti-soviet revolts, Atorkin.

At the end of 1929 a monarchist organisation was discovered in Vyatka, having the bishop Ostrovinov and the priest Glushkov (a former Tsarist officer) at its head.

In November, 1929, the counter-revolutionary Petluran organisation "The Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine" was arrested in the Ukraine. Among the most active heads of this organisation proved to be the leader of the Ukrainian autocephalous church, Bishop Chekhovski, an Ukrainian menshevik and former premier under Petlura, now tricked out as a priest. Not less than 70 per cent. of the leaders of the autocephalous church proved to be former active Petlurans, mensheviks, etc. The extraordinary assembly of the autocephalous church held in January last stated in a resolution that: "During the whole course of its decade of existence the autocephalous church has fulfilled an openly counter-revolutionary, anti-soviet role."

In the spring of 1929 there was a trial of baptists in Volhynia, who had been discovered carrying on espionage and contraband.

Finally, it is no secret to anyone that part of the Polish clergy has been incessantly occupied with espionage in frontier districts, and has carried on anti-soviet agitation. Dozens of priests have been sent from Poland into the U.S.S.R. with this special end in view. A group of Roman Catholic priests publicly stated that this was so in January, 1928.

SUCH are the works of the "holy fathers," which the soviet government has prosecuted, is prosecuting, and will continue to prosecute. And the representative-of-God-on-earth himself is mobilising the entire black international for a "holy" war on bolshevism, not by any means in order to save "innocently persecuted" servants of God, but for the prosaic earthly purpose of saving capitalism! For the death of capitalism connotes the death of religion, as well as the end of social-fascism. Even the most refined art of adaptation will be of no avail here!

The Communist parties of all the world must turn the most serious attention to the anti-soviet provocation. The international demonstration against unemployment which took place on March 6th was at the same time a proletarian warning to the churchmen and imperialists, a mobilisation of the masses against imperialist intervention. Let the "holy" inquisitors and social-fascists of all countries know that there is a strength more terrible than theirs, and that any attack on the country of proletarian dictatorship will come up against the mailed fist of proletarian resistance throughout the world.

The Need for Bolshevik Municipal Work

NECESSITY FOR A DECISIVE CHANGE

THE municipal sphere is one in which the parties can come into contact with the very largest masses of toilers. In addition to the general social and political offensive of monopolist capital which is conditioned by the development of a general economic crisis, the bourgeoisie are now making an intensified attack on the municipal front: in the economic sector by raising the municipal charges for gas,

water, etc., by raising rents, reducing expenditures on social services, frequently by depriving the municipalities of their financial independence and by transferring municipal enterprises to private capitalist hands; in the political sector by modifying the municipal administrations on fascist lines, by restricting the municipalities' administrative rights, by replacing the municipal elected administrations with governmental nominees having dictatorial

powers. Then an extensive programme of preparations for the imperialist and civil wars is being carried out through the adaptation of the municipal enterprises to the production of war materials, and the increase of assignments for police maintenance, the latter being aimed directly at the great mass of the working class and the mass of non-proletarian middle strata. In such conditions the adoption of a sound municipal policy by the C.P.'s can and must become one of the means of mobilising the toiling masses, and of winning considerable numbers away from the influence of the social and national fascists.

Meantime, whilst in all other spheres of their activity (the T.U. sphere particularly) the C.P.'s have already begun to modify their tactics in accordance with the new stage of the class struggle, in almost every section of the Communist International the municipal sphere has been left not merely without any considerable modification of tactic, but absolutely untouched. Moreover, the municipal work of the C.P.'s is stamped with the impress of practical opportunism, and in all sections of the Comintern it is a refuge for opportunistic elements. One of the most important general political tasks of the C.P.'s is a decisive change in regard to municipal work.

MUNICIPALITIES PART OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE

This decisive change in municipal work must include, as a highly important essential feature, a complete break with social-democratic traditions in the estimate of the rôle of the municipalities. These municipal governments are a component part of the bourgeois state.

"The task of the proletariat consists in breaking the state machinery of the bourgeoisie, in destroying it, and with it the parliamentary institutions, whether they be republican or constitutional monarchy. The same applies to municipal institutions, which theoretically are incorrectly contradistinguished from the state organs. In reality they are equally part of the bourgeois state machinery, which have to be abolished by the revolutionary proletariat and replaced by local councils of workers' deputies." (Resolution of the Comintern Second Congress. "The Communist Parties and Parliamentarism.") Consequently the municipalities cannot be an instrument in the class struggle

of the proletariat. The demand for complete administrative and financial autonomy from the bourgeois government, the attempt to assure the masses that autonomous municipalities can resist the pressure of the financial bourgeoisie, are unsound in principle. For the very reason that the municipalities are a component part of the bourgeois state, the communists cannot put forward such demands as that for "the extension of the rights of local government in correspondence with the interests of the workers and peasants"; or the slogan: "Organs of municipal administration must be forced to work in the interests of the worker and peasant population." Nor can they demand that municipal officials should be placed on an elected basis, or that the activities of the secret police should not transgress into the territory of the municipalities. Because the municipalities are a component part of the bourgeois state the communists reject in principle the municipal budget, unmask its class, bourgeois character, oppose to it the model of the local U.S.S.R. soviet budgets as a pattern for the proletarian budget. In those municipalities where the communists have a majority and get the municipal posts into their hands they draw up a budget, the principle of which is the lightening of the burden of the toilers and the taxation of the bourgeoisie; they put the budget forward for consideration at workers' meetings and meetings of toilers generally, mobilising their electorate for the passing of the budget.

The communists reject the opportunists' attempts to draw a strict line of demarcation between private and state-capitalist enterprises on the one hand, and municipal enterprises on the other. They cannot put forward the demand for workers' control over these latter, or demand that they should actively carry out their tasks as municipal enterprises (i.e., that they should be non-capitalistic). Similarly, because by their very social and economic character the municipal enterprises are capitalistic, the communists cannot either put forward or support the slogan of municipalisation of enterprises ministering to the municipal needs of the population. To do that would be tantamount to objectively assisting the social-democrats in their demagogic ad-

vancement of the slogan of "municipal socialism." At the same time, this attitude on the part of communists is not in contradiction to their voting against transferring municipal enterprises into private capitalist hands, provided it be definitely pointed out that a genuine struggle against the monopolistic tendencies of the bourgeoisie is possible only as a revolutionary struggle.

NO BLOCS WITH SOCIAL-FASCISTS

A decisive change in municipal activities involves first and foremost a resolute struggle against any opportunistic practices in the municipal work of the parties. First and foremost it is necessary to make a decisive break with the practice of co-operation with the social-democrats, which is still not outlived everywhere. Both in the central machinery of the bourgeois state and in the municipal machinery, all distinctions between the municipal activities of the bourgeoisie and those of the social-fascists have been wiped out. In present conditions, when the reformists have become social-fascists, any course for the establishment of a so-called "labour" majority in municipalities, composed of communists and reformists, is an opportunistic course. A workers' majority in the municipalities is possible only in the event of the communist candidates obtaining an absolute majority of seats, or where the majority is made up of communists and non-party workers (and poor peasants) working under the leadership of the communists. The communists can neither support the social-democratic candidates for mayors, nor can they carry on any negotiations to obtain support for communist candidates. In all cases the communist group must put forward their own candidates, and extensively popularise among the masses the programme of activities which is entailed in the work of a mayor, etc. The social-fascist evolution of the social-democrats excludes all possibility of any form of co-operation between the communist and the social-democratic groups in the municipalities. The social-democratic municipal group is a component part of the social-fascist ranks. Any attempt to draw distinctions between the social-democratic municipal groups and the social-democratic national leaders is only an attempt to

find a cover for opportunistic practice in municipal work.

TRIBUNE FOR PROPAGANDA AND AGITATION

The general line of the municipal activities of the C.P.'s is defined by the decisions of the Comintern congress dealing with parliamentary tactics, and particularly by the Second Congress resolution on "The C.P.'s and Parliamentarism."

The communists participate in municipal elections, and put forward their representatives in the municipalities, not in order to "conquer the municipalities." Such a slogan is merely reformistic utopianism. The communists enter the municipalities in order to exploit their tribune for the purpose of the propaganda and agitation of communism, the unmasking of the treacherous activities of the social-fascists, the unmasking of the class nature of the municipalities as a component part of the capitalist state. They enter the municipalities in order to help the masses to conquer their democratic illusions, to show the masses that apart from a struggle for power there cannot be success in the work of realising even the most moderate reforms. It is necessary to realise that the C.P.'s have largely failed to exploit the municipal tribune for these ends. In the overwhelming majority of cases the communist groups in the municipalities display an impermissible passivity during the C.P. political campaigns and mass movements generally. The municipal tribune must be much more utilised for the purpose of communist agitation and propaganda than has been the case hitherto. In every party campaign—against the war danger, against the fascist and social-fascist terror, against mass discharges, for the carrying through of an economic or political strike, etc.—the municipal tribune must be utilised in order to explain the party slogans to the masses, to mobilise the masses in the support of the campaign. The municipal representatives must be the chief agitators of the party, must take the initiative in summoning mass meetings, where, as representatives of the workers and toilers, they must explain their class struggle against the politics of the various parties in the country and the given locality.

CONNECTION BETWEEN MUNICIPAL AND FACTORY WORK

One of the biggest mistakes of the municipal work (and one which is of a clearly opportunistic character) is the separation of that work from the mass work, from the work in the enterprises in particular.

Municipal programmes are as a rule drawn up from above, without discussion at large workers' meetings. The proposals put forward by the groups are not preliminarily discussed at workers' meetings, are not linked up with the party's factory agitation, are not co-ordinated with the work for mobilising the masses into the support of the demands put forward. The municipal groups or mayors do not report to factory meetings. The communist representatives who are working in enterprises do not regard themselves as selected by the workers of the enterprise, and do not mobilise those workers for the support of their activities in the council chamber.

The municipal problems are severed from the factory problems in the everyday agitation of the parties. Factory demands are not put forward during municipal campaigns, and vice versa. Municipal problems are not raised in the factory elections, nor in the factory newspapers.

This severance of the communist group from the enterprises, this split between the municipal and factory work of the C.P.'s, is a chief source engendering opportunistic practice in communal work. One of the definite methods of rendering the work of the communist groups more active, and of carrying out a struggle with opportunism in practice, is to put an end to this insulation of the group from the enterprises. The groups must be obliged to report regularly (and not merely before elections) to factory meetings. During every big move in the chamber they must acquaint the worker masses with the group's proposals, and must mobilise the masses in support of those proposals. The T.U. opposition must include the more important municipal demands in their election programme, and the work of the municipal communist group and their struggle against the bourgeois-social-fascist bloc must be systematically reported in the factory newspapers.

BREAKING DOWN BOURGEOIS LEGALITY

The general line of the C.P.'s municipal tactics must be to break down bourgeois legality; that is the party's slogan in its struggle for the majority in the municipalities. This general line was determined by the Second Congress in its resolution on the tasks of revolutionary parliamentarism.

"In the event of the communists obtaining a majority in municipal institutions they must: (a) constitute a revolutionary opposition to the bourgeois central government; (b) do everything possible to help the poor population (economic measures, the organisation of, or the attempt to organise, an armed workers' militia and so on); (c) lay bare on every possible occasion the obstacles which the bourgeois state government puts in the way of genuine and considerable changes; (d) on this ground must carry on resolute revolutionary propaganda, not fearing a conflict with the state government; (e) in certain circumstances must replace the local organs of self-government by local soviets of workers' deputies. Thus all the work of the Communists in municipal institutions must be part of their work for the disintegration of the capitalist state."

Thus the communists strive to win a majority in the municipalities not for the sake of any "positive work"; not in order to introduce reformist patchwork schemes. They must win this majority in order through their attempts to carry out their election programme (attempts which will lead to the dismissal of the communist mayors, etc.) to tear away the mask of pseudo "popular rights" from the municipal authorities of the bourgeois state, to dispel the masses' democratic illusions, and to show them that outside a struggle for power there are no means of realising even the most modest of immediate demands.

The communists must carry on municipal election campaign by going to the masses with a developed programme of immediate demands. They cannot put forward such immediate demands as would perpetuate the democratic illusions of the masses, or create any illusions as to the possibility of carrying through reforms within the framework of the present-day fascist state. Consequently such demands as that for a state subsidy to municipalities

for social expenditures; for the municipalities to force the capitalists to pay for the expenses incurred by the municipalities in the organisation of social works for the unemployed; for the municipalities to take the initiative in providing land for the peasants with smallholdings; for the land courts to be placed in the hands of the workers and peasantry, etc., are all unsound.

The communists cannot put forward the demand for the restoration of municipal rights which have been taken away by the bourgeoisie in the process of transforming the state into a fascist organ. The communists must reveal the connection between the general process of fusion of the bourgeois democracy into the fascist system and the process of fascising the municipalities; and must call the masses, not backward to the struggle for the municipalities' democratic rights, but forward to the struggle for proletarian democracy, for the soviets.

This propaganda of soviets as the true people's municipal organ must be the answer to the bourgeois and social-fascist measures for fascising the municipalities.

WHAT COMMUNISTS MUST FIGHT

In their struggle to win a majority in the municipalities the communists must mobilise the masses around the following basic tasks of the communist mayors and groups.

1. The leadership of the toilers' struggle against fascism of all kinds, the organisation of proletarian self-defence, ruthless struggle with the fascist and social-fascist shock divisions.

2. The systematic campaign against war. The establishment of links with the rank and file soldiers and sailors in the given locality, and support in all ways to their struggle against the bullying régime.

3. Support to the workers in the economic struggle by means of special assignments to the funds for aiding strikers, the organisation of free meals for the strikers and their families, the organisation of children's playrooms for the children of strikers, and so on.

4. The extensive support of the unemployed by releasing them from payment for municipal services, together with the assignment of special sums for simultaneous assistance;

these to be obtained by raising rents to the large house owners, by the issue of special regulations on the part of the particular municipality in question.

5. The establishment of the class principle in extracting payment for municipal services, the release of the low-paid sections of the workers, ex-service invalids, etc., from payment for these services by raising the charges to bourgeois strata.

6. A ruthless struggle with the exploiting policy of the houseowners. The issue of special regulations. The lowering of rents in the case of the low-paid categories of toilers. The settlement of homeless workers in the empty rooms of houseowners.

7. The introduction of the seven-hour day into municipal enterprises, a two-weeks' holiday per annum, and the payment of social insurance by the municipality.

8. All forms of assistance to the mass organisations of the toilers (sports, free-thinking, etc.) aid to such organisations as the Class War Prisoners' Aid and Workers' International Relief, by the municipalities becoming members of such organisations for workers' solidarity.

9. The establishment of fraternal links with the communes of Soviet Russia, the sending of delegates to become acquainted with the manner in which the Five Year Plan is being put into force, the unmasking of the slanders of the bourgeoisie and its social-fascist servants.

This programme is merely the basis of the C.P.'s municipal programmes. Those programmes ought also to include a number of demands in defence of the interests of the working youth, agricultural workers, poor peasants, invalided ex-service men, etc., to be determined by the definite conditions of each country. But every municipal programme must be so constructed as to ensure, firstly, that the masses should be able to realise that without breaking down bourgeois legality it is impossible to set about the achievement of that programme; secondly, that the programme should not be abandoned for petty sectional demands, that its point—its tactical object of breaking through bourgeois legality—should not be blunted; and thirdly, that simultaneously, the programme should indicate the

maximum municipal demands which the C.P.'s will carry through as the party of the working class on coming to power.

SOVIETS—THE TRUE COMMUNES OF WORKERS
AND PEASANTS

In the conditions of a swiftly developing revolutionary rise, when larger and larger masses of toilers are coming to recognise that without a revolution there is no way out of the threatening catastrophe, the task of the C.P.'s consists in explaining to the masses that only the dictatorship of the proletariat will put an end to the robbery which the bourgeois-social-democratic municipalities (Berlin for instance) are carrying out; will put an end to the orgy of exploitation of the houseowners, the urban landowners and other parasites. The communal activity in the U.S.S.R., the first proletarian state, provides a clear example of proletarian communal policy. The militant task of all C.P.'s in the countries of capitalism is the popularising of this communal policy and its results, contraposing it to the capitalist robber policy (in regard to the working masses) of the bourgeois social-democratic municipalities.

The experience of the U.S.S.R. shows that the proletarian dictatorship:

1. Deprives the old ruling classes and all the parasitic elements of any part whatever in the life of the commune. The municipalities (town and village soviets) are elected by direct vote at factory meetings, meetings of the employees in institutions, craftsmen, housewives, and so on. Every deputy reports to the organisation which has sent him, and can be recalled at any time.

2. The commune-soviets not only enjoy complete administrative and financial independence in their work, but all the nationalised industry of local importance and all the housing possibilities, sub-urban lands, etc., are at their disposition.

3. The victorious proletariat puts an end to the thieving policy of bourgeois landlords. It expropriates the houseowning bourgeoisie, expels them from their bourgeois houses, transferring them to the workers and employees who set up their own organs of house administration (house societies). Only workers and employees are allowed to inhabit the newly-built municipal houses and those of the co-operatives.

4. The victorious proletariat puts an end to the taxation policy of the bourgeois municipalities, their policy of transferring all the municipal burdens on to the toilers. Taxation policy is based upon the class principle as also is the payment for municipal services: a considerable part of the expenditure being charged to the remnants of the bourgeoisie, the highly-paid specialists and members of the free professions, whilst considerably lower rates are charged to the low-paid categories of toilers.

The whole policy of the urban organisation has in view the abolition of the gulf which existed between the bourgeois and workers' districts under capitalism. Consequently the houses, tramways, water supply, drainage, electricity, etc., are almost exclusively organised to supply the workers' districts of the large towns and industrial centres.

5. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R., the communes carry on enormous works for assisting the unemployed and socially uninsured sections of the toilers. As unemployment, unlike that of capitalist countries, is engendered not by industrial over-production but by agrarian redistribution of population, the communes in the U.S.S.R. set up schools and workshops for enabling the unemployed to become skilled workers, carry out great social works, and in addition the unemployed in the U.S.S.R. are almost entirely freed from payment for municipal services.

With aid from the communes the ex-service disabled soldiers, the craftsmen and the blind, set up production co-operatives, which would be destined to the freezing-out process in "democratic" countries.

6. The dictatorship of the proletariat ensures a free health service and education for toilers and their children. Dispensaries and children's homes organised in former bourgeois dwellings; children's schools; an extensive development of the system of prophylactics; free teaching in the elementary, secondary, and higher schools; material help in the teaching of the children of low-paid categories of toilers; the application of the principle of self-government in schools through organisations of parents and pupils, a wide network of technical and industrial schools and courses: these are the characteristic features of activity of the soviet communes in this particular field.

7. The dictatorship of the proletariat puts an end to the monopoly of the bourgeoisie in culture—the theatres, cinemas, museums, art galleries, are transferred to the administration of the commune, with the exception of that part of them which remains in the hands of the central organs). The class principle applied in the utilisation of these aids to culture enables the most backward and low-paid categories of toilers to visit the theatres, museums, etc., and other cultural institutions.

The experience of the U.S.S.R. shows that the dictatorship of the proletariat not only puts an end to the municipal exploitation policy of the bourgeoisie, but creates new socialist towns. The building of a number of socialist towns has already been begun in the Ukraine, the Urals, the Lower Volga, and these herald a new historic stage, not only in the communal activity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but in all the work of socialist construction. In these new socialist towns there will be neither bourgeois nor workers' districts, and the workers in them will not be poisoned by the smoke of the factory chimneys. The housing accommodation and all the town buildings will be built on the principle of collective existence. The C.P.'s must unfold this great programme of construction of the new socialist society to the widest sections of the toilers, making of it a mighty instrument for the mobilisation of the masses into the revolutionary struggle, the struggle for power.

TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST MAYORS

The activities of communist mayors must be considered from the aspect of the above-mentioned tasks. Hitherto this activity as a rule has been carried on on the lines of subjugation to bourgeois legality, on the lines of keeping hold of one's post. This last factor has come to be an end in itself. An end must be put to this opportunistic tactic. It has led to the result that in many cases the party has lost its adherents despite the general leftward trend of the proletariat, and occasionally it has driven the masses into the arms of the reformists; for the masses could not see any difference between the communist and the reformist policy, and preferred to vote for the reformists as being the more influential in the bourgeois state. In this regard an alarm signal was pro-

vided by the recent municipal elections in Saxony, which gave success to the "left-wing" social-fascists and Brandlerites, in the very district where the party's municipal work has been directed by opportunists, where the burgomaster and the party group have carried on a policy of co-operation with the left-wing social-fascists! The opportunistic tactics of a considerable majority of communist burgomasters and mayors has engendered a converse reaction among the revolutionary workers, a tendency to refuse to exploit such positions in the interests of the struggle for the masses. They point out that in the conditions of the third period a bolshevik policy for burgomasters and mayors is impossible, that those who hold such posts inevitably tend to become opportunist, and that consequently the most expedient thing is to refuse to put forward communist candidates for such positions, and to restrict the activity of the communist group to introducing proposals during sittings. That way of overcoming opportunistic practice is an ultra-left capitulation to difficulties. The activity of the communist burgomasters and mayors may become no small factor in the mobilisation of the class activity of the masses, and in a successful struggle for wresting the masses away from social-fascism. To this end, from being opportunist that activity must become revolutionary. Without breaking down bourgeois legality any revolutionary practice on the part of the communist burgomasters, mayors and party groups is unthinkable. The burgomaster or mayor who adopts measures to carry out a class proletarian policy in the sphere of taxation or in the sphere of the budget, in order to aid the unemployed or striking workers; the burgomaster or mayor who adopts measures to organise proletarian self-defence in the struggle with the growing fascist reaction; to help the work of the mass proletarian organisations (International Red Aid, proletarian sports societies, etc.); to help the struggle against the growing war danger, is breaking down bourgeois legality, is snapping the chains of the bourgeoisie's municipal class legislation. The communist burgomaster or mayor has only to put into force those minimum demands which have been put forward in the programme of the Communist Party which has gained an absolute majority in the

particular locality, for the bourgeoisie and social-fascists to raise a howl about the communist terror, and for all the bourgeois class legislation to descend on the communist burgo-master or mayor's head. The bourgeoisie will take every measure to prevent the measures put forward by the communist mayor. They will dissolve the particular municipality, they will arrest their leaders as breakers of the law or as traitors.

The communists must clearly envisage this prospect of a clash between the communist mayors and the bourgeois state. If the party organisations are able to mobilise the toiling masses to the support of the communist mayor in his measures; if in answer to the repressive measures of the bourgeois state the party carries on a campaign for mobilising the masses (demonstrations, strikes of protest and so on) in defence of the communist municipality; if the dispersal of the communist municipality and the arrest of the mayor is utilised for the purpose of a big campaign for unmasking the bourgeois reaction and social-fascism; if the court which has to try the communist mayor is transformed by the latter into a tribune for agitation in favour of communist ideas; then every day of activity of the municipality directed by the communists will see a bigger contribution to the revolutionary class struggle than a whole year of the "legal," "positive" work of the communist burgo-master or mayor.

PRE-REQUISITES FOR A CHANGE

There will be no effective change in the municipal work of the Communist Parties unless two conditions are fulfilled: (1) There must be a radical change in the composition of the groups and the method of their selection; (2) there must be a complete alteration in the party direction of municipal work.

The composition of the communist groups, and the selection of the representatives reflect the opportunistic methods of communist work. In the C.P. of Germany a certain change was effected in connection with the last municipal elections. The lists of candidates were drawn up from above. The party organs made no attempts to submit the lists of communist candidates to the consideration of factory meetings. To a large extent the lists were made

up not of militant, revolutionary workers, who could utilise the municipal tribune for the purpose of unmasking the class character of the activity of the municipalities, for unmasking social-fascism, for linking up the party's municipal work with its factory work, but of party members known to the "population" by their many years' residence in the particular locality, of "specialists" on municipal questions, who could participate in the "positive" activities of the municipality and who knew the municipal laws. The composition of the communist groups was unusually marred by petty bourgeois elements. The developing struggle with the right wingers shows that the communist municipal groups are citadels of right wingers. A disproportionately large part of the members of communist municipal groups went hand in hand with the right wingers. A considerable percentage of the communist burgo-masters in Saxony, Thuringia, the Paris district, etc., left the party or were expelled.

Without adopting resolute and extreme measures the communist party will be unable to free the communist group from the opportunistic pressure. It is necessary in the first place to cleanse the group from those elements which are deliberately carrying on an opportunistic line, and that cleansing must be carried out not from above, but with the participation of the broad party and non-party masses. It is necessary secondly resolutely to change the method of selecting party groups for the forthcoming elections. The backbone of the group must be factory workers (especially those from large enterprises) whose selection must be confirmed at the mass workers' meetings. Instead of choosing "specialists" and "experts," young and active men and women workers must be selected who will know possibly very little about the municipal laws, but who possess one of the fundamental qualities: a revolutionary temper, a bolshevik firmness, and connection with the masses. It is necessary to have a systematic organisation of municipal courses for these new ranks of the municipal active group. In the majority of cases the municipal groups work without any systematic control from the party organs. In a number of sections municipal departments do not as yet exist. In others the municipal departments exist only in certain areas. But

even where, as in Germany, there are municipal departments as an obligatory part of the Party machinery, the Party direction of the municipal work is extremely weak. Frequently the head of the municipal department is the leader of the municipal communist group, and so he controls himself. Reports of communist groups at plenums of the regional committees are almost unknown.

The directing Party press reflects this weakness of the departments. Neither in the mass press nor in the special municipal press (for instance the "Commune" of the C.P.'s of Germany and Czecho-Slovakia) are directions given, nor any criticism made of the opportunistic perversions on municipal work, nor definite material published on the activity of the communist groups and communist mayors.

The first condition for a successful struggle with practical opportunism in this sphere is a new departure in the matter of the Party direction of municipal work. The urgent tasks in this connection are the following: The establishment of authoritative municipal departments in the C.C. and in the districts; the bringing in of steadfast, revolutionary, active workers, uncontaminated by municipal illusions, to these departments; the transformation of the municipal journals into militant organs of Party direction of municipal work—organs ruthlessly disclosing and criticising the facts of opportunism in practice; the assignment to these journals of steadfast worker-communists, connected with the masses, as municipal (local) editors, who shall be capable of transforming the local parts of the newspapers from being a mere summary of boring and politically emasculated notes into militant sections, revealing the connection between the general class struggle and the fight on the

municipal front, and aiding the communist groups to mobilise the masses in support of their demands.

AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

The change in the Party's municipal work will evoke from the opportunist, passive elements of the Party no less, but probably much greater, resistance than the change in the T.U. tactic proclaimed by the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. A revolt of these opportunist elements, which have escaped being eliminated during the first general settlement with the right-wing opportunists, is not only probable, but absolutely inevitable. A number of communist burgomasters and mayors will be in the foremost ranks of these rebellious opportunists.

The communist parties not only must not yield ground in carrying through the municipal tactic, but on the contrary must utilise the fact of this revolt in order to mobilise the Party masses against them, to unmask the social-democratic nature of these opportunists to the whole of the working class, and in the last resort to throw out of the Party those of them who continue to struggle against the Party line.

At the present time many of the communist groups and burgomasters are not forces of struggle for the masses, but a hindrance to that struggle. The sooner the Party puts an end to this opportunistic practice, the sooner will the municipal work become one of the important factors in the struggle for the masses.

For a bolshevik municipal work! That is the slogan which the Communist Parties must adopt when mobilising the great mass of the Party for the task of carrying through the new line.

The Economic Crisis in Latin America and the tasks of the Communist Parties

M. Garlandi

A DETAILED study of the economic crisis in the Latin-American countries enables one to establish characteristic features common to these countries. It is very important for us to emphasise the common

features, as it will permit us to get a better understanding of the political situation in South America, and consequently what our policy should be in these countries.

The special reports on the economic situation

in Latin America which are at our disposal show us (although the said reports are not always complete and accurate) that during the last two or three years there has commenced in Latin America a period of economic crises, which are proceeding with a varying degree of intensity and at a varying tempo in the different countries. We now observe the first symptoms of crisis in Chile and Venezuela, depression in other countries, and a very intensive and rapidly developing crisis in Brazil, Columbia, and Mexico.

From a general standpoint, viewing the position in all the countries of the Continent as a whole, it may be said that the organic basis of the crisis is the rapid colonisation of these countries. The typical feature in agriculture is the cultivation of one single product of one kind or another. In many cases the entire economic life of the country depends upon the production of one single product.

Thus, one might look upon the countries of South America as huge factories—Cuba producing sugar, Venezuela oil, Brazil and Colombia coffee, Equador cocoa, the Argentine wheat, Uruguay meat, Bolivia tin, Chile nitrogenous compounds, etc. It is precisely in this typical peculiarity that the causes connecting these countries with the development of world crises are to be sought.

The 1914-1918 war helped the development of production in the Latin American countries, which became big purveyors to the imperialist armies. After the war an increase in the output of certain industrial products of agriculture (rubber, cotton, etc.) was to be observed. This rapid development of agricultural production is explained by the favourable conditions arising from the rapid development of technique and the growth of capitalistic forms of production introduced by the imperialists. As these forms of production develop the contradictions grow between them and the régime of big landed proprietorship connected with feudalism and slavery.

The countries of Latin America are dependent upon the big imperialist countries, and are becoming more and more rapidly transformed into spheres of struggles between Great Britain and the United States, which are rivals for the natural riches and internal markets of these countries.

Each imperialism, in endeavouring to gain possession of the rich resources and markets of Latin America, strives to obstruct the industrialisation of these countries. Iron from the deposits of Brazil is exported to England, and then imported back to Brazil in the form of machinery. Nevertheless, the process of industrial development is observable in South America—(1) in the exploitation of natural riches, (2) in the development of the manufacturing industries, and especially in the industries supplying mass-consumption goods (as, for instance, the textile and boot and shoe industries, etc.) which are either owned or controlled by foreign capitalists. This industrial development creates and strengthens the proletariat, and we must emphasise this in pointing out the typical features in the economics of Latin America. This does not mean that decolonisation is taking place in the Latin American countries. On the contrary, even those branches of industry which do not belong to foreign industrialists are connected with foreign finance capital, which dominates in the economic life of Latin America.

THE TWO CHIEF RIVALS.

Thus, the connection between the economy of the Latin American countries and the big imperialist powers brings sharply into collision with one another the interests of the two biggest imperialist powers which are struggling for monopoly in the basic economic positions in Latin America. This struggle between Great Britain and the United States assumed an extremely exacerbated form after the war. United States imperialism undertook an offensive against the hegemony of Great Britain, increased her investments in South America five or sixfold, and started a fierce fight to oust England from the positions she had occupied in the various countries. But it would be erroneous to think that the U.S.A. has beaten England in this "peaceful" struggle. The struggle between the U.S.A. and Great Britain in the Latin American countries is but one sector of the world struggle between these two imperialist powers. And there is nothing "pacific" about this struggle. It is characterised by a whole epoch of *revolutions and wars* in Latin America. At the same time, the so-called "peaceful penetration" of the United

States into South America means an intensification of the class struggle, a struggle among dominating groups, continual risings of various groups of the ruling classes—risings in which the blood of the working masses is spilt (since this struggle is always conducted at the expense of millions of workers and peasants). All this means starvation, poverty, slavery.

This struggle between British and United States imperialism explains all the phenomena of political life in the South American countries during recent years. The imperialist powers set the countries of Latin America at one another's throats, and purchase, in the form of concessions, territories larger than certain European countries (such, for example, is the Ford concession in Brazil, in the Amazon State, and the Minea-Jerias State). They also buy over the State officials. By means of loans to the various States, the imperialists take in hand the organisation of taxes and customs duties, seize railways, and so on, and in this manner also purchase the governments of these countries. As a result, all elections reflect the struggle between the imperialists. All conflicts existing in the bourgeois camp correspond to the conflicts between the imperialists.

This fundamental characteristic of the economics of Latin America explains the nature of the crisis that has commenced simultaneously with the crisis of world over-production. The fall in the prices of cotton, rubber, and cocoa, the complete failure of the policy of raising the prices of coffee in Brazil (which only worsened the crisis of South American coffee producers) are real economic catastrophes.

Owing to the fact that in the main these countries produce one single product, the crisis affecting this one product causes a general economic crisis in the country. This, in turn, leads to an ever-increasing deficit in the trade balance, disturbs the equilibrium of the State budget, and creates a financial situation that shakes the entire economic position. To this must be added yet another circumstance that holds back these States still more, and makes the picture quite catastrophic—the fact that many South American countries import large quantities of food products from abroad. Mexico, for example, imports about 40 to 50 per cent. of the food products con-

sumed by her population; the Caribbean and Antillian islands also import a large proportion. This increases the dependency of Latin America upon the big imperialist powers.

UNEMPLOYMENT FAST INCREASING.

The social consequences, to which the Latin American parties should devote their attention, are now reflected particularly in unemployment. There are no figures for unemployment in these countries, but data exists which shows beyond doubt that unemployment in South America is increasing at an ever-quickening rate. In Brazil, Mexico, and Columbia unemployment is growing steadily. Thousands of workers are being dismissed from production and the plantations. It is true, in many of these countries, there is seasonal unemployment. In Cuba such unemployment has "normally" prevailed for two or three years. This form of unemployment is to a considerable extent connected with the system of producing one single product, and is a cause of the impoverishment of millions of workers in South America. But when we speak of unemployment as a *new* phenomenon we should not fix our attention on this "normal" side of the economic and social life of Latin America. We must emphasise the new character of unemployment, which is a consequence of the new economic crisis in Latin America.

The ruling classes of these countries, representing as they do the interests of the big imperialist powers, are conscious of the danger of the increasing unemployment. The owners of plantations in certain countries have already tried to take steps to prevent the growing unemployment leading to serious political action. Thus, big plantation owners in Brazil decreased wages by 40 per cent., while at the same time making certain concessions to the workers, who were allowed to sow maize, beans, etc.

The nature of the unemployment arises out of the very nature of the crisis, and for this reason its cure is very doubtful. The level of unemployment in such a situation, while it will undergo certain changes, will in general rise. But it will not be identical in all countries of South America (in Nicaragua, for example,

where work on the canal has already commenced, and where public works may be created).

EFFECTS OF THE CRISIS IN THE U.S.A.

How has the crisis in the United States been reflected on Latin America? Sufficient time has not yet elapsed to permit us to cite facts, experiences, or documents. But after a study of the crisis in Latin America which preceded the New York crash, taking into consideration the typical features of the *world* crisis, one can point out the general character of the consequences the U.S. crisis will have in South America. We shall be able to see how the American crisis is a part of the crisis which was already to be observed in nearly all countries of Latin America.

One can, above all, assert that the *American Crisis will intensify the Anglo-American struggle in Latin America*. The U.S.A., as Hoover has stated, proposes a new course in the policy of economic expansion. Hoover declared that they should export capital for public works and also goods, but should abandon the policy of subsidising foreign industries, since that gives rise to competition. It is quite evident that that programme will be applied to South America, and will increase the antagonisms among the imperialists. One may foresee that the plan to establish American enterprises close to the markets will continue to be carried out in the future.

The export of capital for public works is a measure whereby the U.S.A. is trying to oust Great Britain from her positions, and at the same time is securing domination in those countries which she is "assisting." Look what is taking place in Columbia, for example. During the past two years the U.S.A. has granted loans to Columbia; now she is not giving any more loans, and is making use of this to bring pressure to bear on the government. The election campaign is really a fight between the United States and England. Tendencies have already revealed themselves which very plainly insist upon the necessity for Columbia to become a part of the great American machine (*e.g.*, the article of the Candidate Valencia).

Simultaneously with the export of capital, there will also be exported the necessary mate-

rials for the construction of roads and railways, automobiles, railway equipment, etc. This policy may give a certain momentary relief to the Latin American countries in an acute period of crisis; but, at the same time, countries demanding loans, which thus connect themselves with British and American capital, will have to give a guarantee—a deposit. The crisis, instead of being alleviated, will become still more grave.

But the crisis is also fraught with obstacles to the development of the American (and British) policy of exporting machinery. The agrarian crisis in South America is contracting the market for agricultural machinery. On the other hand, the raising of customs tariffs in the U.S.A. hinders exports to the American market from certain southern countries, and, as a result, decreases the purchase of American products on the part of these countries.

The American customs tariffs have driven the Argentine over to the side of the Abernon Treaty. And here we have yet another factor in the Anglo-American struggle in Latin America. This struggle will help to raise the customs tariffs (and will lead to an increase in the cost of living) even among South American countries.

We have already alluded to an agrarian crisis connected both with the productive periods in the tropics and with the world crisis. It confronts the landowners face to face as an immediate question, with the problem of lowering the cost of production—*i.e.*, the question of lowering wages.

PERSPECTIVES OF CONFLICT.

The political perspectives of the crisis point to the development of the political fight and an accentuation of the class struggle: the struggle between the dominating cliques connected with one or the other of the imperialist powers, and the struggle of the workers and peasants against the capitalists and landowners. We shall witness yet further waves of state revolutions in the countries of Latin America. We shall see further military risings, the struggle between states, governmental upheavals.

It is necessary always to bear in mind the rôle of the imperialists in Latin America, for it determines the nature of the political

struggle in all these countries and the struggle among the ruling groups.

Brazil, for example, which is a country of immense size, embraces states which are fighting one against the other. Minea Terceas, which is a territory containing iron, manganese, and gold properties belonging to the U.S.A., fights the State of San Paolo, which produces coffee and is in British hands. The electoral struggle in the campaign for the presidential elections revolves round these two big Brazilian states. In the Argentine the U.S.A. is purchasing electricity undertakings in the State of Mendoza, and is endeavouring to buy railways.

Of recent years a new and powerful factor has arisen in the political life of the Latin American countries. This is the revolutionary struggle of the masses against imperialism, against the big landed proprietors, against the national bourgeoisie. This new element in the South American situation signifies that the working masses, the masses of land workers and poor peasants, have begun to play an *independent* rôle in political life. This new element is already alarming the imperialists, and those groups which are ruling the various states on their behalf. As a result of the movement of the masses, we can also observe the extension of the fascist dictatorship and the rapid fascisation of the "democratic" states. The process of fascisation is not everywhere the same. The young Mexican democracy has very rapidly evolved towards fascism. The fascisation of the Argentine democracy and of the "Garibaldian" democracy in Uruguay has (for economic and historical reasons) proceeded at a slower pace. We must consider all these phenomena in the scope of the economic and political crisis. It is quite evident that the world crisis deepens the crisis in the colonies and semi-colonies, and that, confronted with political crisis and intensified class struggle in the metropolis, the ruling classes are compelled to assert special pressure on the countries that serve as their economic reservoirs. Hence a closer contact should be established between the toiling masses of the metropolis and the exploited masses of the colonies and semi-colonies.

THE MATURING REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.

The economic crisis helps to mature the revolutionary movement. In certain countries in South America there are already symptoms of an approaching revolutionary situation. In some countries (Brazil, Columbia) the revolutionary crisis is growing rapidly. What are the problems, then, confronting the communist parties of South America? The central problem of all is that of the agrarian revolution. Yet there is *not one* communist party in Latin America that has an agrarian programme, and if any of them does happen to have an agrarian policy it is, unfortunately, incorrect. Without further delay a study should be made of agrarian policy in all South American countries. Without a correct agrarian programme and policy there can be no victorious revolution of the masses of Latin America.

Furthermore, the struggle against imperialism is not waged with sufficient energy and persistence. According to the latest information received from Columbia, for example, one cannot say that the Columbian comrades have properly understood the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the exploited masses against imperialism. Since the Sixth World Congress, instead of putting an end to the existence of separate groupings within the party, these groupings have literally lined up in accordance with the political policies of the various ruling groups in Columbia. There has even taken place a certain bargaining by these groups with the agents of American policy in Columbia. The fight against imperialism is thus a most important current task that needs sharply emphasising.

The next problem is that of the *independence of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle*. We have frequently had occasion to consider the question of the position and tasks of our parties in the various Latin American countries. In general our comrades do not understand the significance of the independent rôle of the communist parties in the revolutionary struggle. They do not understand how it is necessary to establish the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary fight against imperialism, in the fight for the agrarian revolution, etc.

It is precisely for this reason that erroneous conceptions have arisen within the parties concerning the forms of mutual relationship between the working class and the peasantry, and that big political mistakes have been committed, which have already been pointed out in the practice of various parties.

WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' ALLIANCE.

The Latin American comrades in general have not understood that the question of the workers' and peasants' alliance is the most outstanding problem of the party's agrarian and peasant policy. They say: "We have our own respective policies, but we act together because we have to fight the same enemy." They do not see that the revolutionary policy which ought to be carried out in the countryside against the big landowners, against feudalism, against imperialism—this is the policy of the party and of the revolutionary proletariat. It is just by those means that the proletariat can take the lead of the mass struggle against the landowners, the "national" bourgeoisie, and imperialism. In some places attempts are being made to fill up this gap in agrarian policy by organisational forms. Organisational questions are, of course, of great significance, but they cannot be made a *substitute* for Party policy.

The proletariat has to establish organisational contact with the peasantry. We have already shown the forms whereby the proletariat and the communist parties which lead it can win leading positions in the peasant mass struggle, and can lead these masses by their programme and activity (committees of struggle in the country, workers' and peasants' congresses, under definite conditions, etc.).

In Mexico and Brazil the organisation of mutual relations between the workers and peasants has taken the form of a second party—the Workers' and Peasants' Party—behind which the genuine physiognomy of the communist party has disappeared. This policy should be corrected. It is a result of ideological and political weakness, and has already led to serious political consequences.

The estimation of the situation, finally, must be connected on the one hand with the relations

between the proletariat and its party, and on the other hand its relations between the proletariat and the urban radical petty-bourgeoisie. Here also it is a question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle. We have already seen, after quite a number of experiences in Mexico, Chile, Brazil, etc., that in Latin America the "revolutionary" petty bourgeoisie is not capable of carrying through the bourgeois-democratic revolution and of fighting consistently against imperialism. We have experiences which can be utilised for other countries of South America. In particular, attention should be given to the example of Mexico. This experience has significance for all countries, but particularly for those of Latin America, in which there still exist illusions as to the policy of the "revolutionary" bourgeoisie.

DEPRIVE THE PETIT BOURGEOISIE OF THEIR LEADING ROLE.

Fortunately, there are neither social-democratic parties nor social-democratic traditions in South America, with the exception of the Argentine. The workers' movement has developed side by side with the communist parties. But all kinds of labour, "socialist," or reformist (it matters not what name) movements might spring up during the period of the development of revolutionary class encounters, and of our communist parties. There may be formed reformist, labour, or even "national-communist" parties, as in Mexico.

But even if this does happen, as it will take place in a period of sharpened capitalist antagonisms and class struggle, a period when new revolutions and new wars will be ripening, reformism will not represent any great danger for us. This, of course, always provided that we maintain a correct line in the struggle, provided that we attain ideological clarity, and that we deprive the petty bourgeoisie of their "leading" rôle while utilising those strata of the petty-bourgeoisie who really desire to fight against the landowners, the imperialists, and their lackeys.

In order to strengthen the communist parties it is necessary in the first place to improve their social composition. From the social point of view the composition of our South American

parties is very defective. The political influence of the petty-bourgeoisie is very great. Ideologically and politically the petty-bourgeoisie plays too great a rôle. We need not allude to the more backward parties from the ideological and political standpoint—such as the Communist Party of Columbia, Ecuador, etc. But if we take even such a party as the Communist Party of Argentine, here also we find factors which are far from encouraging from the point of view of proletarian revolutionary ideology and policy.

MASS MOVEMENTS OF 1929.

In 1929 big movements of the masses were to be observed. These movements were often spontaneous, but there were also others led by our organisations. There were big movements in Mexico; strikes in Venezuela, marked by the intervention of police and troops; 1st of May demonstrations in Cuba; strikes in Columbia; a rising of Indians in Ecuador; a strike of 15,000 miners on American undertakings in Peru; turbulent and frequent strikes in the Argentine; strikes in Uruguay; spontaneous strikes in Brazil; anti-war demonstrations in Paraguay. There were big demonstrations on August 1st, and particularly on August 23rd.

These movements, which were accompanied by police repression, enable us to judge as to the strength and political capacity of our parties. In criticising these movements we have to admit that there is a certain crisis in our movements—in our parties and in our trade-union organisations.

First and foremost we have to place on record that in 1929 we saw the defeat (from the standpoint of the development of events) of the revolutionary movement in Mexico. From that moment there commenced the transformation of the Mexican party, a transformation which will still continue for some time to come. The Mexican Communist Party, in its present form, is not the Party to lead the masses to the victorious revolution of the workers and peasants. We have also lost the Peasant League.

In 1929 we lost control over the trade unions in Brazil and Equador. In Chile, in Cuba, in Peru, in Paraguay, the movement was dis-

organised by the reaction. We saw liquidatory tendencies germinate in all the Parties. This also was connected with the crisis, as well as with the results of political repression. In Chile, Columbia, Peru, and Paraguay the existing liquidatory tendencies were more or less condemned by our parties: such tendencies were not always quite clearly defined. They were merely the first steps towards communist cleansing and the Bolshevisation. The elements that have commenced to leave our Parties are those petty bourgeois who come to us during the period of formation of our Parties, as a consequence of the intensified crisis and of the inspiring event of seizure of power by the Russian proletariat. The first groups of the petty bourgeoisie are leaving us. Other groups will leave us as the struggle develops further.

THE NEW LINE.

During recent months there has commenced talk about a "new line" in our Parties in South America. It should be made quite clear what this alludes to. The formula "new line" is peculiar. Actually it was the Rights who asserted that since the VIth Congress the Comintern had taken a new line, had revised the decisions of this congress, etc. The content of this "new line" must therefore be properly established.

We do not wish to labour the analysis of this formula, but it seems to us that if no explanation at all is given, this will not be of help in distinguishing opportunism from the correct line. The carrying out of the respective international decisions must be reviewed. Thus, for example, mass work, "the winning of the majority" in the economic and political struggle (which is precisely the meaning of the Xth Plenum decisions) must be in the forefront of the "new course." But what are our successes in this direction in South America? We have often spoken, for example, of the auxiliary organisations in Latin countries (in fact this was the matter dealt with from the beginning of the discussion concerning August 1st and August 23rd) and have found that these organisations, in general, are extremely weak. Self-criticism should help us to perceive our weaknesses. What has been done by the League against imperialism? And in particular, what is our position in the trade

unions? Even in the Argentine, we remain stationary.

What have we done to organise Committees of Action? The objective conditions are favourable for the organisation of the struggle and for the capture of the leadership of the masses. We have not yet much experience in this sphere, because we have not yet moved forward.

As to work in the peasant organisations—this is practically non-existent.

In conclusion it seems to us that we cannot expect much progress in the political development of our Latin American Parties, and not much increase in their capability in the face of the coming big political mass movements, if we do not, along with the other tasks, apply ourselves to the task of ideologically developing our Parties, of training our Party workers. It has been said that our Parties in Latin America will be formed in the process of great struggle. That is correct. Struggle is the best schooling. But this is only on condition that our parties are under the direction of centres which are ideologically and politically stable. It must be said that at present the leading elements in our Latin American parties are composed of intellectuals who are bearers of petty-bourgeois psychology.

BRING WORKERS INTO THE LEADERSHIP.

We are not opening an attack on intellectuals. That is not the question. But what participation of workers is there in the party leadership and in the working out of the lead?

If there is a majority of workers in the party, and if the workers do not participate in the actual political leadership, they are there merely as spectators in the gallery. Under such conditions one could always expect that some Brandao would dictate the ideology and political line of the party. There are not only Brandaos in Brazil. These Brandaos are to be found in all the Latin American countries, and they are one of the chief causes of the fact that these parties do not always find the correct political line.

To bring success to our South American parties it is necessary to strengthen the direct control by the Comintern and its organs. There must be a strict watch to see that leads are carried out, and the parties must be assisted in achieving the highest quality in their political work. They must be helped to utilise the opportunities presented by the economic crisis for winning the majority of the proletariat and for acquiring influence over the main strata of the peasants.

We are approaching great struggles. In these fights against feudalism, imperialism, and the national bourgeoisie the proletariat of Latin America will assume the leadership of big masses of toilers: will overthrow the existing order, and set up an anti-imperialist Federation of Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Republics of Latin America. But this will only be done if they are led by communist parties armed with a clear and decisive policy and the will to struggle.

Decaying Capitalism and the Fascisation of the Bourgeois State

By A. Martinov

THE fact that, in connection with the fascisation in the social-democratic parties. fascist tendency, which is at the very basis of decaying monopolistic capitalism had not yet been stated that the qualitative itself, the social-democratic has been transformed into a social-fascist party, has difficulty penetrated into the consciousness of our parties.

The new course taken by the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., under the slogan of "Class against class," was a timely reaction to the

But it was only a new practical position. It had not yet been stated that the qualitative changes in social-democracy connoted its transformation into social-fascism. The Sixth Comintern Congress took a step forward. The characterisation of the "third period" given by that congress provided the key to the theoretical basis of the fascisation of the bourgeois states and the social-democratic parties.

None the less, even the Sixth Congress resolution still talked only of the "embryos" of social-fascism and the general "tendencies" towards the fascisation of the state. Only the E.C.C.I. Tenth Plenum definitely established that fascism is becoming a universal method of bourgeois domination, that "the special form of fascism in countries with strong social-democratic parties is social-fascism," and that "special attention needs to be directed to an intensification of the struggle against the "left wing" of social democracy, which is restraining the process of decline in social-democracy by spreading illusions as to the opposition nature of that wing to the policy of the leading social-democratic organs, but which in reality supports the policy of social-fascism in all ways."

The question was raised definitely only at the Tenth Plenum, for two reasons. In the first place, the process of fascisation of the state unfolded only by degrees, and grew especially strong only during the last two years. Secondly, after the close of the war a certain historical zigzag occurred, which led the thought of many comrades along a complex trail. That zigzag was expressed in the fact that after the war it was in the foremost capitalist countries that the capitalist system was saved from the proletarian revolution by the treacherous social-democrats under the flag of "pure democracy." But after Italy fascist coups began in the backward countries; and those coups were accomplished in the "classic" countries of fascism (Italy, Poland), through the medium of the national fascists.

The cause of this historic zig-zag we shall explain later. We now note that from this zig-zag certain comrades (Radek and those who thought with him) in 1922-23 made the opportunistic conclusion that fascism can set its roots in agrarian Bavaria or Italy, but by no means in industrial Prussia, a conclusion which was logically bound up with the whole system of fatal errors committed by the opportunistic Brandlerite leadership in 1923. We further note that owing to this same historic zig-zag even at the Comintern Sixth Congress the majority of the members of the programme commission (with the exception of the German delegates and those of the Polish "minority") were disposed to contradistinguishing the Italian

and Polish fascism from that manifestation of fascism which was to be observed in the leading capitalist countries, and which they proposed to call simply bourgeois "reaction." Finally, after the E.C.C.I. Tenth Plenum, when the picture was completely clear, the right-wing renegades and conciliators took this same historical zig-zag as their justification when arguing that no qualitative changes had occurred in social-democracy, that it was impossible to confuse the social-democrats with the fascists, that it was not permissible to call every counter-revolutionary a fascist, and that consequently we had no justification whatever for changing our tactics in relation to the social-democrats, inasmuch as throughout the whole of the post-war period they had been equally counter-revolutionary. Here a complex theory was pursuing an obviously opportunistic end.

* * *

Now the picture is absolutely clear to all who use their eyes: fascism is not a local but an international phenomenon, and it is rooted in the very nature of decaying monopolistic capitalism.

The social-democrats, and the right-wing deviators after them, declare that monopolistic capitalism is being transformed into "organised capitalism." The social-democrats go further. They maintain that it is being transformed into "socialism." Lenin opposed this charming little idyll by another prospect: "In reality imperialism is not reconstructing and cannot reconstruct capitalism from top to bottom. Imperialism renders the antagonisms of capitalism more complex and acute. It is this very combination of the two opposing 'elements' of competition and monopoly which is essential to imperialism. It is that which prepares its break-up, i.e., the socialist revolution." The bourgeoisie realise that they are menaced with this prospect. Consequently, in order to avoid the "smash," they attempt by force to overcome the internal and external antagonisms of monopolistic capitalism, on a national scale by fascist methods, on the international scale by the methods of imperialist wars.

These social and economic contradictions of decaying monopolistic capitalism found a poli-

tical expression first and foremost in the decline of parliamentarism.

In the resolution of the Comintern Second Congress we read: "The attitude of the Third International to parliamentarism is determined not by a new doctrine but by the modification of the rôle of parliamentarism itself. In the past historical epoch parliament as an instrument of developing capitalism did in a certain sense accomplish an historically progressive work." This applies particularly to the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, and then to the liberal era when parliament was one of the bourgeoisie's weapons of struggle against the survivals of feudalism. Then came a period, in the second half of the nineteenth century, when the bourgeoisie were enabled out of their super-profits to throw certain crumbs to the working class and to nourish quite large sections of the labour aristocracy. At that time the proletariat could utilise parliament as a tribune for the criticism of the capitalism system and the bourgeois parties, and at the same time could utilise it also at certain times as an arena for the "struggle for reforms." Simultaneously the bourgeoisie also could utilise, and did, successfully utilise parliament for the consolidation of their own hegemony, for the "mitigation of class conflicts," for the extension of reformist and parliamentary illusions among the proletariat. And this period passed with the oncoming of the imperialist epoch, as "the situation of the working class began to grow absolutely worse." Consequently, parliament lost its significance to a large extent for the proletariat, as also for the bourgeoisie.

On this question the resolution of the Second Comintern congress which we have already quoted says: "At the present time parliament cannot under any circumstances be to the Communists an arena of struggle for reforms, for the improvement of the situation of the working class, as happened certain times in the last epoch. The central importance of political life has entirely and finally passed outside parliament!" This does not mean that parliament has already everywhere lost all importance. The proletariat can still utilise it as a revolutionary tribune, but that is all. To the bourgeoisie of many countries it is still necessary and useful up to a point, as a screen concealing their open force, as we see even by the

example of the miserable and impotent Seym of fascist Poland. The same resolution says of parliament's present functions: "In present-day conditions of unbridled imperialism, parliament has been transformed into one of the instruments of lying, deception, force and enfeebling phrase-mongering in face of the imperialistic ravages, spoliations, violence, robbery and devastation; parliamentary reforms, deprived of any systematic quality, of stability and plan, are losing all practical importance to the toiling masses." This was written in the resolution of the Second Congress in 1920, when social democracy and the bourgeoisie of the foremost European countries were still covering themselves with the figleaf of "pure democracy" for the sake of the suppression of the proletarian revolutionary movement, and when, correspondingly, they were forced to make certain temporary, partial concessions to the working class. But now there can be no talk even of parliamentary reforms "deprived of any systematic quality." Now parliamentary reforms have the sole aim of depriving the proletariat of the last remnants of the winnings of the first post-war period.

Thus "the central importance of political life has entirely and finally passed outside parliament." But where has the monopolistic capital ruling in the modern capitalist countries transferred the central importance of its political activity? Having subjected directly to itself the entire machinery of the executive powers of the state — whether financial, police, war, or diplomatic (partly on the basis of personal union or personal bribery), and having subjected to itself also directly, the entire machinery of certain mass parties and organisations of national-fascist parties connected predominantly with the petty bourgeoisie, and also the social-fascist parties and trade unions connected with the workers, which parties have fused with the trusts and the state, monopolistic capital is with their aid carrying out its imperialistic brigand policy.

Such attempts to overcome by violence the contradictions of decaying monopolistic capitalism, and such direct utilisation by monopolistic capital behind the backs of the parliamentary praters or under their cloak, with their blessing or without it, of the machinery

of the executive powers of the state and the machinery of the national and social-fascist parties and organisations and the social demagoguery peculiar to each of these parties for the purpose of carrying out its imperialist policy, for the preparation of imperialist wars, for the struggle with its competitors, for the smothering of the colonial peoples, for the plundering of the toiling masses, for enchaining the forces of the working class with talk about "industrial peace," for the removal of the workers' political rights, for the violent suppression of their movement, for their terrorisation, for a maniacal slandering of the communists and the U.S.S.R., for preparations for their annihilation—all this is nothing but the fascisation of the State.

* * *

If, now that it is quite clear whither monopolistic capitalism is going, we glance back over its past, we become convinced that its road to fascism was laid down from its very first steps.

When Kautsky was still fighting with revisionism, in 1902, in his book on "The Social Revolution," he deduced a general decline of parliamentarism. This decline of parliamentarism and plans for the abolition of universal suffrage (in Germany), the transference of trust capital to an offensive against the proletariat on a wide front, the feverish preparations for war, the ideological enslavement to trustified capital of the labour aristocracy and the trade union bureaucracy, were all harbingers of the epoch of wars and revolutions, and simultaneously elements engendering fascism. Parallel with this, elements of social-fascism were engendered in the ranks of social-democracy. They were to be sought in the following features. At the very period when the increase in wages had come to a halt and a strong rise in the cost of living had begun, at the very time when a wide offensive on the working class had begun, when attacks on parliamentarism had been initiated, when, on the other hand, gigantic mass strikes had broken out in Britain, when revolutionary demonstrations had developed in Germany, and the question of a mass revolutionary strike was in the air, at that very moment the German trade unions began to talk of "overcoming" the absolut-

ism of the employers, of the possibility under capitalism of a gradual increase even of the relative (!) proportion of wages in the cost of production, and of the wage agreement being a "bit of socialism." At that very time the "centrists" in the social-democratic party crystallised and entered into a bloc with the reformists against the left-wing radicals.

During the war, from 1914 to 1918, monopolistic capitalism took another step forward in the direction of fascism. The open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the virtual abolition of parliamentarism, even in such a country as Britain, the unusual strengthening of the state machinery of oppression, the elimination of the class struggle, the conclusion of "civil peace" between the social-democrats and the bourgeoisie in the interests of the successful prosecution of the brigand imperialist war, the establishment of war state capitalism, the establishment of stocktaking and control over production and distribution for the same end—what did all this mean if not the fascisation of the state? The state capitalism of that time was not "organised capitalism," but an extraordinary system of measures in order to save the country from the economic chaos and ruin evoked by the war, and in order to harness the working class to the war chariot. In his article on "The Produce Tax" Lenin wrote: "You see that state monopolistic capitalism in a really revolutionarily democratic state inevitably, infallibly connotes a step towards socialism," and certain opportunists endeavoured to interpret this pronouncement in the sense of a theory of "organised capitalism." But here Lenin definitely said that war state capitalism can connote a "step towards socialism" only under one condition—that the war shall directly end in a victorious revolution ("a really revolutionarily democratic state"). But, as in all countries except Russia, it led directly, not to the victory of the revolution, but so far only to the break-up of capitalism, war state capitalism was in fact a step towards fascism, and consequently it is still extolled by the fascists (the German Stahlhelm, for instance).

When a severe revolutionary crisis broke out in Europe after the war the bourgeoisie saved itself from a proletarian revolution by two roads: in the foremost European countries

under the flag of "pure democracy," in a number of backward countries by fascist coups. What was the explanation of this historical zigzag, of which we have already spoken? On sound consideration it merely confirms that there is the closest connection and a complete parallelism between the fates of fascism and the fates of imperialism.

In the foremost capitalist countries which began the imperialist war, fascism in the first post-war years did not play any large part, for the simple reason that imperialism itself during those years was strongly shaken or broken in those countries.

For the very reason that imperialism in Germany and Austria, in which there were still vestiges of feudalism, were temporarily shattered, in those countries capitalism was saved from the proletarian revolution by the treacherous social-democrats under the slogan of a bourgeois democratic revolution (although social-democracy sabotaged the latter by all means in its power). Just because in Britain and France—in the countries of long-standing democracy — during the first post-war years militant imperialism was compromised in the eyes of large sections of the masses, the suppression of the revolutionary worker masses in those countries could only be accomplished under the slogan of "pacifism" (the League of Nations) and "pure democracy." Just because the bourgeoisie was tremendously weakened in all these countries, it was forced at first to hide behind the curtain of "pure democracy." Lenin explained this at the Third Congress of the Comintern.

For the imperialism of the foremost capitalist countries which had begun the war, the curtain of "pure democracy" was, after the war, a kind of "N.E.P.," a retreat in order to get a better jump.

* * *

The situation was different in such backward countries as Italy and Poland. There imperialism could not be compromised in the eyes of the masses after the war, for it did not as yet exist there. In Italy before the war existed only "the imperialism of paupers," as Lenin expressed it. At the beginning of the war the majority of the Italian bourgeoisie and social-democrats took up a neutral position. After the war Italy was robbed of its share in the

spoils of victory. True imperialism only made its appearance with the coming of the fascists to power. As for Poland, before the war it did not even exist as an independent state.

During the post-war crisis it was not imperialism but the régime of parliamentary democracy which was compromised in the eyes of the masses.

A serious crisis overtook Italy after the war. If a genuinely Bolshevik Communist Party had been in existence that crisis might have been settled by a victorious proletarian revolution. But the Italian Communist Party was not yet mature, it was fragmentary, and had not been cut free of the navel of social-democracy. Consequently Italy's fate at that time was in the hands of the parliamentary parties—the Giolitti party and the socialists—and they displayed the greatest impotence in face of the crisis.

At the beginning of the war the Giolittians, who were in government, and also the socialists, maintained a neutral attitude. When a profound revolutionary crisis set in after the war, the centrist Italian socialist party did not have the "manhood" to struggle with arms in hand against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, as the German social-democrats had done with the aid of the powerful labour aristocracy. Only at the very last moment, in 1920, when the proletariat was on the very threshold of power, did the Italian socialists find the "courage of treachery." And it was this spinelessness of the Italian parliamentary parties (the Giolittians and the centrists) which prepared the ground for the victory of fascism, which, after the defeat of the proletarian revolution, through the treachery of the socialists, came as the "saviour" under the slogan of anti-parliamentarism on the one hand, and under the imperialist slogan of a "great Italy" on the other.

A similar impotence of the parliamentary parties, although in different conditions and forms, existed in Poland on the eve of the Pilsudsky coup in May 1926. With the loss of the Russian market the Polish industry was in a blind alley. On the eve of the Pilsudsky coup Poland was passing through a serious political and economic crisis. The communist party was still not mature enough to head the proletarian movement in a decisive struggle

for power. The counter-revolutionary bourgeois landowner kulak government, in which the "National Democracy" played first fiddle, was quite helpless to find any way out whatever from the crisis. The "National Democracy" orientated mainly against Germany, being afraid of its economic competition. From Soviet Russia it feared only the plague, and at the same time it was not averse to exploiting the Soviet market for its own industry, remembering the time when it adopted a complaisant policy towards the Tsarist government. As a result it could obtain no support whatever from British imperialism, which was striving to make Poland an advance-post in the war against the U.S.S.R. Its policy in the border areas was also lacking in any imperialist taint; it was national-chauvinist. It strove for the complete Polonisation of the border regions, but not to come into close affiliations with the bourgeois leading groups of those areas at the cost of concessions to those groups. In such conditions Pilsudsky, who at one time had been the organiser of the P.P.S. right-wingers, whose program included an insurrection against Tsarist Russia, who during the war organised the Polish legions, who after the war was transformed into a fervent imperialist, was enabled with British support to raise a revolt against the rotten parliamentary bloc in the name of an imperialist objective, decked out with mediæval decorations—in the name of the restoration of the "Great Poland of the Jagiellons," "from sea to sea."

Italian "classic" fascism had a number of specific features: firstly, its social basis was at first the petty bourgeoisie. Secondly, its chief method of struggle was the creation of patriotic militant organisations which terrorised first the agricultural workers in the countryside and then the revolutionary proletariat in the towns. Thirdly, it resorted, especially at the beginning, in addition to its main propaganda of national chauvinism, to an incessant social-demagogy, the fire of which was directed against the socialists, communists and the bourgeoisie, but by no means against the really commanding strata of the bourgeoisie. Fourthly, from the very beginning it set its course for a rising against the parliamentary government, and for a state coup.

In view of these specific features of Italian

fascism our Italian comrades warned the Comintern against generalising on the Italian experience, and warned against confusing any and every bourgeois reaction with fascism. Our Italian comrades overlooked two circumstances: first that these specific features were a prototype of the tactic of almost all the national fascists in Europe; secondly, and this was the more important, our Italian comrades had overlooked the common features behind these specific features, which enable us to consider Italian fascism together with all the other forms of present-day fascism, including social-fascism. These general features were first that from the very beginning, Italian fascism had served the interests of monopolistic capital; even during the war Mussolini had been in fact the instrument of the metal and motor entrepreneurs when demanding Italy's entry into the war. Secondly, after the seizure of power, the social basis of Italian fascism gradually changed; the petty bourgeoisie began to abandon it, yielding place to the great bourgeoisie and the landowners, and fascism's social-demagogic slogans correspondingly gradually faded out. Thirdly, the classic programme of Italian fascism was in deed, albeit not in words, always the programme of monopolistic capital. Before the seizure of power this found expression in the circumstance that despite their social demagogic slogans the fascists were unbending in one respect: from the very beginning they waged a ruthless struggle against strikers. After they came to power this found expression in all the policy of the fascist government. In 1926 Mussolini said: "Our syndicalism is endeavouring only to improve the position of those syndicates which are assembled under its standard and have no ulterior motives. Our syndicalism is based upon co-operation in all stages of the production process." At another time he said: "The second point of fascist syndicalism is the recognition of the historic functions of capital and capitalism. Here we are completely anti-socialists. . . Capitalism is not only not in a decline, but it has not even had its dawn as yet. . . Modern capitalists are the captains of industry, etc."

Our Polish comrades, especially the right-wing majority of the C.C. of the C.P. of Poland, Comrades Kostrzew, Stefanski, and

others, went considerably farther than the Italian comrades; they took quite an opportunistic estimate of the significance of Polish fascism during its coming to power, and in consequence then committed serious opportunistic errors. Comrade Kostrev at first assumed that Pilsudsky's coming to power connoted "the coming to power of the petty bourgeoisie" in the quality of "an independent political force." In Pilsudsky's further conduct she saw merely a capitulation of the petty bourgeoisie to the great bourgeoisie. She was led into this error by the primary petty bourgeois social basis of the Pilsudskyites, and by the circumstance that they raised a revolt against the counter-revolutionary capitalist party of the "national democracy." It quickly became evident to a considerable majority of the Polish comrades, as the result of Pilsudsky's entire policy, and on the basis of the fact that he quickly became the centre of refuge for all the Polish bourgeoisie and, first and foremost, for the great bourgeoisie, that Pilsudsky's "mission" from the very beginning had consisted in strengthening the position of monopolistic capital in Poland, in order to bring Poland into a struggle with the U.S.S.R., even at the price of her complete vassal subjugation to the great imperialist robbers who were striving to include her in the imperialist anti-soviet bloc.

* * *

Thus it resulted that the pioneers of fascism in Europe were the national fascists of the backward countries with a retarded, and therefore all the more rickety and decayed imperialism. As we have already said, in the foremost industrial capitalist countries the process of fascism took other roads. Here this process, which had begun even before the war and was broken off after the war by the manoeuvre of a kind of capitalist "N.E.P.," was renewed with fresh force after the liquidation of the post-war revolutionary crisis on the basis of a partial stabilisation of capitalism and its steadily intensifying contradictions. Here there were no fascist coups. Here we observe a gradual fascisation of the state with the active support of social-democracy and the reformist trade unions in a situation of an intensifying class struggle. Here the main weapon of fascisa-

tion of the state was social-fascism, which does not exclude a very active rôle to the other fascist wing—national fascism, which grew particularly strong at the moments of acute economic crisis (in Austria and Germany, for instance).

What one may call the classic example of gradual fascisation of the capitalist states on the ground of a partial stabilisation of capitalism and its antagonisms is provided by Germany.

The strong fascist wave, in the very form of national fascism (Hitlerites) rose in Germany in 1922-23, during the inflation and the Ruhr occupation. Despite the fact that the Hitlerites enrolled its adherents principally from the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie who had been ruined by the inflation, and despite the fact that they extensively resorted to methods of social-demagogy like all the national fascists, they in fact were inspired and financed by the same monopolistic capital (the enormous concern of Stinnes) merely serving as an instrument in its hands. But the Hitlerite variety of fascism could not play a decisive rôle in Germany even after the defeat of the proletariat in 1923, for a number of reasons. In the first place, the concerns which had been expanded on the unhealthy basis of inflation, and the Stinnes concern in particular, were very evanescent. Secondly, the road to the regeneration of imperialism in Germany at the price of the enslavement of the working class, went not through economic victory over France on the ground of the Ruhr conflict, as Stinnes had dreamed, but through Locarno. Thirdly, the fascisation of the German State with its colossal industry could not be achieved with the aid only of the petty bourgeois movement—petty bourgeois in its composition but not in its tasks! For this purpose trustified capital needed yet another much stronger basis in German conditions—social-fascism, based on the labour aristocracy. But with all its counter-revolutionary nature German social-democracy had not as yet matured to the state of social-fascism. The conditions for the regeneration of German imperialism, for the fascisation of the state and social-democracy were established only by the partial stabilisation of capitalism.

In the process of Germany's fascisation we

can distinguish two stages: the first corresponds with the restoration period (1924-1927), the second with the so-called "third period" of post-war capitalism.

The most characteristic feature of the first stage of Germany's fascisation was the transference of the governmental power from the alliance of secondary industry (Erzberger and Rathenau) with social-democracy (the Weimar coalition) to finance capital, to heavy industry, to the finance magnates of the Ruhr, to the steel trust (Goldschmidt, Silberburg), to the chemical trust (Duisburg), who during the period of the post-war crisis lurked and kept in the background. On coming again to power in Germany financial capital forced the social-democracy also to re-orientate, to come into its service, to carry out its policy, just as they had previously carried out the policy of the less aggressive, albeit no less counter-revolutionary, strata of the bourgeoisie. This involved the liquidation of the "democratic" era and the beginning of the regeneration of German imperialism. Economically it connoted a frantic development of concentration and centralisation of capital and just as frantic an application of capitalist rationalisation at the expense of the working class. Despite this rationalisation, the number of unemployed during this period (1925-1927) swiftly decreased, owing to the restoration and extension of production and owing to the strong growth of state and municipal economy in connection with the increase of state and municipal budgets at the cost of foreign loans.

In order in such conditions of the elimination of unemployment to force the workers to harness themselves in the yoke of capitalist rationalisation, in order in such conditions to intensify the rate of exploitation of the working class, to raise their labour to an extreme degree of intensity, to hold wages at a low level, to lengthen the labour day and so on, monopolistic capital had to bring two manœuvres into operation: 1. To establish "peace in industry" with the aid of a system of compulsory arbitration through the ostensibly "neutral," "non-class" state; 2. To carry out a big manœuvre for deluding the working class under the flag of introducing, or to be more exact, talk of introducing "economic democracy." Both these man-

œuvres could be carried through only with the active aid of the social-democrats and reformist trade unions, which never raised more noise, never went into greater raptures over the charms of "organised capital" than at this period. (Hilferding and his brothers.)

The system of compulsory arbitration involved an almost complete prohibition of free strikes. And "economic democracy," which took the form of allowing representatives of the trade unions and reliable factory committees into the "supervisory councils" attached to the trusts, rendered no small services, as the employers themselves admitted (Siemens, Hargen, etc.), in the work of a painless introduction of capitalist rationalisation. As a result, the workers did not utilise the favourable opportunity. Even on the admission of the reformist trade union leaders wages for unskilled workers in Germany in 1927 were somewhat lower than in pre-war days, whilst for skilled workers they were considerably lower, despite the enormous increase in the intensity of labour. Simultaneously, during these years there was a continual lengthening of the labour day, which was even fixed in fresh legislation, whilst simultaneously by a fresh law the state exchequer was freed from contributions to the unemployment insurance fund.

During this period the social-democratic extollers of "organised capitalism" raised a big song over the development of state capitalist tendencies, which were to their way of thinking a direct transition to socialism, and comrade Bukharin assured them that modern monopolistic capitalism has a tendency gradually to transfer more and more to state capitalism.

At the present time the silliness of that declaration is quite obvious, for as we see, monopolistic capitalism has now taken a firm course for the restriction not only of state capitalistic, and especially municipal enterprises, but even of compulsory state arbitration, since under changed conditions it has no longer need of their services. But at the same time state capitalism served only the interests of trustified capital. That state capitalism existed in Germany long before the war.

Thus somehow or other, for two main reasons (the defeat of the revolution in 1923

and the enormous influx of American dollars) monopolistic capital in Germany succeeded in the restoration period, with the aid of social-democracy and the reformist trade unions, in ensuring itself a smooth passage for the exploitation of the working class through the higher organisation of exploitation. This was the first phase of the fascisation of the German state. With the arrival of the "third period" the "organisation of the exploitation of the working class," which the sycophants extolled as "organised capitalism," was broken, for two main reasons. In the first place, there was a new rise in the working class movement, disillusioned with the charms of capitalist rationalisation—a rise which came to have and is still developing more and more revolutionary content. Secondly, the highly favourable position of German industry came to an end. Even before the arrival of the American crisis a strong depression had set in in German industry, swiftly taking the form of a crisis and accompanied by a colossal increase in unemployment. This disorganisation of the entire social-economic life of capitalist Germany did not weaken, but on the contrary extraordinarily strengthened and accelerated the rate of fascisation of the state, which acquired such a naked and bald form that it is no longer possible to adorn it in any way with "economic democracy."

The first fissure in the edifice came by way of a strongly developing strike movement, a leftward movement of the working class, a growth in the influence of the C.P. at the expense of social-democracy, signalled by the Mav elections of 1928, an extraordinary development of activity on the part of the unorganised masses, the seizure by communists of the leadership of the strike movement during the Ruhr lockout, and finally the subsequent factory committee elections, in which the communists obtained the victory over the social-democrats in the larger enterprises. This evoked great anxiety on the part of the bourgeoisie, who raised the question of dictatorship; and the social-democrats at the Magdeburg party conference declared that they were not only ready to realise that dictatorship, but considered that it was they themselves who had the predominant right to realise it (Wels), for in Germany there is "twenty times as

much socialism as in the Soviet Republic." (Dietmann.) These were not mere words. The social-democratic ministers Severing and Grzesinski did not hesitate to transform these words into deeds. After the May Day provocation and shooting down of the workers who had erected barricades in Wedding and Neukoln, followed the prohibition of the Red Front Fighters, then the prohibition of workers' meetings and demonstrations, and the systematic shooting down of workers violating these interdictions, strong preparations for the suppression of the Communist Party, the legislative crystallisation of this régime of fascist dictatorship in the form of Severing's law "for the defence of the republic," the attack on the Soviet Union, and so on.

This swift transformation of the social-democratic into a social-fascist party, inasmuch as it was accomplished only under the influence of a growth in the proletarian revolutionary movement, still allowed a possibility of its hypocritically covering its fascist terror under the argument that it was defending the republic from these communists and agents of Moscow, was defending the blessed republic in which "organised capitalism" was flourishing as the "road to socialism." But the second fissure in German capitalism—the new crisis situation—evoked such a reorientation of monopolistic capital, the real master of social-democracy, as aroused the trust bourgeoisie to put forward an economic programme for fascism which deprived the social-democrats of all possibility of concealing their fascist terror, even under the pretext of defending the petty wage interests of the workers against the communists who sacrifice the present interests of the workers to a future utopia, and who prophecy all kinds of "catastrophes" to the country.

The complete change in the economic situation, the growth of indebtedness, the contraction of the home market, the reduction of new internal investments, the fall in the quotation of shares, the extraordinarily swift increase in unemployment, the consolidation for a long period of Germany's indebtedness by the Dawes Plan, the prospect of a deepening of the economic crisis under the influence of the American crisis, all aroused the monopolistic capital of Germany to take a new course. The road which it had followed during the restoration period was now no longer adequate. An

extraordinary pressure on the working class was necessary. Hence monopolistic capital came to the conclusion last autumn to reject compulsory state arbitration and the game of "economic democracy," to restrict as far as possible state and municipal economy; to evoke a split between the unemployed and the employed workers; to lower all expenditures on social needs, and especially on social unemployment insurance; to increase taxation and all other burdens on the workers, under the pretext that the cheapening of labour power would reduce unemployment and under the threat that if the workers raised their demands the result would be that they would be flung on the street; simultaneously they worked for a reduction in the taxation burden on capital and on the possessing class generally, and for a restriction of the Reichstag's budgetary rights. As a result of all this they would be successful in strengthening the formation of capital in Germany, which was the sole way of salvation from the crisis. That was the spoliatory financial programme which was published in the memorandum of the "Alliance of German industry," a programme counting on the exhaustion of the workers through starvation, and realisable only by way of establishing a completely un-concealed dictatorship of capital.

What was the disposition of forces in the bourgeois camp during this new frenzied attack on the working class? The national fascists — the party representing the "German nationalists," directed by Hugenberg, and the party of the "national socialists," directed by Hittler, which had grown much stronger, and had even attracted to their ranks part of the workers, especially in Saxony, in connection with the economic crisis, accomplished a demagogic manœuvre. They demanded a plebiscite in Germany against the adoption of the Young Plan. They knew previously that in the decisive second stage of the plebiscite they could not hope to obtain the necessary majority of votes. Nor did they want that. They raised the campaign with the dual aim: first in order to turn the masses' attention away from the burning question of the moment, the bourgeoisie's new financial programme, and secondly in order to utilise their "patriotic" campaign for propaganda of the idea of fascist dictatorship.

For their part, the social-fascists strove to carry through, did carry through, and in the person of Hilferding even took on themselves the initiative for carrying through, the financial programme of monopolistic capital. In doing so, however, they strove as far as possible to remove the traces of their crime; they tried to introduce the programme sub rosa, gradually and sectionally. At the same time they very easily allowed themselves to be "violated," and under the pressure of the German great bourgeoisie and the American creditors they at once yielded and adopted the rate of progress demanded of them. In this matter an especially contemptible rôle was played, as usual, by the "left-wing" social-fascists. By the example of their attitude to the financial programme one can see at once how the rôles are always distributed among the social-fascists between the social-fascist ministers, the social-fascist parliamentary group, and the "left-wing" social-fascists. The leader of the "left-wing" social-fascists in Saxony, Zeidewitz, published an article in "Klassenkampf" for December 15th, 1929, in which he criticises the financial programme which Hermann Muller had "suddenly (? A.M.) introduced into the Reichstag a 'programme' long put forward by capitalist circles," a programme which Muller insisted on in the Reichstag, despite the fact that the social-democratic group declared against it. The "left-wing" social-fascist writes that "this kind of coalition policy (and what of other kinds? A.M.) constitutes a great danger to social-democracy," that "in the last municipal elections social-democrats did not obtain so many votes as at the last parliamentary elections," that it is "dangerous to bend the bow too much" (i.e., squeeze the workers, but not to the point of insensibility, or the worker voters will abandon you. A.M.) How did the matter end? The social-fascist Reichschancellor Muller demanded that the programme should be adopted without modification and demanded a vote of confidence. The social-fascist group of course supported the vote of confidence, and the twenty "left-wing" social-fascists left the hall during the voting, so as to avoid voting against, so as to avoid a breakdown in the spoliatory programme, so as to avoid breaking the coalition with the bourgeoisie, and yet at

the same time to be enabled to present their alibi to the working class: We did not participate in the crime, we were in another room!

As for the monopolistic capitalists, they also, in the person of their "German national party," the Alliance of German Industry and their press, also manœuvred. They pretended that they were now directing their main attack against the "dangerous" social-democracy and reformist trade unions, against their "socialistic" policy, against "economic democracy" and state capitalism, with which it was "time to end." This manœuvre temporarily tripped up even certain of our German comrades, who thought that having exploited social-democracy monopolistic capital was now ready to dismiss it. That was a great mistake. The monopolistic bourgeoisie knew very well that modern social-fascism is one of the most important instruments for the fascisation of the state, with which social-democracy has now organically fused.

The outcry raised by the great bourgeoisie against "economic democracy" was a pure comedy. The great bourgeoisie knew very well that in its day it had not only suffered the prating about "economic democracy" but had encouraged it in every way, for this phrase-mongering was extraordinarily useful to it. And if it had now raised a crusade against it it was simply because the economic situation had changed, because it was necessary to take a new course and it was necessary to force the social democrats and reformist trade unions also to re-orientate as speedily and as thoroughly as possible—which it did achieve quite thoroughly.

That the German great bourgeoisie had no intention of eliminating the social-democrats from participation in the fascist dictatorship is evident, if only from what was written by the organ of German heavy industry, the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung," in connection with Hilferding's resignation on December 29th last, during the height of the mock "struggle" of the great bourgeoisie against social-fascist "socialism." "It is a mistake to be joyful over the fact that the social-democrats are released from responsibility for the ministry of finances. They have made the bed, let them lie in it. There is much to indicate that the social-democrats are

thirsting to return to opposition again (there is incomparably more to indicate the opposite! —A.M.). The bourgeois parties should by no means render it too easy for social-democracy to realise these intentions. The bourgeois government will only have successes when the pre-requisites are established for a radical abandonment of the present methods, for a break with the ruling system, for a resolute struggle against the destructive economy of socialism (?! A.M.) in all spheres. We are drawing near to this, but we have not yet arrived at this state. Before that let all the nation call for salvation from slavery and exploitation as the result of socialistic (!!—A.M.) arbitrariness, imprudence and corruption."

Hardly two weeks had passed after the writing of these words when the bourgeoisie were convinced that quite different times were at hand. The crisis grew more acute, unemployment grew with every day, the mood of the workers became more and more dangerous. This is witnessed to by the premature elections to factory committees, which have given new successes to the communists. In view of this the bourgeoisie hastened again to renew the talk of "industrial peace," of "business co-operation," of a united front with the trade unions for the "salvation of the fatherland," and renewed this talk inter alia in the pages of the same newspaper where the above words had been printed. The social-fascists, who had calmly adopted and carried out the bourgeoisie's spoliatory financial programme, at once responded to the signal given them by the great bourgeoisie. The social order of monopolistic capital was executed by them to the full 100 per cent., right down to putting forward a slogan for a seven-hour day without reduction in wages, a slogan which of course no single social-fascist ever thinks of forcing in practice. But this social demagoguery, this new demagogic manœuvre is hardly likely to take anyone in. The less so as the social-fascists are simultaneously carrying on an ardent campaign for the preparation of war with the U.S.S.R. in connection with the liquidation of the kulak as a class, which evokes the fear and passions of the bourgeoisie of all the world; the less so as they are simultaneously carrying on an ardent campaign in favour of

the suppression of the communist party, motivating their campaign by the argument that the soviet régime is on the verge of destruction, and that in order to save itself it is driving the German communists into murders, putsches, provocations and all kinds of madneses.

Such is their dream, and so a united front is being formed in Germany for the establishment of a complete fascist dictatorship by replacing one slogan by another, by replacing the quarrels among various categories of fascists by their fraternisation, by replacing open provocation with miserable terror. We can be sure that when they are all finally fused in one the hurricane of the proletarian revolution will sweep away all these scum.

* * *

Germany provides a typical example of the modern fascisation of the capitalist states. Consequently, we shall not discuss the fascisation of the states further. We shall consider the variants of social-fascism in France, Austria and Britain only briefly.

The French socialists have long been the pioneers of the militarisation of France (the Boncour law for the "militarisation of the country and the socialists' initiative in forming a ministry of aviation). They have long fought with the greatest of ardour with their brothers of the Second International for the foreign policy of their native bourgeoisie (guarantee pacts and sanctions). They have all without distinction long slandered the communists and the soviet régime, they have long been co-operating with the bourgeoisie in the economic sphere (participation in the League of Nations Labour Bureau and in the Economic Council.) They have long unvaryingly supported the government, although they have not entered formally into the national bloc, working on the formula of their leader Blum, who declared at the Toulouse congress: "We shall support the least reactionary government," i.e., the better reactionary against the worse—for after all a patriot for his fatherland cannot altogether refuse his support to the government!

But now, in connection with the swift fascisation of the bourgeoisie they also have made a resolute jump forward, and have transformed themselves into open social-fascists. At the

September conference of the General Confederation of Labour a special resolution was even adopted in which they openly call upon the workers to aid in the introduction of capitalist rationalisation, with a view to introducing "the scientific organisation of labour" and the "increase of the productivity of labour," and with a view to the "partitioning of the markets by the means of cartels." Thus the French socialists have openly rallied to the defence of monopolistic capital, and they are energetically putting its measures into force by means not only of propaganda of "industrial peace," but by smashing strikes and direct strikebreaking, and first and foremost by a desperate struggle against the communists. And in this regard they have taken a decisive step forward, following Renaudel's slogan: "Between us and them it is a question of life or death." In the first place at a meeting organised by the French socialists they called in the aid of the gendarmes, who jointly with them rough-handled the worker communists who wanted to come into the meeting for the purpose of discussion with the socialists. And these methods of open armed struggle with the communists are now sanctioned by the higher organs of the party. Last autumn the National Council of the French Socialist Party adopted a resolution in which it maintains its resolute will . . . to answer with force to the provocation of any party of disintegration (read the Communist Party. A.M.).

The methods of open civil war against the revolutionary proletariat do not exclude, but on the contrary are supplemented by the methods of social-demagogy (although necessarily extremely curtailed, for they have no trumps left). Furthermore, the more they prepare for civil war, the more intensively do they turn to the "masses" with their curtailed social demagogy. They have now begun to squeak over the question of an amnesty (partial of course), over the question of social unemployment insurance (of course, with the exclusion of strikers from the right to benefits). They are now increasing their work among the youth, where through the mouth of Paul Klotz they are arguing that the "material conditions of the workers have now risen to such an extent" that the workers "are now struggling only for an increase of

comfort," and that to this end, in order to "acquire a motor-car and to vary the methods of their entertainment" the workers, in distinction from the past, are willingly prepared to lengthen their labour day. Consequently the workers are already emancipated "from the utopias and insurrectionary illusions of former times." Consequently, their struggle now arises only from "the intellectual and moral incitements." They want merely to enlarge their participation in the "management" of the enterprises! (See "La Vie Socialiste" for April 29th.)

In order to have at least some chance of success in displaying this tinsel and paste to the workers, the French social-fascists prefer at present not to join the government, although they have announced that they completely agree to the programme of the bourgeois "radicals" and even accept the programme of the police premier Tardieu (in their words, the only fault of the latter programme is that there is too little of the "republican spirit.") In answer to the radical Deladier's proposal to join the government the congress of the socialist party which long since unanimously accepted this as permissible in principle, found it untimely at that particular moment. But when will it become timely? This question was answered by the right-wing opportunistic syndicalist Chambellain, who is well acquainted with his soul mates the French social-fascists. "I shall believe in a genuine disturbance of the capitalist stabilisation, I shall believe in the existence of a new rising of the masses, menacing the power of the bourgeoisie, on that day when the bourgeoisie calls the socialist party to government." When it becomes necessary to shoot down the workers in masses, the French social-fascists will be at their "patriotic" posts.

A word or two on the Austrian social-fascist centrists. These are the worst of all forms of social-fascists, for they succeed in combining the most contemptible of treachery to the working class in practice with such "left-wing" phrases as we never hear these days, or very rarely hear, either from the German or from the French social-democrats. The question whether the Austrian social-democrats could be called social-fascists appeared to arouse some doubts among certain comrades, who

thought that at the moment the Austrian social-democrats only had a tendency to social-fascism, that they had not yet become social-fascists, for they had not themselves actually shot down workers (sectionally they have already done that more than once! A.M.) but were only opening the gates to the true fascism of the Heimwehr. This point of view was profoundly inaccurate and testified to a misunderstanding of the specific rôle in world social-fascism played by the "left-wing" social-fascists. In reality what special task did the social-fascists in Austria carry out when, after the Vienna rising in July 1927, and especially after the armed conflict of workers and fascists in San Lorentz, the wave of national fascism rose considerably, drawing in all the Austrian bourgeoisie and being headed by the Heimwehr?

The Heimwehr put forward a programme of fascist dictatorship, and openly threatened to put it into effect by means of a state coup, as without the social-democrats the bourgeois parties do not possess a sufficient majority in parliament to modify the constitution. How did the Austrian social-democrats react to this? They lulled the workers with revolutionary phrases, declaring that if the national fascists made any attempt to carry out a state coup they must all as one man fight to the last drop of their blood for the glorious Austrian constitution. Simultaneously they used every method of restraining the workers who were eager for the struggle, demobilising them, and affording the national fascists the possibility of occupying all the commanding positions one after the other. At the same time they carried on secret negotiations with Schober and so prepared the ground for the fascisation of Austria without a bloody coup, for the modification of the Austrian constitution in the direction of fascism by legal methods. They persuaded the Viennese workers to hand over their arms, they defended the right of the fascists to hold street demonstrations, they defended the right of the national fascists to penetrate into the enterprises and to organise strike-breaking organisations there, persuading the masses not to oppose this, for it would connote the violation of "freedom" for a certain section of the citizens in a "democratic" republic. Simultaneously they as-

sured the workers that the repressive measures which Schober was threatening would be directed not against them but against the Heimwehr. And simultaneously they played a double game with the fascist war minister Vaugoin, openly protesting that they were against surrendering the army into his hands and secretly announcing that they "by no means demanded Vaugoin's resignation." At the end they achieved their ends (for the time being!) Their representative Daneburg fell foul of Schober over the fascist "reform" of the constitution, i.e., over the bloodless fascisation of Austria, after which Schober announced that this was only the "first step," and the social-democratic leader Renner wept copious tears, declaring that "we are ready for extreme sacrifices in the interests of the development of the Austrian state and economy."

And what lessons did the social-fascist Renner draw from the first act of the fascisation of Austria by bloodless, legal methods? They were extraordinarily instructive. He has expounded them in "Die Gesellschaft" for February 1930. The first lesson was: "Civil war destroys our economy and to such an extent that in the last resort it is a matter of indifference who is victor and who is vanquished." Consequently: "the supreme principle is the economic community of interests of the people"; consequently, we "must be the announcers and realisers of general interests, leaving it to the foremost fighters of the bourgeoisie to emphasise the special class interest." The result is a by no means stupid change of the trimmings: in the bourgeois state let the bourgeois (fascists) carry on the class struggle, it is our business to defend the bourgeois state, expressing the common interests of all the people! The second lesson was: As in Austria we ourselves cannot form a government, "we must render it easier for the bourgeois majority (parliamentary) to govern." The third lesson: "Nothing is so ruinous to the working class as talk of permanent revolution, as the preaching of violence, so long as and to the extent that others can apply it. . . Our party itself never took this seriously (golden words! A.M.) and our opponents have very seriously utilised this to their own ends." Fourth lesson: "We were

wrong in leaving the government coalition earlier on, when the epoch of reaction arrived. It is necessary to participate even in the epoch of reaction in a reactionary government, in order to act the part of a brake" (and not a hostage? A.M.). It would appear unnecessary to comment on that programme.

Now a word or two on the British variety of social-fascism. The British social-democracy—the Labour Party—passed through and is still passing through the same stages as the other social-democratic parties after the war, only in its own peculiar forms and at its own rates in accordance with the peculiar British conditions. During the outbreak and development of the miners' conflict which led to the general strike, the General Council of Trade Unions and the Labour Party headed the workers' movement with the pre-determined purpose of betraying it, as was quite clear from the speeches of MacDonald and Thomas on the eve of the strike. This stage of the Labour Party development corresponded to the stage in the post-war history of German social-democracy in which it betrayed and smothered the proletarian revolution in Germany under the banner of "pure democracy." After the miners' defeat in 1926, when a partial stabilisation of British capital set in, the Labour Party entered upon the same road of social-fascism which the German social-democrats had taken somewhat earlier, in 1924. Following the latter's example the Labour Party tried every method of harnessing the proletariat to the chariot of capitalist rationalisation, like it the Labour Party preached "industrial peace" (Mondism). Like it the Labour Party even to-day says through the lips of Ben Tillet: "The workers are more interested in the prosperity of industry than the shareholder, director and administrator." In the home policy of the metropolis the rate of the Labour Party's development into social-fascism has not as yet caught up with the rate of development of social-fascism in Germany, owing to the fact that in the work of capitalist rationalisation Britain is behind hand, is lagging not only behind the U.S.A. and Germany, but even behind France; and for the reason that capitalist rationalisation in Britain has only recently begun to develop to any extent, and that it is now the chief economic

task of the British so-called "Labour Government." This situation is different in respect of colonial policy. Here the Labour Party and the "Labour" Government are in the foremost ranks of world social-fascism; here their policy corresponds already to the second, higher stage of German social-fascism. In regard to the strangulation of the colonial peoples of India, Egypt, Palestine, etc., they are in no wise distinguished from the most hard-headed of Conservatives. In general it can be said of the British Labour Party that it is conscientiously fulfilling its obligations to the bourgeoisie: it is becoming fascised as fast as the British bourgeoisie. It is going hand in hand with it, and when a revolutionary situation arises in Britain one can be absolutely sure that it will no longer attempt to head the movement, as in 1926, in order to betray it; from the very beginning it will attempt to shatter it by force of arms.

* * *

We now see the disposition of the two wings of fascism—national-fascism and social-fascism, during the fascisation of the foremost capitalist states. In certain cases, as in Austria, the national fascists are the pioneers, and the social-fascists are the executives; in other cases (and this is the majority of cases of the industrial capitalist countries) the social-fascists are both the pioneers and the executives. We do not mention the monopolistic bourgeoisie, but of course they are the chief directors. In every case both these wings of fascism are zealously carrying out the economical and political programme of monopolistic capital, decorating that programme with social demagoguery in accordance with their various social bases. But their social bases also are growing less and less distinctive. On the one hand the social-democrats are increasingly losing influence with the working masses, are increasingly compensating for the loss of worker adherents by adherents from the petty bourgeoisie, as was evident during the Parliamentary elections of 1928 in Germany, France and Poland. Since then this process has gone much further. On the other hand the national fascists, whose chief social basis is the petty bourgeoisie, also at the moments of sharp economic crisis catch workers in their net who have long since lost work and all hopes of getting it, declassed

workers, as was evident from the municipal elections in Saxony for example, where industry is declining.

As the class antagonisms grow more acute, as the process of fascising the state develops on the one hand and the revolutionary rise of the proletariat develops on the other, the manœuvring powers of the social-fascists become less and less, they are growingly forced to unmask themselves to the masses. This applies not only to the right-wing of social-fascism but especially to their most dangerous "left-wing," who find it growingly difficult to hide under "left-wing" radical phrases the most naked economic and political attack on the working class. The "left-wing" social-fascists will therefore no longer be in a condition to play the part of buffer which they played during the post-war period of the "centrists." They have lied too much and too openly. It is obviously the renegades of communism who want to take up that rôle now. And none the less there is not the least justification for expecting that the great bourgeoisie in the present pre-revolutionary time will refuse to avail themselves of the services of the social-fascists of all hues. It is true that their influence over the worker masses is swiftly vanishing, but the bourgeoisie are willy nilly saying to themselves that they must be content with what they can get in the way of services.

One other question, in conclusion. Does the present fascisation of the capitalist states witness to a consolidation of growth in the strength of the bourgeoisie? The answer to this question has been supplied by the whole of our article, and by its main thesis, that the fascisation of the capitalist state is an inevitable product of the decay of monopolistic capitalism. Consequently, to designate the present course of the bourgeoisie not by the word "fascisation" but by the phrase "the strengthening of the bourgeois reaction" is false, is marked with opportunistic deductions, because it is deprived of any definite historical content and glosses over the connection between that "reaction" and the decay of monopolistic capitalism. We have known innumerable cases in history of the development of bourgeois reaction after bourgeois revolutions. Such reactions have hung on a long time, and after the defeat of the proletariat they cus-

tomarily did not think it necessary to conceal their nature with the figleaf of social demagoguery (with the exception of the bonapartism of Napoleon III in France, for which there were special grounds). For no matter how these bourgeois revolutions ended, whether with complete or whether with semi-victory, they opened a way for the development of full-blooded capitalism. But the present moment of intensification of reaction among the possessing classes, accompanied by depression among the masses, is a very temporary one, and will swiftly be replaced by a new revolutionary rise; or else the intensification of the reaction of the governing classes goes parallel with and in closest connection with the revolutionary rise, as is the

case at the present moment. Finally, the present bourgeois reaction is forced to seek some basis for itself in the social-demagoguery of the national and social-fascists. All this is because this reaction arises from the decay and decline of capitalism, from a weakening of the strength of the bourgeoisie. Consequently fascisation in the bourgeois states is impotent to stop the revolutionary process. It merely engenders still sharper forms of struggle of the revolutionary proletariat. And that is a necessary condition of the latter's decisive victory. The second necessary condition is the ability of the Communist Parties to exploit a very favourable historical situation, not to lose time, and to organise the victory.

International Revolutionary Working Women's Day

By Moirova

[The following article was received too late for publication before International Women's Day. But it contains so much that is of value and importance to the everyday work of the Parties that we print it now.—Editor.]

THE international campaigns of the proletariat are playing an important and original rôle in the development of revolutionary events. The measures taken by every Communist Party regarding these campaigns are becoming the property of the whole world, and are very soon appraised by the working class, from the point of view of the fighting capacity of its own ranks and the quality of its leader—the Communist Party. This appraisal constitutes the basis for a comparison of the forces of the working class with those of the enemy, and for the rapidity of the development of further proletarian actions.

The International Women's Day is not an exception to this general rule. Its special object only in bringing into the general struggle of the proletariat—as an inseparable part of it—the movement of women workers, working men's wives and all working women.

Before dealing with the actual tasks of the

International Women's Day, it is essential to turn our attention to the conditions under which this campaign will have to be conducted in the current year.

The development of the revolutionary movements of the mass of workers and peasants goes on vigorously. Step by step with the deepening national and international crises, and with the capitalist offensives, which are taking exceptionally insolent forms, the masses are swinging more and more to the left. Their will to fight is growing. Their demonstrations and counter-attacks, led by the Communist Parties, are gaining in magnitude, and some of them assume the form of armed collisions.

In the present gigantic class struggle women engaged in industry and agriculture are certainly playing a far from mean rôle. One has only to take any country and follow up women's participation in past and present economic and political struggles of the proletariat, to become convinced of the exceptional swing to the left of women in general, and women workers in particular.

It is clearly expressed in the human documents which come from the lower strata of the

proletariat, and are characteristic of the frame of mind of these masses. We cannot help quoting one of these documents, the letter of a French woman worker employed in the metallurgical industry and burdened with a large family. This is what she writes :

"Yesterday, namely, Sunday, the socialists organised a demonstration in Champigny. The C.P. issued a call to the workers, and I must say that we achieved a great success. Y.C.L. members organised several contingents, and there were also groups of women. The men workers responded to our call : they were in fighting trim. It was magnificent : the fight went on all day long ! But what a blow in the face to the socialist detectives ! As an example, I will tell you about my contingent and how I had my knee injured. We women were marching at the head of the procession, shouting, 'Organise soviets in France ! Long live the Red Army ! Down with the social assassins !' We tore down all the blue-white red banners with which the municipality had decorated the streets, tore them into shreds, and dragged them on the ground. . . . The socialists, who were protected by the police, were shouting to the latter at the sight of the demonstrating workers, 'Kill them, kill them !, And, like wild beasts, the policemen threw themselves on us. . . . The lesson I have learned from this demonstration is that if the C.P. knows how to go about its work, the masses will be with us. One could see yesterday that the workers are feeling that the C.P. is their only bulwark ; they were not afraid to come to Champigny, though they knew what they had to expect there. Our last battle was fought on the railway platform. The police brought their batons into play, and many people fell on to the railway line. Comrades, I have never held a rifle in my hands ; but how I should like to have one in moments such as these ! I hope not to be bedridden too long, otherwise I shall feel miserable about the long spell of inactivity ! "

STRIKES IN FRANCE

This is only one illustration from the present struggle of the French proletariat, which bears testimony to the revolutionary character of the actions of women workers and working men's wives. In the many strikes we

have repeated evidence of the mass participation of the working women.

This exceptional swing to the left of the mass of proletarian women is not only characteristic of France. The same applies also to Germany. One has only to recall the May incidents prior to which men workers were solemnly declaring, "On May Day the streets will not be a place for women and children." But the proletarian women's reply to this was that they placed themselves at the head of a number of demonstrations, initiated strikes, and showed exceptional bravery in their resistance to the police. Similarly, in the strikes which followed May Day.

In Czecho-Slovakia, many non-Party women workers were arrested as a result of incidents on August 1st. This is what they said to their friends who visited them in prison : "Do not worry about us : we understand why we are here. All we care for is to know that men and women workers will carry on a united struggle against the actions of the government."

In Lodz (Poland) the Party banner was carried during the August 1st demonstration by a group of non-Party women workers. In the Piraeus (Athens) women workers organised a protest demonstration on August 1st, at which the slogans of the Party were brought forward, though the initiative for the strike and its conduct was not under the direct leadership of the Party. In Lavrian, another place in Greece, employers demanded that blacklegs should be sent from the Piraeus, but the strikers came to the landing stage and fought desperately, assisted by their wives, against the landing of these blacklegs. During the fighting these women threw several policemen into the sea.

The provincial commissar of the fascist textile workers' unions has something to say about the mood of Italian woman workers in a small place called Pencero : "After two warnings, just on the day when the agreement was signed in the Ministry of the Corporation, the women workers committed a thoughtless act : they downed tools en masse. In spite of my solicitude (!) for female workers, and though I know how to explain and extenuate their thoughtless actions, it will be a long time be-

fore I forget their unwarrantable conduct, which made our province look like a nest of excitable old women (!). Order has been restored now in Pencero. One must say, however, that this is only calm before the storm. In their inmost souls the women workers still 'consider themselves tricked.' "

One could go on ad infinitum giving examples of the heroic struggle of women workers against the imperialist robbers, examples illustrating the militancy of the masses of working women, not only in Europe, but also in America, Asia, and Africa. The native women in Nigeria organised demonstrations in the villages against British imperialism. During the firing on the unarmed demonstrators, 45 people were wounded and 18 women were killed.

One still remembers the exceptionally energetic resistance of women strikers in India, and already one hears of fresh revolutionary deeds on the part of Japanese, Chinese, and other women workers.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN'S LABOUR IN PRODUCTION

The class struggle in the third period through which we are passing now has several distinguishing features regarding the female proletariat—features which must be taken into account when analysing all revolutionary events.

Capitalist rationalisation is shaking to their very foundations habits and traditions which developed in the workers' families in the preceding periods. Women's labour is assuming a new meaning which was not so pronounced in the past. Machinery is rapidly eliminating men workers with average and low degree of skill, who are, after all, expensive labour, and factories are filled with equally unskilled woman labour. None of the official statistics *vs* the percentage of women workers employed in industry give the true state of affairs. Even such an important indicator as the percentage of women's participation in the French industry (40 per cent.) is very much disputed now, and not without reason. Suffice it to turn our attention to a very interesting example, extremely indicative regarding the present character of production which was formerly carried on with the help of skilled labour only. In

a certain German enterprise of exact mechanics, women, who were formerly not employed, now constitute 53 per cent. of the total number of workers. The percentage of expert workers has been reduced from 71.5 to 24 per cent.

But this process when woman labour is driving out man labour does not receive everywhere the attention of Party organisations. It is curious that in the Dutch Communist Party the view prevailed among a number of Party members—this was discovered by the women's department formed by the Party—that women's labour does not play any rôle in Dutch production. If woman labour was employed at all—so it was said—it was merely the labour of girls, and these girls were merely working for a dowry or pocket money! But facts are refuting emphatically such a viewpoint. For instance, in the Phillips firms, 10,000 of the 20,000 workers are women; married women are to a great extent employed in the textile industry; in artificial silk factories women workers are given the preference; and the number of women agricultural labourers in Holland is considerable. These facts only reveal the ignorance of many members of our Parties regarding the enterprises of their respective countries.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN WORKERS' EARNINGS

The change in the composition of labour power in production is accompanied by another process which is at present assuming exceptional importance. The elimination of men's labour power from the process of production very frequently means at the same time the bringing down of the higher budget of a working class family to the budget of the average earnings of women. In other words, women workers' wages, which for a long time were considered supplementary to the earnings of the breadwinner, frequently become the chief earnings of the family, the unemployment dole received by the male part of the working class family becoming supplementary.

In view of the fact that everywhere, in all branches of industry, and in all countries, except the U.S.S.R., women's labour is valued very low, the change in the rôle of these earnings in the family has a very detrimental effect

on the position of the whole working class. Even in Germany, where the difference between men's and women's wages is smaller than in other countries, the discrepancy is appalling in May 1929 women workers' wages constituted 58.2 per cent. of men's wages.

In Poland, women's pay for the same kind of work as men's is on an average 35-40 per cent. lower than men's pay. In America, women's pay two years ago constituted between 40 and 70 per cent. of men's. There is every reason to believe that this discrepancy is growing at present. In such a state of affairs, women workers are rapidly realising their rôle in the process of production, and men workers are also compelled to reconsider their attitude to the slogan "Equal pay for equal work." Never before did this slogan have such a general character for the *whole proletariat*, as in our period.

Characteristic of the recent rationalisation wave is the strong concentration, which has resulted in the closing of a considerable number of enterprises and in mass dismissals, bringing in its wake still greater wage reductions, by means of a direct reduction of wages, introduction of payment by results, etc., and simultaneous intensification of untrained labour power. Thus there has been introduced in the A.E.G. concern in Berlin the Dutch conveyor system which, with the help of special distribution, even robs women workers of all possibility of exchanging a few words.

This whole barbarous system of labour exploitation is made still worse by insanitary labour conditions, which are general.

A woman worker of the Lorenz metallurgical factory who attended the all-German Women Workers' Congress, spoke of her work in this factory as penal servitude—every day 20-25 women workers faint at the conveyor. Numberless similar facts could be cited from other German factories and from France.

The American Bedaux company in Germany has introduced a refined piece-rate system which means terrible wear and tear to the physique of women workers. But the German capitalists try not to lag behind. In the Bierbaum factory in Cologne work is arranged now with such an intensification of labour that the time for the manufacture of the goods has been reduced from 25 hours to two. In France,

where an exceptionally large number of women workers is employed in the metallurgical industry, special "model" women workers have been introduced, who compel their fellow workers to produce twice as many ready parts as the fixed number. In the Michelin works, the Taylor system and work by chronometers have been introduced in all departments.

In the Chatin factory (artificial silk) in Saint-Chamoneze-Loire, productivity increased four times in nine months—but wages remained at 14 francs per day, from which pay 16 per cent. goes on an average to fines.

Even more appalling are the general labour conditions of women workers in Balkan countries. "In a textile factory in Varna which employs 1,300 women workers, they have to clean the machines on Saturday after work, and they also work on Sunday till dinner time. In the hostels, nearly all women workers are suffering from consumption. They are compelled to eat abominable food if they do not want to be cruelly beaten. The hostels are dirty and are never aired. The letters received by the women workers are read. They can see their relations only in the presence of the overseer, who also accompanies them on their day out, to prevent their running away. The fractious ones are beaten on the head."

Particularly hypocritical, under such conditions of woman labour, is the persistence with which laws directed against abortions are defended. Premature births and child mortality in the first year are an inevitable result of the whole capitalist system of barbarous exploitation of labour in branches of industry which are well known to be injurious to women's organism. The mother of a child born out of wedlock is considered a prostitute, and is persecuted in a way which frequently leads to suicide.

When looking into the existing legislation of every separate country regarding the protection of motherhood and childhood, one notices characteristic features which are common to all capitalist countries—the paragraphs of the laws on this subject are composed in a grandiloquent style, but all of them are accompanied by such substantial reservations and limitations as to deprive women workers of even a minimum of protection. One could give an inexhaustible series of facts about

the utterly disgusting attitude to working mothers on the part of the bourgeoisie and the social-fascists.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The attack of the employers on social insurance, and the new laws of the social-fascist governments, which relieved the capitalists of even a minimum of expenditure for the benefit of the workers, are detrimentally affecting women workers' position. In spite of the mass substitution of men by women workers in industry, the number of unemployed women is steadily increasing, because capitalist rationalisation, under conditions of restricted markets, leads to a general reduction of labour power employed in production, whereas at the same time the destitution of workers' families is throwing an ever-growing number of wives and mothers on to the labour market in search of employment.

In 1928 there were in Germany 406,430 unemployed women registered as compared with 212,261 in 1927. But the recent amendment of the law regarding unemployment doles has again struck women workers hardest:—According to this law, 75 per cent. of unemployed women are deprived even of the miserable dole which they received hitherto. The position of unemployed in Poland was more than once taken up by the press. One can get an idea of the number of women among them by their number in the Lodz district alone, which exceeds 50,000.

It goes without saying that this general picture of conditions under which women workers work and live, is a graphic illustration of the "contradiction" which has arisen "between the mass inclusion of women into the process of production, and the forms of family and home life and habits inherited to a considerable extent from former economic forms." (C.I. Programme.)

All this constitutes a source of the rapid revolutionary growth of the female proletarian masses. The movement of the proletarian women *is outgrowing the form of the movement of auxiliary labour power which, in the past, frequently impeded the movement of the fundamental mass of the proletariat, and is itself converted into one of the fundamental forces in the current and impending struggles of the proletariat.*

But the rising revolutionary energy of the mass of working women is characteristic not only of the struggle against capitalism in bourgeois countries, but also of the construction of socialist economic and living conditions in the U.S.S.R.

Competition is the motive power of the socialist reconstruction of production. The formation of shock brigades has been adopted as the method of direct participation of the masses in the acceleration of the development of the Five-Year Plan, but the idea of such brigades originated in September 1926, when in the "Red Triangle" works in Leningrad 120 *young women workers* began of their own initiative to work according to a scientific plan. In 1929, the number of women workers in the shock brigades in the same "Red Triangle" reached 2,168. They raised production by 16 per cent. In Moscow, Kiev, Vitebsk, Shui (Ivanov-Vosnessensk district), Tver, and innumerable other centres the same tale can be told.

This development of working women, so exceptional with regard to strength, impetus and class consciousness, is the result of the systematic care of the proletarian State for the conditions of the workers. This work has become as important as the development of socialist production, and the reconstruction of agriculture. In all directions—co-operatives, trade unions, Soviets—in the domain of housing, feeding, bringing up of children, protection of motherhood and childhood, as well as in the domain of the organisation of towns on sanitary lines, the U.S.S.R. is throbbing with tremendous inexhaustible energy in the direction of reorganising itself on a socialist basis, placing women's emancipation on a firm material foundation, and socialising their house-keeping. The masses themselves are doing wonders regarding the transformation of living conditions and customs. In this domain, too, the shock brigades are digging out the old decaying roots and are planting new Communist shoots.

The C.P.S.U. was compelled to recognise at its true value the united energy of men and women workers of the poor peasants and the peasant women, the powerful growth of female proletarian cadres and the progress of political consciousness among the mass of working

women. It therefore placed work among women on the highest plane, opened splendid possibilities to these masses and imposed on them a greater responsibility than before for the further solution of questions connected with their promotion and education, their organisation, the higher qualification of their labour, and with the whole organisation of the new socialist forms of life and labour. At the present juncture bodies of active women workers are called upon to participate, in perfect equality with men and at the same valuation, in the domain of socialist construction, and to promote with their indefatigable energy the common cause of socialist construction.

Now what is the attitude of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries to the important changes which are going on in the ranks of working women? Have the Parties overcome their under-estimation of the importance of the female proletarian masses and of the necessity of getting them under their influence?

LAGGING BEHIND THE MOVEMENT OF THE PROLETARIAT

The period which has elapsed since the Tenth Plenum is long enough to allow the Parties to remedy the mistakes of the past in this direction; all the more so, as the Tenth Plenum laid special emphasis on this question and passed an explicit enough decision, which laid the Parties under the obligation of doing away with the discrepancy between the impetuous development of the revolutionary movement of the female proletarian masses and the very narrow basis of the influence of the Communist Parties on these masses.

One can and must mention the decisive change in this direction on the part of the C.C. of the German Communist Party. The latter is systematically encouraging the local Party organisations, as well as the Women's Departments, to more intensive decisive new methods for the capture of women workers. This is what we call leadership for action. The C.P.G. has been able to create out of women workers' conferences a method of systematic consistent Party influence on the masses. Moreover, the Party is consistently taking account of its mistakes and is remedy-

ing them. The most brilliant success of the past year regarding work among women, a success which is of international importance and was the result of preliminary energetic work by the Party among women — was the first All-German Women Workers' Congress, which demonstrated the vast revolutionary possibilities to be found in the female proletarian masses. But simultaneously, this Congress brought to light conservatism, under-estimation, and a downright failure on the part of some district Party organisations, to understand what work among unorganised women means: which was once more confirmed at the Congress of the German trade union opposition and was demonstrated again at the report conference of the same trade union opposition which was supposed to be one third constituted of women, but of which, in fact, only 10 per cent. consisted of women. But these shortcomings are not condoned by the C.C. C.P.G., on the contrary, it exposes them ruthlessly and indefatigably.

Gradually, the importance of getting hold of the masses of working women is being realised also in the ranks of the French Communist Party. One must mention the series of women workers' conferences in the North, in Paris, etc., especially the recent women workers' conference held simultaneously with the C.G.T.U. Congress, and attended by representatives of women workers of the biggest factories and districts. True, there was a whole series of defects in connection with these conferences, the chief defect being inability to consolidate organisationally the connections with women workers established by the conferences. But proper leadership during the strike in Rouen-Darnetal, and the special women workers' conferences organised during the strike, had the result that, in spite of the lost strike, the number of members in the Darnetal union increased from 20 to 200 and the number of members in the Rouen union from 200 to 1,300, of whom the majority were women. In Roanne, at the Textile Workers' Congress, 96 of the 196 delegates were women.

NEGLECT OF SPECIAL WOMEN'S DEMANDS

Unfortunately, this congress made no attempt to get women workers interested in its work: in the list of demands issued by the

congress there was not a single demand capable of attracting women workers. But what has been mentioned is sufficient to show that the French Communist Party is overcoming—under the pressure of the very striking revolutionary demonstrations of women workers—its prolonged and serious under-estimation of systematic work among working women.

The method of calling comprehensive conferences is being rapidly adopted in a number of Parties. Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Greece and Poland have entered upon this path. When Parties, in the person of the C.C., begin to pay attention to this work, they immediately endeavour to win the *industrial* women workers, and get rid of the old method (used in the past even in some cases by the Women's Departments themselves) of keeping this work separate. More than that, a number of Parties which have been using the method of keeping work among women separate, find out, though rather late, that a Right tendency exists in the Women's Departments, when all the other mass work is already being conducted on new bolshevik lines. Such was the case at least till quite recently in the Polish Party, which did not investigate this work in good time, and failed to organise it on bolshevik lines, as a result of which it quite unexpectedly discovered Right tendencies which were impeding the work of the Women's Departments.

THE BRITISH PARTY BACKWARD

One must admit, on the whole, however, that, compared with the state of affairs before the Sixth Congress, considerable progress has been made regarding work among women, though this progress is still lagging behind the progress made by the mass of women workers themselves. Simultaneously, one notices the unevenness of the progress. Some Parties are particularly behindhand with their tasks in this sphere. For instance, in the British Communist Party the Central Women's Department is drawing up excellent plans, but has not established in practice an adequate connection with the industrial women workers. The C.C. of the Party is evidently not considering the question important enough, for (at least up to January) it did not give a lead to this work, nor examine these plans and take

measures for their application. The National Women Workers' Congress of the type of the German national working women's congress, which the Women's Department of the British C.P. proposes to organise, is assuming under these circumstances special importance, provided the whole Party sets a proper value on it and helps to carry out this project, prefacing it by energetic work among working women. The C.C. of the American Communist Party has acted on much simpler lines. About a year ago the Women's Department ceased to exist. But it seems now as if the Party intends to take up a different attitude to this sphere of work. At any rate, a leader for the women's department has been appointed, and the future will show what will be the attitude of the Party to the necessity of taking advantage of the activity of the women masses which is so obvious in America.

The necessity of raising in a rather sharp form the question of the need of a change in the attitude of the Parties to work among women should not give rise to any offence, or desire to put off the matter with a laugh or recommendation of gradualness. The fact that women workers are willing to follow the Parties, whereas the latter are inadequately equipped for taking advantage of the revolutionary mood of the female masses, cannot be called a mere under-estimation. There are moments when under-estimation becomes a downright error, and even worse. The Communist Parties have grown to such an extent that it is impossible for them not to realise the necessity of bringing under their influence new fresh revolutionary elements.

It is absolutely necessary to review more rapidly and decisively than before the cadres methods and plans in this sphere of work. The party must firmly draw the attention of the women's departments to the women *in industry*. It must call upon these workers themselves to carry out the measures of the Party among the mass of proletarian women.

It must bring women workers into all the spheres of the Party and revolutionary trade union movement. Give them an opportunity to rise and grow stronger, take special measures in order to raise the political level of leaders who have come forward in the revolu-

tionary struggle from the midst of women workers, and raise at all costs the percentage of women workers in the party. All these are immediate and urgent tasks of the Parties regarding work among women—tasks which can be fulfilled more easily by taking advantage of International Working Women's Day.

We do not know whether and how the C.C.'s of the Parties have reacted to the reorganisation of this work in the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., but we deem it necessary to warn the Parties against drawing a mechanical analogy, trying to pursue the path of the C.P.S.U., "transferring immediately the work to the highest plane," interpreting this plane as liquidation of women's departments, because such intentions would be a perversion of the measures of the C.P.S.U. The conditions of work among women in bourgeois and colonial countries cannot be compared with the conditions of work among women by the C.P.S.U., all the more so as the decision regarding reorganisation of this work was the result of twelve years of systematic work, with the help of a special department with equal rights in the apparatus of the Party organisations under conditions of proletarian dictatorship. This is all the more impossible in capitalist countries, as the enemy organisations are adapting their activities in every possible way to the specific habits, labour, and living conditions of working women burdened with families and slaves to their households. It should be pointed out that in the U.S.S.R., owing to the enormous progress regarding the socialisation of living conditions, sex equality, and equal pay for equal work, there is no longer any need for a considerable part of the *specific* work among women.

UNITED FRONT

We have endeavoured to demonstrate that the healthy proletarian instinct of working women and working men's wives directs their struggle into the common channel of the revolutionary working-class movement. It is our task to convert the political instinct of working women into conscious will, into class-conscious determination to participate in the general struggle of the proletariat and to contribute to it in every possible way: "United Front of men and women in industry; men and women agricultural labourers; youths and girls; the

whole proletarian family; housewives and women employees; against the attacks of the capitalist world," is our slogan. But this slogan must be explained to working women in such a manner as to link it with all those concrete questions upon which working women are compelled to struggle. As a result of the successfully-conducted campaign, proletarian women must be brought to realise that only through the general revolutionary struggle will they be able to fight for their own partial demands, equal pay for equal work, equal unemployment doles, protection of motherhood and of their labour, lower taxes, against capitalist rationalisation, fines, housing and other laws which worsen their position, against high prices, taxes, etc.; and that only the united struggle of the proletariat and its ultimate victory will emancipate working women.

CHARACTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Our object must be pursued not only by means of suitable propaganda, but also by actually drawing proletarian women into the present struggle carried on by the Communist Parties. The struggle against unemployment, which is gaining ground in all countries, must constitute the basis for the class-conscious participation of women workers in the general struggle of the proletariat. The Parties must show to the proletariat women what is going on at the present juncture; must explain that this is the epoch of the decline of the capitalist world, which is making frantic but ineffectual efforts to crush the revolutionary struggle, and is directing its blows simultaneously against the proletariat of its own country and against the workers of the U.S.S.R.

Protection of the U.S.S.R. by every possible means; struggle against pacifism; active revolutionary readiness to resist the blows directed against the Workers' Republic—this must be the determination of proletarian woman. Simultaneously, the Communist Party must be popularised as the true leader of the toiling masses, as the only Party which champions proletarian women wholeheartedly, without hypocrisy, and treachery, which supports with all the means at its disposal their demands, rights and interests; for which championship

of their interests Communist Parties are persecuted, the leaders of the proletariat are put in prison, newspapers are suppressed, and the property of the Communist Parties is confiscated; for which the Communist Parties in bourgeois-“ democratic ” countries are threatened with being declared illegal.

If we turn our attention to the character of the International Women’s Day in the U.S.S.R. for a number of years, one thing is clear : there was reflected in it as in a mirror, from year to year, the true revolutionary state of affairs in the Soviet Republic, in the years of civil war, as well as in the years of N.E.P. and in those of socialist economic reconstruction. These revolutionary traditions must become the property of all the Parties, and then the success of the International Women’s Day can be considered assured.

TO REACH WIDE PROLETARIAN AND PEASANT MASSES

While strengthening the internal organisational system of work among women, the Communist Parties must at the same time reach out to wide circles of proletarian women. While its chief efforts must be to draw in industrial women workers, the Party must at the same time take advantage of every opportunity for reaching working men’s wives, housewives and women in offices. Under present conditions these sections of women are also affected by the capitalist offensive. High prices for articles of primary necessity, higher rent, higher prices for gas, water, lighting and travelling, unemployment, which is affecting every factory, all this combined calls forth protests everywhere which convert working men’s wives and housewives into an unorganised army of protesters who do not care what forms these protests take. This energy must be directed into the common channel, the struggle against the existing order, against the whole present system and for proletarian dictatorship. The Parties must organise these wide sections of the working population, and supplement with their energy the growing revo-

lutionary mood of the working class. This makes it all the more necessary to extend the organisational measures of the Communist Parties to the rural districts, and to begin work among women agricultural labourers and peasant women, especially in the agrarian countries. No matter how inadequate the work of the Communist Parties among women, it has at any rate reached that stage when these Parties must take up more systematic work among peasant women. Why should there not be, for instance, expeditions of the revolutionary brigades of unemployed and employed women workers to adjoining villages, in order to establish a revolutionary bond of fraternity, to organise meetings as a preliminary to conferences of women agricultural labourers and peasant women ?

The forms and methods to be adopted for the conduct of “ March 8th ” must be so varied and flexible that neither prohibition nor persecution should be able to prevent the initiation of new organisational forms for the conduct of the campaign. We must, therefore, get the masses to help us to find ways and means of giving a revolutionary form to the International Women’s Day. By organising independent committees of working women for the conduct of March 8th in factories and among unemployed, among working men’s wives and peasant women, the Parties will enrich our revolutionary experience with the discovery of new methods for getting into the midst of these masses and creating, through the efforts of these masses themselves, the means for drawing them under our influence.

This year’s campaign is going on under favourable conditions (revolutionary incidents are developing). Provided only that the Parties themselves take the International Women’s Day seriously, and pay maximum attention to it, it will be able to play an important rôle in the mobilisation of proletarian women around the slogans of the Communist Parties. It will bring new members into the ranks.

The Lessons of the Strikes in Paris

Letter from S——, Paris

THE leadership of the Paris district, as well as the central leadership of the C.P. of France, in a letter sent to the recent Paris district conference, well characterised the mistakes of the two opportunist camps of the right and the left, and called for a determined struggle against them. This letter expressed self-criticism of past activity, and laid down the tasks before the Paris district.

Self-criticism and resolutions putting forth our tasks in a correct manner are good. But what is necessary in the present situation—the beginning of the crisis of French capitalism, growth of international class antagonisms, the increasing danger of imperialist war against the U.S.S.R., and new revolutionary advance—what is necessary in order that the Party may truly win the majority of the working class, may be its leader in the daily struggles, may lead it in the decisive fight against the capitalist class—is not beautiful self-criticisms made for the love of self-criticism, not correct resolutions which remain on paper.

Our self-criticism must not be the mere dilettante description of our weaknesses and errors. We must criticise our activity before the broad masses of workers, in order that, having analysed the causes of our mistakes, we shall not repeat them; in order that, relying upon experience, we shall learn from our defeats to work better in the future. It is by this kind of self-criticism that we are going to win the confidence of the workers and draw them into the ranks of our Party, and it is thus that we shall gain the strength and experience necessary to lead the proletariat.

The last strikes in France and the militancy of the workers show unmistakably the upward revolutionary trend of the proletariat. Our Party has rightly recognised this; but has it also fulfilled the tasks which constituted its duty in these strikes?

To answer this question let us take an example from the Paris district. Let us take the strikes at the Alsthom works, and more specially at the Thomson-Favorites.

The Party leadership of the Paris district

very well saw the unrest which prevailed in all the Alsthom-Thomson metallurgical works; appreciated the favourable situation for struggle; and did well to entrust one comrade specially with the agitation in all the Alsthom factories in Paris. But we were wrong in being satisfied to conduct agitation *only*, and not to *organise* the willingness of the workers to fight.

In the Thomson-Favorites factory—with 1,500 workers of whom the majority are women, one of the first Alsthom factories to stop work—our agitation, through the Party factory papers, the red metal unions and the Communist youth, reached all the workers—labourers, women, foreign workers, young workers—all of them were ready to follow the slogans of the C.P. and the revolutionary trade union.

These workers who came out at the call of our Party cell gave us a fine example of how economic strikes become political strikes. On the first day they defended against the police the distributors of our factory paper, of "l'Humanité" and "l'Avant-Garde," at the works gates; were on the point of beating the distributor of a factory sheet issued by the fascist company union, who was only saved by the police. And on the last day of the strike, at the moment of returning to work, they rescued from the hands of the police a functionary of the revolutionary trade union.

The women and young workers of the Alsthom works, seeing the machine guns which were brought out before the factory in an effort to intimidate the strikers, understood that this army, which the capitalist class is ready to use against French workers on strike, it is also preparing to use in the war against the fatherland of all the exploited, the U.S.S.R.: and they shouted "Down with imperialism! Long live the Red Army!"

Again, it was the young workers at Favorites, who in response to our anti-imperialist propaganda came to propose to the mass meeting of strikers to "adopt" the 3rd engineers' regiment.

BUT WHAT OF OUR LEADERSHIP?

And in face of this magnificent militant spirit—in face of these extraordinary possibilities of winning the most exploited sections of the workers—what has been the work of our Party leadership and organisation, and of the revolutionary trade union?

The leadership of the movement was in the hands of the Paris district secretary of the revolutionary metal union, a member of the Communist Party. Did this Party member immediately get into touch with the Party cell which existed in the factory? No! He even categorically refused to speak with anyone from the Party. Did this leader of the revolutionary union try to apply the line carried out in strikes by the R.I.L.U.? Not in the least. No strike committees elected by the strikers in the course of the strike. No extension of the strike. Faure-Brac—the secretary referred to—advised the workers to stay at home, not to demonstrate in the street or before the factory! No pickets were organised. This same Faure-Brac said that it was sufficient for each delegate to take two or three workers with him.

And the delegates? That is a special story. These were the delegates who in a strike of several months ago had shown themselves to be incapable of fighting—had shown themselves on the side of the employers. Neither after the strike of July, nor at the time of the strike of which we are now speaking, did either the Party cell or the leaders of the union dream of new elections of delegates. And it is characteristic of the absolutely false manner of conducting self-criticism, that even after the self-criticism made by the Party committee of the 6th sub-district of its activity in the strike at Favorites, the decision to have new elections of delegates has not been taken. So when there comes a new movement in the factory, it is with the same delegates, incapable of struggle, or even betrayers of struggle, that we shall go into the fight.

At the conference of the Paris district all the comrades recognised that the metal union is in a bad way, that it does not enjoy the confidence of the metal workers of Paris, that the fault is in the opportunist leadership of the union, which **must** be changed completely.

Yes, comrades, let us fight against the opportunists. Let us drive them from the posts where they are injurious to our struggle, and replace them by good revolutionaries. But this is not all. *We must expose their opportunism at once before the working masses, and draw the greatest possible number of workers into the fight which we rightly conduct against them.*

It is not a fight against opportunism, it is not a communist fight, it is opportunism in practice, to let Faure-Brac do his work of strike breaking and not criticise him openly before the workers, before the wide masses, by speeches, through the factory papers, "l'Humanité" and "la Vie Ouvriere."

WHAT WE MUST DO NOW.

By the faults of Faure-Brac and the leadership of the metal union, which has not sufficiently concerned itself with the Alsthom strikes; by the lack of Party direction and co-ordination of the various actions, all the factories (Favorites, Standart, Lecaube, St. Ouen, etc.) have been beaten one after the other by the employers.

In these movements, where thousands of working men and women were ready to follow us, where thousands of workers were engaged in struggle, our Party has not been able to win hundreds of new adherents; the Communist youth has not enlarged its ranks with valiant young workers; and the revolutionary union has not gained new members.

Therefore, the answer which is given to our question by an analysis of the movement in the Alsthom works is, that our Party, while appreciating the situation correctly, did not fulfil all the tasks which that situation imperatively set before it.

All of us, members and leaders of the French C.P., must see the bad work which we are still carrying on. We must set ourselves immediately and seriously to combat the dilettante and superficial work which is a heritage from social democracy. We must take up immediately and resolutely a wide and deep work of organisation for the conquest of the majority of the working class.

Our Party will only truly fulfil its role of leader of the proletariat:

1. When it understands the importance of

the daily struggles of the proletariat; when it takes up all their demands and puts itself at the head of the struggle for them.

2. When it organises and extends the struggles, by forming committees of struggle and factory committees, strengthens the revolutionary trade union organisation, and promotes defence corps for defending the workers' movements, the revolutionary press and organisations.

3. When it reinforces the political character of the economic fights, linking the latter with our whole struggle against the bourgeoisie, social-fascism and fascism; against the terror

which they exercise against the proletariat and its organisations; against the attack on the U.S.S.R.

4. When it clearly controls its own activity, and does not permit any deviation, any breach of discipline, without unmasking and fighting against it.

5. When it sets itself by hard work on the part of every individual member to strengthen its ranks and improve its social composition by the recruiting of new workers from among those who have shown themselves the most militant in the struggles.

The Theory of Bonapartism

One of the Gospels of Neo-Centrism

Hermann Remmele

ALTHOUGH Karl Kautsky, the theoretician of the Second International, has demonstrated (in several hundreds and thousands of printed pages) that the Second International uses Marxist theory as armour to protect the most vulnerable parts of its nakedness, one cannot find, however carefully one may examine the spiritual output of these heroes of the Second International, any sign of an attempt to decorate in a Marxist fashion the most recent stage in the development of social-democracy, the stage of social-fascism. Indeed, one finds the contrary: in so far as menshevism still concerns itself with theory, it is employed in an effort to give this social-fascist period an explanation and a significance which quite openly and distinctly dissociates itself from the Marxist theory of the development of capitalism; and whenever the theoreticians of the Second International still speak of revolutionary Marxism, they do so in order to explain that the "old masters" of the socialist movement started out on an incorrect basis, due to the fact that at that time capitalism was still quite young. This theory is presented most clearly and shamelessly by the Austro-Marxist Karl Renner and the German social-democratic theorists Rudolf Hilferding and Naphtaly.

Still more contemptible is the part played

by the left social-democrats, who have, even more than the others, made use of Marxist phraseology. At the present time, in the social-fascist period of reformism, these lefts are advancing so rapidly towards the most extreme social-fascist wing, that in many respects they quite put the bulk of the reformists in the shade. We have only to compare the recent issues of the "left" papers in Germany—the "Leipzig Volkszeitung," the "Chemnitz Volksstimme," the "Planener Volksblatt" and other daily papers of the same type with the rest of the social-democratic press and the bourgeois newspapers, in order to see that these gentlemen are the most clamorous shouters in the anti-bolshevik and social-fascist front against the class conscious proletariat and the soviet power. There can be no doubt about it; as fascist tendencies gain ground within social-democracy, the basis for the left becomes smaller. Their historical task to serve as a buffer between the revolutionary proletariat and reformism, is approaching its end. A powerful process of levelling between right and left social democrats is taking place. In the present period of intensified class struggles, which are taking on a more and more revolutionary character, which demand from the working class clear and definite decisions, the ground on which one-

time centrism used to manoeuvre grows narrower and narrower. We have only to consider, in this connection, the part played by Austro-Marxism in the development of fascism in Austria, the left-wing Cook and company in England, the development of the Labour Party in Norway, etc., etc. This latest development in the reformist movement shows indubitably that the time is coming nearer and nearer when the old left-wingers will have played out their part, that their methods of labour treachery are finished, that they are so deeply compromised in the eyes of the entire working class that, in the coming period of revolutionary upheaval in the capitalist world, they will be unable to play the part of throttling the proletariat with the same success which they achieved in the first period of revolutionary upheaval in Europe—the period of 1917-1923.

Reformism to-day, whatever the particular brand, has not the mental vigour or strength to defend itself, practically and theoretically, from the attacks of the revolutionary proletariat. The intellectual and spiritual degeneration of the bourgeoisie, to decay and stagnation in bourgeois political life, the bankruptcy of the capitalist party system—this whole process of degeneration is at the same taking place within social-democracy, which now, in its period of social-fascism, has become to an even greater extent than before an integral part of the capitalist class domination.

In this hour of need a new knight-errant has arisen among the reformists—although, as we shall see, a knight who cuts as doleful a figure as Sancho Panza—from the ranks of the renegades who fled from our ranks before the approaching revolutionary wave. The heritage of revolutionary phraseology, in which the old centrism excelled, is now being taken over by these groups of renegades who have arisen in different countries. Neo-centrism is trying to stem the exodus from the camp of reformism of the working masses who are now awakening from the inertia of the stabilisation period. This neo-centrist movement is composed of the Brandler-Thalheimer group in Germany, which calls itself the "Communist (opposition) Party," the "Workers and Peasants Party" of France, which, following the model of the bourgeois party sys-

tem in that country, consists of six parish councils and the Mayor of Strassburg; the Flyg-Kilbom-Samuelson group in Sweden which, in order to mislead the Swedish workers, has appropriated the title of "Communist Party of Sweden, section of the Communist International," the Lovestone group in America, Serra in Italy, etc. Finally, it includes all the Trotskyist ranters, who as the revolutionary wave advances, spin more and more openly the "spiritual threads" which connect them with the Brandler group of renegades. It is a remarkable peculiarity of this new centrism that in its fight against the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat it bases itself, with incomparable irony, upon that work of Karl Marx which begins:

"Hegel remarks somewhere that all great world-historical events and persons reappear in one form or another." He forgot to add: "once as a tragedy, and the second time as a farce."

It is clear that, after the rich experiences of the international proletariat in the first post-war period of revolutionary upheaval within capitalism, centrism in any form, whether it is garbed as social-democratic left or communist right, can no longer win the mass following of the former period, and that consequently it cannot play the same predominant part as a revolutionary factor. If ever Marx's words on this twofold appearance of historical events and persons, "once as tragedy, and the second time as farce," were applicable, then it is to centrism in the fascist and social-fascist period of the imperialist epoch.

Neo-centrism, by the very act of its birth, has given proof of Marx's statement. The "most important theoretical brain" of neo-centrism, Dr. August Thalheimer, is conducting his campaign of "annihilating" the Comintern and defending reformism, by means of the theoretical "proof that social-democracy is the exact opposite of fascism" and that consequently—accordingly to his learned opinion—to declare that reformism has developed into social-fascism is "treachery to the working class." Mr. Thalheimer has, in this "delicate affair," directed a very great number of articles against us.

Events run on fast. The left social-democrats who, in the crisis of social-democracy and

of the workers' revolutionary struggle, began by playing the part of a buffer, are now completing the circle of social fascism and are now becoming its ideological opponents. For such a post of honour does not remain unoccupied for long. Messrs. Dr. Thalheimer and Co. enter upon the stage. The more rapidly these gentlemen emerge the better it is for the revolutionary proletarian vanguard; and the more important is it that there should be in the Comintern a timely exposure of these followers of Thalheimer, who fight against our unmasking of international social-fascism. It is well to recall the fact that even at the Wedding congress of the German Party it was the group of conciliators (comrades Arthur Evert, Ernst Meier, Hugo Eberlein, Süsskind, etc.) who sharply attacked the Comintern because it maintained that social-democracy was on the road to social-fascism. The fact that the conciliators defended social-democracy offers the best proof that we were correct in describing opportunism in our ranks as an "agency of reformism."

The practical aspect of this dispute between the neo-centrists and the conciliators on one side, and the Comintern and our Party on the other, was unmistakable. The united front, as it was understood by the opportunists—that is, the united front with social-democracy for good or ill; the united front with social-democracy as a Party, without reference to the changed character and the political and social development of social-democracy; the denial of the revolutionary rôle of the Communist Party—formed the basis for the hostile attitude of the opportunists towards the policy of the Comintern. August Thalheimer, the theoretician of neo-centrism, created the theory for opportunism in his analysis of the nature of fascism.

When the Comintern first considered its attitude towards Italian fascism (1920-21), Thalheimer disposed of fascism as "Bonapartism." He thought that that statement dispensed with the necessity for any further explanations as to the character, nature and social content of fascism. Obviously, the genius of Mr. Thalheimer's exposition far transcends that of Hegel and Marx. According to him, historical events and persons repeat themselves not only twice, but three, four or a dozen times. Unfortun-

ately Mr. Thalheimer forgets to give details of the garments in which his historical visitations appear.

At the time of the Third World Congress and after, Thalheimer's attempt to explain fascism was unanimously rejected. At the programme commission of the Sixth World Congress, Thalheimer, in a written document, again gave his viewpoint of fascism-bonapartism. One comrade who was present pointed out that comrade Lenin decisively rejected a similar former attempt of Thalheimer's to justify his attitude. Lenin expressly pointed out that bonapartism is possible only in the transition period from the feudal to the capitalist order of society, during which the monarchy tries, after the feudal foundations of its existence have been withdrawn, to steer its way and to preserve its balance between the classes and forces of the new forms of economy and production. As distinct from such a historical situation, fascism arises at the concluding stage of the capitalist order of society, and consequently the economic and political situation is wholly different, and the nature and character of fascism cannot in any respect be compared to bonapartism. The Italian comrades to whom Thalheimer promptly appealed rejected his standpoint as decisively as did the entire Comintern. It was superfluous then to enter into a closer consideration of the peculiarities of Thalheimer's ideas; but now, after ten years, when Thalheimer's bonapartism arises again in defence of reformism, and has become one of the most important dogmas of neo-centrism, it is worth while making some critical remarks on this gospel.

Among the many paradoxes and deep sayings about bonapartism, we find an article on "The war cry of 'social-fascism'" in No. 14 of the Leipzig "Arbeiterpolitik," the organ of the right-wing renegades; an article which, after his contribution on fascism to the programme commission of the C.I., develops most thoroughly Thalheimer's theory of bonapartism. The title and the tenor of the article suffice to show the object of this theoretical work—it is the defence of social-fascism against Communism. The last sentence runs: "We must quickly and finally dispose of this war cry of 'social fascism.'" This categorical imperative of Thalheimer's is sufficiently

clear proof, and we might leave it there and proceed with our work; but we wish to do full justice to the theorist of neo-centrism. Thalheimer himself gives the following reason for his struggle against us:

“In order to carry on an effective fight against fascism, we must differentiate between fascism on the one hand and reformism, liberalism, etc., on the other.”

Of course, nobody in the Comintern has ever disputed the fact that there is a difference between fascism “on the one hand” and reformism and liberalism “on the other.” We know quite as well as Mr. Thalheimer that fascism and social-fascism (although overtures between the two are constantly proceeding) are not identical, just as reformism and social-fascism, liberalism and fascism are not identical. But that they are contradictory, that they mutually exclude each other—this is a discovery peculiar to Thalheimer, which he has made for a shield to protect social-fascism. Thalheimer’s evidence deliberately avoids the real matter at issue, to which we shall return later. Let us continue with his statement.

“The obvious fact that fascism suppresses and destroys all other political and economic mass organisations” . . .

Again, there is absolutely nothing new in this discovery of Thalheimer’s nor does it in the least influence our attitude nor those questions with which it is supposed to deal. The same is true of another statement which he makes further on:

“The war cry of social-fascism is based upon a complete misunderstanding of the nature of fascism, on the one hand, and of reformism on the other.”

Another argument from his article:

“Ebert and Noske sent thousands of workers to death. Was that social-fascism?”

After Mr. August Thalheimer had, as he believed, theoretically, refuted our position by such and similar inquisitorial questions, he became aware, apparently, that this method of refutation did not dispose of the matter, and so he made the following discovery:

“Every instance of the employment of violence by bourgeois democracy against the working class is preparatory work for the bayonet and the sword to make themselves

independent and to establish their dictatorship.”

But in regard to fascism we are concerned not merely with the use of violence but with a system which, as a method of government, has nothing more in common with liberalism and bourgeois democracy, in any of its functions or forms of life. What we maintain is the fact that bourgeois democracy and fascism are both methods of ruling, which the bourgeoisie employs, the one or the other, according to need; that fascism grows out of bourgeois democracy, the one being transformed into the other, the precursor containing within itself the seed of its successor. Thalheimer disputes this vigorously. He maintains that bourgeois democracy and fascism are so sharply contradictory to each other that they can never have anything in common. Mr. Thalheimer’s democratic soul is profoundly pained and he cries from the depths of his heart:

“An end must be made, quickly and finally, to this stupid chatter.”

Now let us see what Karl Marx, in whose school Thalheimer claims to have been raised, says on this subject: “The inevitable ‘general staff’ of the liberties of 1848, personal liberty, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, of meeting and association, educational and religious freedom, etc., were given a constitutional uniform which made them invulnerable. Each one of these liberties was proclaimed to be the indefeasible right of the French citizen, but always with the proviso that they were unrestricted only in so far as they were not limited by the ‘equal rights of others or by considerations of public safety,’ or by laws intended to promote such harmony. For example:

‘Citizens have the right of association, of peaceful and unarmed assembly, of petitioning and of freely expressing their opinion through the press or by other means. The exercise of these rights is restricted only by the equal rights of others and the public safety.’ (“The French Constitution,” Chap. II. §8.) ‘Education is free. The freedom of education shall be enjoyed under the conditions established by law and under the supervision of the state,’ ” and so on.

In summing up these liberties, Marx pointed out:

“Every paragraph of the constitution thus

contains its own antithesis, its own upper and lower house. We have always a general assertion of the liberty, and a proviso whereby the liberty is denied; that is so long as the name of the liberty is respected, and only its effective exercise prevented, in a perfectly legal manner, of course, the constitutional existence of the liberty remains intact, however dead its public existence."

If Mr. Thalheimer were not the philistine metaphysician that he is, he would have noticed long ago that it is not only the constitution of the democratic republicans of 1848 which contains within itself its own antithesis, but that this is of the very nature and content of democracy. Let us take the constitution of "the most free of all republics," the Weimar constitution of the Ebert-Hindenburg republic.

In this case the antithesis was not merely stated by the democrats and social-democrats as a proviso, as was done in 1848; it was made, in the form of paragraph 48 of the constitution, the central axis of the entire republican machinery of bourgeois society.

The learned Marxist August Thalheimer has not only read his Marx badly; he has understood him even worse, otherwise he would not have fallen into the trivial error of thinking and dealing with fascism simply as a further edition of bonapartism. Marx, wisely foreseeing what his "descendants" would do, gave a number of warnings as to how historical and political analogies should not be made. In the preface to the "Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," he says:

"Finally I hope that my little book may contribute to give its quietus to the talk of 'Cæsarism' which is nowadays current in Germany."

Marx was mistaken. The current talk has gone on in Germany until to-day, and August Thalheimer is one of its prophets. Karl Marx's brilliant irony in disposing of that conception has availed nothing in this case:

"So extensive are the differences between the material and economic conditions of the class war in classical and in modern times, that the political incidents born out of the struggle in our epoch and the other can have no more resemblance to one another than the Archbishop of Canterbury has to the High Priest Samuel."

We can transfer this statement of Marx to the great difference which exists between the conditions of the class war and social relations in 1851 and in 1930, for bonapartism has as little in common with fascism as the idyllic stage-coach of blessed memory with the modern aeroplane of to-day. "But both are means of transport!" our learned Marxist Thalheimer will probably answer triumphantly. What shall we reply to that? For in that case there is equally no difference between—shall we say Mr. Thalheimer and a rat, for both are living creatures in one and the same historical period and, truly, neither rank among the most estimable of our contemporaries.

Thalheimer wants to explain fascism by reference to the economic, social and political conditions prevailing in the middle of the past century. He sees no difference between the particular political forms of capitalism in its early period, the period in which it was possible for bonapartism to arise, and the epoch of imperialism, which alone can serve as the basis for fascism. We think that it is more useful and advantageous to the working class to understand and to estimate the growth, the nature, the character and the development of fascism, its advance and its decline, by a consideration of the economic, social and political conditions of the present; for such an approach is the essential condition for a successful struggle against fascism and for its utter elimination. We believe that this is more useful to the working class than August Thalheimer's endeavour to make Louis Bonaparte responsible for the devilries of fascism.

The extent to which Karl Marx opposed and rejected the formal transference of events and persons in universal history to other times and other conditions that is, the extent to which he condemned the method employed by Thalheimer—is clearly shown in the following extract from the "Eighteenth Brumaire":

"Men make their own history, but not just as they please. They do not choose the circumstances for themselves, but have to work upon circumstances as they find them, have to fashion the material handed down by the past. The legacy of the dead generations weighs like an Alp upon the living. At the very time when they seem to be engaged in revolutionising themselves and things,

when they seem to be creating something perfectly new—in such epochs of revolutionary crisis, they are eager to press the spirits of the past into their service, borrowing the names of the dead, reviving old war cries, dressing up in traditional costumes that they may make a braver pageant in the newly-staged scene of universal history. Thus did Luther masquerade as Paul of Tarsus (and we may now add, Mussolini as Cæsar, Hitler as Mussolini, Pabst as Gneisenau, Göbels as Hitler and each leader of a group as his immediate superior, and, last of all, Thalheimer as Marx—H.R.), thus did the revolution of 1789-1814 drape itself successively as the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire; and thus was it that the revolution of 1848 could find nothing better to do than to parody by turns 1789 and the revolutionary traditions of 1793-95. In like manner, the learner of a new language begins by translating every word and every phrase into his mother tongue, but he does not acquire freedom in his new speech, he is not at home there, until he has become able to break away from the memories of the language he learned in the nursery and until he can use the new instrument without thinking of the old.

“When we study these callings up of the dead upon the stage of universal history, we forthwith become aware of a remarkable difference. Camille Desmoulins, Danton, Robespierre, Saint Just, Napoleon, the heroes as well as the parties and the masses of the great French revolution, though they donned Roman garb and mouthed Roman phrases, nevertheless achieved the task of the day—which was to liberate the bourgeoisie and to establish modern bourgeois society.”

Further on in the same book Karl Marx wrote:

“The calling up of the shades of the dead took place in order to embellish the new struggles, and not in order to parody the old; it was done for the sake of adding an imaginative halo to the tasks that had to be performed, and not in search of an excuse for refraining from their actual performance; there was a genuine endeavour to rediscover

the spirit of revolution, and not the mere making of a ghost to walk.”

We think that this quotation from Marx, if applied to Thalheimer's calling up of the shades of Bonapartism, is clear and conclusive enough. But Mr. Thalheimer has not yet grasped the fact that, unlike the bourgeois revolution, the proletarian revolution does not need to call upon the dead. The outlook of the proletarian revolution cannot, as that of the bourgeois revolution, be directed to the past; it does not have recourse to the museums of antiquity in order to find trappings in which to strut across the stage; it is turned forwards, and only forwards, for the proletarian revolution, as distinct from the bourgeois, accomplishes that of which there is no other example in the past. The bourgeois revolution could never be completed, it had always to remain a half measure, returning to its starting-point with the historical development of bourgeois society. No other course was possible. Bourgeois society, in its new forms of production and property, took over the corpses of economic systems which had decayed; it did not do away with them, it only co-ordinated them. Bourgeois society, born between the millstones of the primitive, individualist feudal order of society, and the collective economy of socialist society, stormed forward until it reached the boundaries of its own world and shrank back from the abyss of the proletarian revolution; retreating hurriedly until it again reached its starting point, its forces fettered in the chains of the old decayed society. Relying now upon the powers of the past, now upon the powers of the future, bourgeois society leads a sorry existence, which will never find the strength to admit itself to be what it is, but falls back upon the garb of antiquity in order to pass as something else, just as Mr. Thalheimer finds it necessary to quote from Marx, believing that this will make him appear as a learned Marxist and a great revolutionary.

It is just the same with Mr. Thalheimer as with Marx's novice: he tried to learn a new language—the language of Marxism—but he always translates it back into his mother tongue, into that of the petty-bourgeois philistine. Since he can never acquire freedom in this new language, since he cannot make it his

own, he will never be at home in it. In this matter he is, and he will remain, a beginner.

From what we have said it is obvious that Mr. Thalheimer has never grasped, and never will grasp, the fact that the proletarian revolution does not follow the same laws as the bourgeois revolution, that it does not fluctuate between its beginning and its end, but that the proletarian revolution, once it is accomplished, can never return to its starting point; it must go forward, always advancing to something new, something that has not been before and that we cannot learn from the past.

Bonapartism-fascism, according to Mr. Thalheimer, is defined in the following fashion:

“ Thus bonapartism or fascism arises when the bourgeoisie is either not yet able, or no longer able, to exercise its own rule directly. Fascism is the open but the indirect dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.”

In this statement Thalheimer does not say that bonapartism appears at the beginning of capitalist development and fascism at its end—which would have some meaning. No! He places bonapartism and fascism as on one level, names them both in the same breath and describes both, irrespective of whether they appear at the beginning or at the end of capitalist development, as forms of bourgeois rule. Thalheimer's theory of the bourgeoisie “ which is not yet able, or no longer able, to exercise its own rule directly,” is an old acquaintance from the Thalheimer school. If we are not mistaken, it was the one-time comrade Thalheimer who taught us that: “ The workers' and peasants' government is a government ruling in a period when the bourgeoisie is no longer strong enough, and the proletariat not yet strong enough, to rule alone.”

If we place Thalheimer's definition of fascism alongside his theory about the workers' and peasants' government, we shall immediately discover that, to Thalheimer, both these forms of rule require an identical social situation as the condition from which they can arise. The Thalheimer model is adaptable to all the occasions and “ accidents ” of historical events.

It is true that Marx's analysis of the situation of the French bourgeoisie in the period 1848 to 1851, during the struggles among the

various bourgeois groups (landowning—the Orleanists; merchant capital—the legitimists; industrial capital—the democratic republicans) which led to actual conflict, is given its great significance when he says that “ the bourgeoisie had lost the capacity to rule the country, and the working class had not yet won that capacity ”; and there is some grain of plausibility in Thalheimer's theory concerning the workers' and peasants' government in his hypothesis of a balance of power, although it has nothing whatever in common with reality—but his description or analysis of fascism as the rule of the bourgeoisie when the bourgeoisie has already lost its power, is utterly meaningless. Thalheimer's discovery that the de-classed elements, the lumpen-proletariat, constitute themselves into a class and take over the government is so staggering that he really should have it patented. It never occurred to Marx to regard the Society of the 10th December, the lumpen-proletariat, and the de-classed elements of the French bourgeoisie, as the class rulers in Louis Bonaparte's government. What, with Marx, plays a wholly subordinate part, is promoted by Thalheimer to become the class character of fascism. Such Marxist wisdom on the part of Mr. Thalheimer is too much for our poor understanding, and we find it difficult to develop a taste for it.

In actual fact the case with fascism is the direct opposite of what Thalheimer would like to prove. In the period of highly developed imperialism fascism becomes the necessary instrument by which finance capital exercises its rule precisely because parliamentary democracy, the form of government in the earlier stage of capitalism, has become inadequate for serving any longer as the governmental medium of finance capital. It is fascism which becomes the direct form of the rule of finance capital, while parliamentarianism was the indirect form which finance capital was forced to do away with.

According to Thalheimer's theory the capitalist world is developing back to its beginning stage, to early capitalism. It is not difficult to see that this crab's walk is but the hopeless prospect of the petty bourgeois who, in distress at the opening of a new world, and feeling the ground give way beneath his feet, does

not turn his glance forwards towards revolutionary development, but back to the past, demanding from it an answer to the questions raised by the socialist revolution. We give him the answer given by Karl Marx in the "Eighteenth Brumaire":

"The social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot draw its figurative embellishments from the past; it must create them anew out of the future. It cannot begin its work until it has rid itself of all the ancient superstitions. Earlier revolutions had need of the reminiscences of historical

pageantry, for thus only could they bemuse themselves as to their own significance. The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead, for thus only can it discover its own true meaning. In those earlier revolutions, there was more phrase than substance; in the revolution that is to come, there will be more substance than phrase."

Karl Marx was not mistaken in this: Communism will do its utmost to cast neo-centrism, along with all other forms of social-fascism, on to the dust heap of history.

The Problems of Fascism and Social-Fascism in the International Communist Press

A. Fogarashi

THE development of the social democratic parties and the reformist trade unions into *social-fascist* organisations is a phenomenon the significance of which can only be fully understood after having investigated it on an international scale, and after having *concretely* illustrated the general characteristics of social-fascism by an outline of its peculiar forms in the various capitalist countries. That is a duty of the communist press, and particularly the theoretical journals. Up till now, however, these communist party organs, with the exception of the German "Internationale," have devoted little or no attention to the problems of social-fascism; this shows that the *international* nature of the development of social-democracy into social-fascism is not adequately understood, particularly in those countries where the fascisation of social-democracy has not yet assumed such open forms as in Germany.

It can therefore be considered a sign of the times, and a step forward, that recently the communist journals have begun to deal more thoroughly with the problem of social-fascism. In the fight against social-fascism and national fascism the communist journals have a very important duty to perform they must follow

the concrete forms of development, the *changes*, the *innovations* in the theory and practice of national fascism and social-fascism. (But, while they should endeavour to bring out the concrete symptoms that are characteristic of particular countries, they should not ignore general international symptoms, as was done in Comrade Gerber's article in the "International" on *Social Fascism in Austria*). By an adequate study of national-fascism and social-fascism, our journals can provide Party workers with a very valuable weapon in the fight against fascism.

The less clear the outward manifestations of this fascisation of the state—due to historical circumstances or to skilful camouflage—the bigger the danger that the workers will not realise what is the essence of social-fascism. A classic example of this is England, where the majority of the old Central Committee of the C.P.G.B. was quite incapable of understanding the social-fascist development of the Labour Party and trade unions. The article by Comrade Murphy, *The Growth of Social-Fascism in Great Britain*, in the January *Communist Review*, points out with complete justification that without a correct appreciation of social fascism it will be impossible to

carry out the new line in the Communist Party. Comrade Murphy points out the danger of the illusion that the Labour Party occupies an anti-fascist position. He considers that the origin of this illusion is that no distinction is made between fascism in general and the peculiar forms assumed by the fascist dictatorship in Italy. To counteract this illusion Comrade Murphy endeavours to bring out in relief the theoretical unity of fascism and social-democracy in the conception of the corporate state, standing above classes, and in the replacing of parliamentarism by a peculiar kind of party representation. He illustrates this with some extremely pertinent quotations from Macdonald, Henderson, or from Labour Party documents. He also gives a detailed sketch of the complete solidarity of the "lefts" of the Independent Labour Party with the official social-fascist policy of the Labour Party.

DEVELOPMENT FROM REFORMISM TO SOCIAL-FASCISM.

Comrade Murphy's article is of great service in that it contains an abundance of documentation, quotations and concrete facts, clearly illuminating the social-fascist character of the Labour Party. But the article also has its definite defects. In the first place, Comrade Murphy has defined symptoms of fascism one after the other, but has not indicated the nature of the *development* from the former petty-bourgeois reformist ideology to the present social-fascist ideology and policy. Secondly, he alludes to a whole number of social-imperialist acts of the Labour Government and the "lefts" simply as symptoms of social-fascism without showing that social-fascism is a consistent stage in the evolution of social-imperialism, and that accordingly the shameful imperialist actions of Macdonald and Henderson are not a specifically *new* element in social-fascist development. What is specifically new is the close *combination* of their imperialist policy with the organisation of a fascist dictatorship against the proletariat in the home country. Thirdly, Comrade Murphy does not clearly emphasise the inter-relationships between fascism and social-fascism, and thus the special rôle of the latter, when he says :

"The last reserves are called up, and as the crisis deepens social-fascism swiftly evolves to pure fascism."

Here social-fascism is portrayed as a kind of feeble, undeveloped fascism. That is a very common misunderstanding. Social-fascism, *in essence*, is as little a feeble, undeveloped fascism as social-imperialism, in its essence, is a feeble and undeveloped imperialism. Social-fascism is a definite form assumed by fascism, just as social-imperialism is a definite form assumed by imperialism.

The error committed by Comrade Murphy in describing the inter-relationships between social-fascism and fascism was also made in the *Rote Fahne*—where, by the way, it was immediately rectified. The article in *Rote Fahne* treats the development thus: "Social-democracy, after a short period of time, will be ousted from the government by finance-capital, so as to cede place to open fascism." That article was based on the non-comprehension of the specific rôle of social-fascism and its significance for the fascist dictatorship.

Indeed, social-fascism by no means needs to be developed into "pure" fascism. It already is actual fascism. It renders a signal service to capitalism by the very fact that, by a special camouflage—socialist phraseology—it helps to enforce—and itself enforces—the fascist dictatorship.

The theoretical organ of the C.P. of France, the *Cahiers du Bolchévisme*, is also belated in dealing with the problems of social-fascism in the bourgeois states. In the February number of this journal (No. 2, 1930) are articles by Comrade Sémard (*Social Imperialism and Social Fascism*) and by Comrade Berlioz (*The Fascisation of the Bourgeois State*.)

For France the fascisation of the bourgeois state is a process of no less decisive significance than for Germany. It is precisely because in France this process takes place under other conditions than in Germany, England, Italy, or Poland that its study is of great importance, not only for the C.P. of France, but for the entire Communist International. The more concretely we analyse the peculiar forms of the manifestation of fascism in the various states, the more clearly will it be seen how strongly the *common* features in its develop-

ment predominate. This shows the profound and extensive unity of the whole process. It is a process of an *international* character, which is proceeding in step with the world-wide disintegration of relative capitalist stabilisation.

FASCISATION OF FRENCH BOURGEOIS STATE.

Comrade Berlioz's article contains excellent material for an analysis of the process of fascisation taking place in France. The organisational rôle of the "National Economic Council" and the personal rôle of Tardieu in this process is treated in spécial detail. There are also instructive illustrations of the exaltation of the "executive power over the legislative"; "the government-directed campaign against parliamentary chatter and in favour of a reform of the state with the collaboration of all classes, all steady forces"; the "organic reform of the state"—all these things being shown as the extensively thought-out activity of Tardieu or of the capitalist group behind him. There is an equally clear illustration of the collaboration of the social-democrats in the work of the fascist reform of the state, on the National Economic Council, and in the propagandist press campaign. The estimation of the prospects of development given in the article is quite correct: in the measure in which the economic crisis embraces France also there will be an increase of fascist propaganda, a strengthening of fascist cadres, of Mauras, Thessinger, Coty and their band, and above all an increase in the fascist rôle of social-democracy and the reformist trade-union bureaucracy.

Comrade Semard's article, *Social Imperialism and Social-Fascism*, sets out to portray social-imperialism and social-fascism in their most recent present-day forms as displayed in France, and to combat the illusion whereby social-fascism in France is supposed to be less

dangerous than in Germany. Here Comrade Semard, like Berlioz, gives a host of examples of the merging of the social-fascist party and the trade-union bureaucracy with the state apparatus.

What is lacking in the articles by Comrades Semard and Berlioz, as well as in that of Comrade Murphy, and various German articles on social-fascism (E.K., *The End of Democracy*; I.K., *Fascisation of the S.D. Party Apparatus, Two Paths of Fascism*; in the "Internationale," Nos. 1 and 2, 1930) is an analysis of the connection between the development of monopolistic capitalism and of social-fascism. The object of theoretical work in the various countries should be to trace the development of social-democracy and social-fascism as an *inevitable* process. Only when this conception becomes the common property of all communists will it be possible to weed out the theoretical roots of opportunist vacillations in the appreciation of social-democracy. And this is only possible if we cease to be contented with correct but too general arguments to the effect that the causes of social-fascist development lie in the crisis of capitalist society. In our day we need to ascertain the laws of the development which is observable on an international scale in the conditions of the unequal development of capitalism, determining the fascisation of the bourgeois state, the development of social-democracy into social-fascism, and of bourgeois democracy into fascism.

Elucidation of the problems of fascism and social-fascism must not be omitted from the columns of the communist press, particularly its theoretical organs. On the contrary, this should be the centre of attention, so that the theoretical study of these vital questions does not lag behind practical questions of the day-to-day struggle.