

# INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 14 No. 6

2nd February 1934

## CONTENTS

<b>Politics</b>		<b>The Decisions of the Thirteenth Plenum and Their Concrete Application</b>	
J. Berlioz: The Chautemps Ministry Sinking Into the Morass .. .. .	151	Sepp Schwab: The Crisis and the Perspectives of Fascist Dictatorship .. .. .	163
Vicente Arroyo: The Organisation of Fascism in Spain .. .. .	152	<b>The Labour Movement</b>	
<b>Germany</b>		A. A.: The Fight of the British Miners for Wage Increases .. .. .	163
After Dimitrov—Thaelmann .. .. .	154	K. J-n: The Wage-Cutting Offensive of Swedish Social Democracy .. .. .	166
<b>Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.</b>		<b>Struggle Against Unemployment</b>	
Opening of the Party Congress .. .. .	155	I. Amter: National Convention Against Unemployment in the U.S.A. .. .. .	166
Opening Speech of Comrade Molotov .. .. .	155	<b>In the International</b>	
Greeting of the C.P. of Germany to the Party Congress of Socialist Victories .. .. .	156	Statement of Comrade Remmele .. .. .	166
Karl .. .. . The Architect of Socialist Society .. .. .	157	<b>Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union</b>	
<b>Struggle Against Imperialist War</b>		L. F. Boross: The Working Class of the Soviet Union in the Second Five-Year Plan .. .. .	167
The Danger of War in the Balkans .. .. .	160	The Lenin Celebrations in Moscow .. .. .	168
A. C. Bosse: The U.S. Flight to Hawaii .. .. .	161		

## Comrade Stalin on the World Situation

(From the Report Delivered at the  
17th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

### 1. The Protracted Crisis of World Capitalism and the Foreign Political Situation of the U.S.S.R.

I think no period of the last decade was so rich in events as the period since the Sixteenth Party Congress. In the economic sphere these years have been years of continuous world economic crisis. The crisis affected not only industry, but also agriculture as a whole. In the sphere of politics these years saw a further sharpening of relationships between the capitalist countries and also within these countries: Japan's war against China and the occupation of Manchuria, which sharpened the relationships in the Far East; the victory of fascism in Germany and the triumph of the idea of revenge, which sharpened the relationships in Europe; Japan's and Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations, which gave a fresh impetus to increase of armaments and imperialist war preparations; the defeat of fascism in Spain, which once again shows that the revolutionary crisis is ripening and fascism is not by any means long-lived—these are the most important facts of the period under report. It is not surprising that bourgeois pacifism is breathing its last and disarmament tendencies are being openly and directly replaced by tendencies to increasing armaments and re-arming.

Amidst these raging waves of economic upheavals and military political catastrophes, the Soviet Union stands apart like a rock continuing its work of socialist construction and struggle for the preservation of peace. Whilst in the capitalist countries the economic crisis still rages, the Soviet Union continues to advance both in industry and in agriculture. Whilst in the capitalist countries feverish preparations are being made for a new war for the redivision of the world and spheres of influence, the Soviet

Union systematically and persistently continues its struggle against the danger of war and for peace.

The present economic crisis in the capitalist countries differs from all similar crises, among other things, by reason of the fact that it is long drawn out. Whilst former crises lasted one to two years, the present crisis is already in its fifth year. Arid year after year it is devastating economy in the capitalist countries and sucking the sap accumulated in previous years. It is not surprising that this crisis is the most severe of all crises.

This is explained first of all by the fact that the industrial crisis affected all capitalist countries without exception, rendering it difficult for one country to manœuvre at the expense of others. It is explained secondly by the fact that the industrial crisis is interwoven with the agrarian crisis, embracing without exception all the agrarian and semi-agrarian countries, and thereby could not but complicate and deepen the industrial crisis. It is explained thirdly by the fact that during this period the agrarian crisis has become more acute, seizing all branches of agriculture, including cattle-raising, leading to its degradation, culminating in the replacement of machines by hand labour, substitution of horses for tractors, in the sharp decrease and sometimes complete abandonment of the employment of artificial fertilisers, which in turn still further prolonged the industrial crisis. It is explained fourthly by the fact that the monopoly cartels dominating in industry strive to maintain the high prices of commodities, a circumstance rendering the crisis particularly devastating and preventing the consumption of reserves of commodities. Finally, and most important, it is explained by the fact that the industrial crisis occurred under the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, when capitalism, both in the leading States and in the

colonial and dependent countries, no longer possesses that force and stability which it possessed during the war and up to the October revolution; when the industry of the capitalist countries received as a heritage of the imperialist war, chronically under-utilised enterprises and millions of unemployed from which it is no longer able to free itself.

The same circumstances also explain the fact that the crisis was not limited to the sphere of production and trade, but also embraced the credit system, currency, debt obligations, etc., and destroyed the relationships, which had become traditional, between the various States and also between the social groups in the individual countries.

The fall in prices played a great role here. In spite of the resistance of the monopolist cartels, the price drop increased with elementary force, whereby the prices of commodities in the hands of unorganised producers (peasants, artisans, small capitalists) sank first and the most, while the price drop proceeded only gradually in the case of the commodities owned by the organised capitalists and those united in cartels. The fall in prices rendered the position of debtors (industrialists, handicraftsmen, peasants, etc.) unbearable, while on the other hand, it placed the creditors in an enormously advantageous position. Such a situation was bound to lead, and did in fact lead, to a colossal bankruptcy of firms and individual capitalists. Owing to these reasons, during the course of the last three years, tens of thousands of joint stock companies in the United States, Germany, England and France collapsed.

Following the bankruptcy of joint stock companies there came a depreciation of the currency, which somewhat eased the position of the debtors. The depreciation of the currency was followed by the legalised refusal of States to pay foreign and also internal debts. The collapse of such banks as the Darmstaedter and Dresden banks in Germany, the Credit Anstalt in Austria, of concerns such as Kreuger in Sweden and Insull in America, are well known. Such happenings, which shook the foundations of the credit system, were naturally followed by cessation of payment of credit obligations and foreign loans, curtailment of payment of inter-allied debts, cessation of export of capital, further decrease in foreign trade, intensification of the fight for foreign markets, trade war between the various countries, and dumping. Yes, comrades, dumping. I do not speak of so-called Soviet dumping, about which some honourable members of Parliament in Europe and America recently shouted themselves hoarse.

I mean actual dumping, carried on at present by nearly all "civilised" States, about which these brave and esteemed members of Parliament wisely keep silent. It is also understandable that this destructive factor, which goes hand in hand with the industrial crisis and operated beyond the sphere of production, could not in its turn but influence the course of the industrial crisis in the sense of rendering it more deep and complicated. Such is the general picture of the movement of the industrial crisis.

Here are some figures from official sources which illustrate the curve of the industrial crisis in the period under report.

#### *The Volume of Industrial Production Compared with 1929*

If we take one hundred to represent the industrial production in the year 1929 we get the following picture:—

	(Level of production at end of 1933)
Soviet Union	201.6
U.S.A.	64.9
Great Britain	86.1
Germany	66.8
France	77.4

While industry in the chief capitalist countries showed an average decrease in output at the end of 1933 of 25 per cent. compared with the 1929 level, industry in the Soviet Union increased in the same period more than 100 per cent. (Applause.)

The volume of industrial production in the last few years in comparison with the pre-war production (taking 100 to represent 1913) was as follows:—

Soviet Union	194.3	1932	359.0	1933	391.9
United States of America	170.2		91.4		110.2
England	99.1		82.5		85.2
Germany	113.0		67.6		76.0
France	139.0		96.1		107.6

The industrial output of Great Britain and Germany has not yet reached the pre-war level, while that of the United States and France exceed it by a few per cent. The Soviet Union, on the

other hand, has in the same period increased its industrial output in comparison with the pre-war level by over 200 per cent. (Applause.) One can draw a further conclusion from this table. . . The monthly figures of 1932 and 1933 show that the industry of these countries, in spite of fluctuations in their production in the course of the year 1933, showed no tendency to fall back to the level of greatest decline which they reached in 1932.

What does this mean? It means that the industry of the leading capitalist countries has apparently already passed the lowest point and did not return to it in the course of 1933. Many are inclined to attribute this phenomenon to the influence of exclusively artificial factors, such as war and inflation boom. There is no doubt that war and inflation boom play a not unimportant role here. This applies especially to Japan, where this artificial factor is the main and decisive cause of a certain revival of some branches of industry, chiefly the war industries. It would, however, be a great mistake to seek to explain everything as being due to war and inflation boom. Such an explanation would be false because the changes in industry described by me are to be observed not in single, chance regions, but in almost all capitalist countries, including also countries with a fixed currency. Obviously, in addition to war and inflation boom, the inner economic forces of capitalism are making themselves felt here.

Capitalism has succeeded to some extent in improving the position of industry at the cost of the workers: through increased exploitation, by means of increasing the intensity of work; at the cost of the farmers by means of the policy of paying the lowest prices for the products of their toil—food and partly also of raw materials; at the cost of the peasants of the colonial and economically weak countries, by still further forcing down the price of the products of their labour, before all of raw material and also of food products.

Does this mean that we are confronted with a transition from the crisis to the usual depression, bringing in its train a new advance and industrial prosperity? Not by any means. At all events there is nothing which would indicate either directly or indirectly the commencement of an industrial revival in the capitalist countries. Not only that. Taking all in all, there cannot be any such indication, at least in the near future, and this is not because all those unfavourable circumstances which do not permit of any serious revival of industry in the capitalist countries still remain in effect. It is a question of an enduring, general crisis of capitalism, within which the economic crisis is taking place; of chronic non-utilisation of the factories and plants, of wholesale unemployment, of the intertwining of the industrial with the agrarian crisis, and the absence of any tendency towards a serious renewal of foundation capital, which usually announces the approach of an economic revival. Obviously, it is a question of a transition from the extremely lowest level of industry, from the extremely lowest point of the industrial crisis, to depression, nevertheless to a depression of a peculiar kind, leading not to a fresh advance and blossoming of industry, but also not again falling back to the lowest point.

A result of the long-drawn-out economic crisis was the unprecedented sharpening of the political situation of the capitalist countries, both within these countries as well as between them.

The strengthening of the struggle for foreign markets, the abolition of the last remnants of free trade, prohibitive tariffs, trade war, currency war, dumping and many other analogous measures demonstrating the extreme nationalism in economic policies sharpened to extreme relations between countries, created the basis for military clashes and put war on the agenda as a means for a new redivision of the world and creation of spheres of influence in favour of stronger powers.

The war of Japan on China, the occupation of Manchuria, Japan's exit from the League of Nations and advance towards Northern China, sharpened the situation still more. The accentuation of the struggle for the Pacific and the growth of military and naval armaments in Japan, United States, England and France, represent the result of this sharpening.

Germany's exit from the League and the spectre of revenge gave a new impetus to the sharpening situation and the growth of armaments in Europe.

No wonder bourgeois pacifism maintains a pitiable existence, and the babble of disarmament is replaced by "business" talks regarding increased armaments.

Again, as in 1914, the parties of militant imperialism, parties of war and revenge, come to the forefront. Things are obviously

moving towards a new war. Owing to the action of these self-same factors the internal situation in the capitalist countries sharpens to a greater extent.

The four years of industrial crisis exhausted the working class and plunged them into despair. Four years of industrial crisis, not only in the chief capitalist countries, but also, and especially, in the dependent and colonial countries, worked in the same direction. It is a fact that, notwithstanding all kinds of statistical manipulations, which aim at making out that unemployment has declined, the number of unemployed, according to the official figures of bourgeois institutions, amounts to three million in England, five million in Germany, and ten million in the U.S.A., not to speak of other countries in Europe. If we add to these the workers on short time, whose number exceeds ten million, and also the masses of peasants, numbering millions, who have been ruined, we get an approximate picture of the suffering and despair of the toiling masses.

The masses of the people have not arrived at the point of storming capitalism, but that the idea of storming ripens in the consciousness of the masses, there can hardly be any doubt.

Eloquent proof of that is furnished by such facts as the Spanish revolution, the growth of the Soviet districts in China which the united counter-revolution of the Chinese and foreign bourgeoisie is unable to stop.

It is this which explains the fact that the ruling classes of the capitalist countries eagerly destroy or annul the last remnants of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, which might be utilised by the working class in the struggle against their oppressors, drive the Communist Parties underground, and pass to open terrorist methods in order to maintain their dictatorship.

Chauvinism and war preparations as the main elements of foreign policy, repression of the working class and terror in the sphere of internal policy as the indispensable means of strengthening the rear of future military fronts—that is what is particularly engaging the attention of imperialist politicians at the present time.

No wonder fascism has now become the most fashionable commodity among the military bourgeois politicians. I speak not only of fascism in general, but first of all of fascism of the German type, which incorrectly calls itself national socialism. With the most minute investigation it is impossible to discover in it even an atom of socialism.

In this connection the victory of fascism in Germany should be considered not only as an indication of the weakness of the working class, and a result of the betrayal of the working class by social democracy, which cleared the path for fascism, it must also be considered as an indication of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, as an indication that the bourgeoisie is no more able to rule by old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, and is therefore compelled to resort, in internal policies, to terrorist methods of ruling. It is no more able to find a way out from the present situation on the basis of peaceful foreign policy, owing to which it is compelled to resort to a policy of war.

Of course, there is no ground to suppose that war could bring the actual way out. On the contrary it must complicate the situation still more.

Moreover, it will certainly unleash revolution and will challenge the very existence of capitalism in a number of countries, as took place in the course of the first imperialist war.

And if, notwithstanding the experience of the first imperialist war, bourgeois politicians nevertheless seize at war as a drowning man seizes at a straw, that means they have become definitely tangled, and have reached a blind alley, and are ready to plunge headlong into the abyss.

It is therefore not amiss to examine in brief those plans of organisation of war which at present are nurtured in the circles of bourgeois politicians.

Some think war should be organised against one of the great powers to whom they think of administering an annihilating defeat, improving their own business at its expense. Suppose they organise such a war. What may come out of it?

It is well known that during the first imperialist war they also wanted to annihilate one of the great powers—Germany—and profit at its expense. But what came out of this? They did not annihilate Germany, but sowed in Germany such seeds of hatred towards the conquerors and created such fertile soil for revenge that to date they still cannot and, we might say, will not be able so soon to get rid of the hideous mess which they themselves had

created. But it did result in the smashing of capitalism in Russia, the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. Where is the guarantee that the second imperialist war will give them "better" results than the first? Would it not be more correct to suppose the opposite?

Others think that war should be organised against one of the countries militarily weak, but large as a market, for instance, against China. They apparently want to divide her finally and improve their business at her expense. Suppose they organise such a war, what may be the result of this? It is known that in the beginning of the 19th century, Italy and Germany were regarded in the same way as China is regarded at present, that is, they were considered as "unorganised territories," and not as States, and they were enslaved. What was the result of this? The result was, as is known, the war of Germany and Italy for independence, uniting these countries into independent States. The result was the strengthening of hate towards their oppressors in the hearts of the peoples of these countries, the results of which have not been eliminated to date, and we might say, will not be eliminated. The question arises: Where is the guarantee that the same will not happen as a result of the imperialist war against China?

The third group thinks that war should be organised by a "higher race," say the German "race," against the "lower race," in the first place against the Slavs, and that only such war might furnish the outlet from the situation because the "higher race" is destined to ennoble the "lower" and rule it.

Suppose that this strange theory, which is as far from science as heaven is from the earth, was realised in practice. What might be the result of this? As is known, ancient Rome looked upon the ancestors of the contemporary Germans and French in the same way as to-day the representatives of the "higher race" look upon the Slav tribes. As is known, ancient Rome treated them as a "lower race," as "barbarians," destined to be in eternal subjection to the "higher race," to "great Rome." Ancient Rome—be it said among ourselves—had some ground for this, which cannot be said of the representatives of the contemporary "higher race." (Thunderous applause.) But what was the result of this? The result was that all non-Romans, i.e., all "barbarians," united against the common enemy and overthrew Rome with a crash. The question arises: Where is the guarantee that the pretensions of the representatives of the contemporary "higher race" will not lead to the same deplorable result? Where is the guarantee that the fascist politicians in Berlin will have better luck than the old experienced conquerors in Rome? Is it not more correct to assume the contrary?

Finally, the fourth group thinks that war should be organised against the U.S.S.R. They think they will smash the U.S.S.R., divide its territory and profit at its expense. It would be a mistake to suppose that only certain military circles in Japan think thus. We know similar plans are nurtured in the circles of political leaders of some European powers. Suppose these gentlemen passed from words to deeds. What might be the result?

It is hardly possible to doubt that this war will be a war most dangerous for the bourgeoisie. It will be the most dangerous not only because the peoples of the U.S.S.R. will fight to the finish for the victory of revolution. It will be most dangerous for the bourgeoisie also because this war will take place not only at the fronts, but also in the rear of the enemy.

The bourgeoisie must not doubt that the numerous friends of the working class of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and Asia will strive to hit at the rear of their oppressors who may undertake such a criminal war against the fatherland of the working class of all countries. And let not the bourgeois gentlemen blame us if on the morrow of such a war they miss some of their own governments which at present happily rule "by the grace of God." (Thunderous applause.)

There has already been one such war, fifteen years ago you will remember, against the U.S.S.R. As is known, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill clothed this war in the poetic formula: "an invasion by fourteen States." You will, of course, remember that this war consolidated all the toilers of our country in a united phalanx of self-sacrificing fighters, defending with their lives their workers' and peasants' fatherland against the foreign enemies. You know how this war ended. It ended with the driving of the interventionist troops out of our country and with the formation of revolutionary Councils of Action in Europe. It is hardly to be doubted that a second war against the U.S.S.R. will bring complete defeat of the aggressors, revolutions in a number

of countries in Europe and Asia, and the smashing of the bourgeois landlord governments of these countries.

Such are the war plans of the crazy bourgeois politicians. As you see, they are not distinguished by wit or valour. (Applause.)

But if the bourgeoisie selects the path of war, the working class of the capitalist countries, brought to desperation by four years' crisis and unemployment, will enter the road of revolution. This means the revolutionary crisis ripens and will ripen. And the revolutionary crisis will ripen the faster the more the bourgeoisie becomes embroiled in its war combinations, the more frequently it resorts to terrorist methods of struggle against the working class and toiling peasants.

Some comrades think, since there is a revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie must get into a hopeless situation, that its end accordingly is already predetermined, that victory of the Revolution is thus already assured, and that all that is left for them is only to wait for the downfall of the bourgeoisie and write victorious resolutions.

This is a profound error. The victory of the Revolution never comes by itself. It must be prepared and attained. And only a strong proletarian Revolutionary Party can prepare and attain it.

There are moments when the situation is revolutionary, when the power of the bourgeoisie totters to its very foundation, but the victory of the Revolution still does not come because there is no Revolutionary Party of the proletariat sufficiently strong and authoritative to lead the masses and take power into its own hands. It would be unreasonable to assume that such "cases" could not occur.

Stalin then recalled the words of Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International on the question of the revolutionary crisis as the basis for revolutionary action, according to which it was impossible to assume that a situation could arise in which the bourgeoisie would have "absolutely" no way out of its problems, and that the problem of whether the bourgeoisie would be able to find a solution for its problems would depend on the activity of the revolutionary parties of the proletariat, on their degree of class-consciousness, on their degree of effective organisation, on the effectiveness of their connections with the exploited masses, and on their determination and capacity to utilise the crisis of capitalist society for the purpose of achieving a victorious proletarian revolution.

In the circumstances of this pre-war witches' dance, which has seized a number of countries, the Soviet Union continued during these years, firm and unshaken, its peace policy, fighting the war menace, fighting for the preservation of peace, meeting half-way those countries which in one way or another are for the preservation of peace, exposing and unmasking those who prepare, who provoke war.

What did the Soviet Union count on in this difficult and complicated fight for peace?

- (1) Its growing economic and political might.
- (2) On the moral support of the vast masses of the working-class of all countries, which are deeply concerned with the preservation of peace.
- (3) On the sanity of those countries which are not interested, for one reason or another, in violating peace and which are desirous of developing trade relations with such punctual clients as the U.S.S.R.
- (4) On our glorious Red Army ready to defend the country from foreign attacks.

On this basis came about our successful campaign for the non-aggression pacts, and the pacts defining the aggressor with our neighbouring countries.

Stalin dealt with a number of facts reflecting the successes of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, emphasising two of the most important, firstly, the recent improvements in the relations between the Soviet Union and Poland; and secondly, between the Soviet Union and France, which took place recently.

This does not mean, of course, that the process of rapprochement may be considered as sufficiently firm and assuring final success. The surprising zig-zags in the policy, for instance, of Poland, where anti-Soviet sentiment is still strong, cannot be excluded. But the change towards the improvement in our relations, irrespective of the results in future, is a fact deserving of note and should be put to the fore as a factor for improving the cause of peace.

What has caused this change? What is its stimulus? First of

all, the growth and strength of the power of the U.S.S.R. And then some changes in the policies of Germany, reflecting the growth of revenge and imperialist sentiment in Germany.

Some German politicians say in this connection that the Soviet Union at present orientates itself towards France and Poland, that from an opponent of the Versailles Treaty it has become an adherent; that this change is explained by the establishment of the fascist regime in Germany.

This is not correct. Of course, we are far from being delighted with the fascist regime in Germany. But it is not the point. We have never had an orientation towards Germany, just as we have no orientation towards Poland and France. We have orientated ourselves in the past and are orientating ourselves at present on the U.S.S.R., and only on the U.S.S.R. (Thunderous applause.)

And if the interests of the U.S.S.R. demand rapprochement with some countries or others which are not interested in violating peace, we do not hesitate in agreeing to that.

The fact of the matter is that even before the advent to power of the present German politicians, and particularly after their advent, a struggle began in Germany between two political lines: between the old policy which was reflected in the treaties between U.S.S.R. and Germany, and the "new" policy which fundamentally resembles the policy of the former German Kaiser, who at one time had occupied the Ukraine and undertook an offensive against Leningrad, turning the Baltic countries into a base for such an offensive. Moreover, the "new" policy quite obviously has the upper hand over the old policy.

It should not be considered an accident that the men of the "new" policy are getting the upper hand in everything, while the adherents of the old policy are in disfavour. Neither are the less-known declarations of Rosenberg, who directs the foreign policies of the ruling party in Germany, accidental.

That, comrades, is the fact of the matter. I also have in mind the resumption of the normal relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. There can be no doubt that this act is of the most serious significance in the whole system of international relations.

It is not only that it increases the chances of the cause of preserving peace. It improves the relations between both countries, it strengthens trade relations between them and creates the basis for mutual co-operation.

It marks a turn from the past, when the U.S.A. was considered in various countries as the bulwark for all kinds of anti-Soviet tendencies, and the present, when this bulwark is voluntarily removed from the path, to the mutual profit of both countries.

Such are the two main facts reflecting the successes of the Soviet peace policy.

However, it would be incorrect to think that during the period under report everything went smoothly with us.

We may recall the pressure on the part of Britain, the embargo against our exports, the attempt to interfere in our internal affairs, to try us out on this and to test the force of our resistance.

To be sure nothing came of this attempt, and the embargo was afterwards lifted, but an unpleasant residue of these attacks still makes itself felt in everything that concerns the relations between Britain and the Soviet Union, also in the negotiations for a trade treaty.

And these attacks against the U.S.S.R. cannot be considered as accidental. It is known that a certain part of the British Conservatives cannot live without such attacks. Just because they are not accidental the attacks on the Soviet Union in the future will create menaces of every kind and harm it.

We also cannot help but have in view the relations between the U.S.S.R. and Japan, which are in need of serious improvement. The refusal of Japan to sign a non-aggression pact, of which Japan is no less in need than the U.S.S.R., once more emphasises that in the sphere of our relations all is not well.

The same must be said regarding the break of negotiations concerning the Chinese Eastern Railway, which came about not through the fault of the Soviet Union, and also regarding the fact that Japanese agents perpetrate impermissible acts on this railway, lawlessly arrest Soviet officials, etc.

This is not to mention the fact that one section of military circles in Japan openly propagate in the press the necessity of war against the U.S.S.R., and the seizure of the Maritime Province with the apparent approval of the other sections of military circles, while the Government of Japan, instead of calling incendiaries to order, pretends that this does not concern it.

It is not difficult to understand that such circumstances cannot but create an atmosphere of disquietude and uncertainty. Of course, we shall continue resolutely to carry on our peace policy and strive to improve relations with Japan.

But not everything is dependent on us. Therefore, we must at the same time adopt all measures to protect our country against surprises, and be prepared to defend it against attacks. (Thunderous applause.)

Our foreign policy is clear. It is a policy of preservation of peace and strengthening of trade relations with all countries. The U.S.S.R. has no thought of attacking anybody, whoever it may be. We are for peace and maintaining the cause of peace. But we are not afraid of threats, and we are prepared to answer the war-makers blow for blow. (Thunderous applause.)

Whoever desires peace and strives for business relations with us will always meet support from us. But those who attempt to attack our country will receive so crushing a resistance that in the future they will not take it into their heads to shove their dogs' snouts into our Soviet garden. (Thunderous applause.)

That is our foreign policy.

Our task consists in putting this policy into practice with all possible persistence and determination.

## 2. Continuous Advance in National Economy and the Inner-Political Situation of the U.S.S.R.

From the standpoint of the inner-political situation of the Soviet Union the period under review shows an increasingly accelerated advance both on the economic field and on the cultural field. This advance was not merely a simple increase in quantity. This advance was noteworthy because it brought about fundamental changes in the structure of the Soviet Union and changed the features of the country basically.

In this period the Soviet Union changed fundamentally. It got rid of the old shell of medieval backwardness. From an agrarian country it developed into an industrial country. From a country of small-scale individual peasant production it changed into a country of large-scale mechanised collective agricultural production. From an uneducated, illiterate and uncivilised country it changed into an educated and civilised country covered with a tremendous network of elementary, higher schools and colleges, teaching in all the languages of the Soviet Union. New branches of production were created: tool-making, the motor-car industry, the chemical industry, motor building, aeroplane building, complicated modern agricultural machinery, high-power turbine production, the building of generators, the production of modern high-quality steel, iron alloys, synthetic rubber, nitrogen, artificial silk, etc. (Prolonged applause.)

Thousands of new and thoroughly modern industrial factories were erected and set to work. Such industrial giants were built and set going as the Dnieper power station, the tremendous foundries in Magnitogorsk and Kusnetzk, the big tractor factories in Cheliabinsk, the tremendous works in Bobriki, Kramatorsk, etc. Further, thousands of older factories were reorganised on the basis of modern industrial technique. Many factories were built or renewed and modernised in the frontier districts and in the territory of the national republics: in White Russia, in Ukraina, in Northern Caucasia, in Central Asia, in Kasakstan, in the Buryat-Mongolian Republic, in the Tartar Republic, in the Bashkirian Republic, in the Urals, in East and West Siberia, and in the Far East. New factories were erected here and new centres of industry created. Over 200,000 collective farms and 5,000 Soviet farms were created with new district centres and new industrial towns. Big new industrial towns with large populations were created in districts which were previously almost uninhabited. In addition, all towns and industrial centres were extended tremendously. The basis of the industrial combination in Ural-Kusnetzk and for the unification of the coal of the Kusnetzk basin with the iron ores of the Urals was laid. The basis of the new foundry industry of the East can therefore be regarded as the realisation of a dream. The basis for new and extensive production of oils has been laid in the districts on the west and south slopes of the Urals, in the Ural district itself, in the Bashkirian Republic and in Kasakstan. Obviously the tremendous State investments in all branches of our economic system which were made in the period under review and totalled over 60 milliard roubles were not useless and they are already beginning to show a return.

As a result of these achievements the national income of the

Soviet Union rose from 29 milliard roubles in 1929 to 50 milliard roubles in 1933, whilst at the same time the national income of all capitalist countries without exception fell rapidly and tremendously. It is clear that these achievements and this great advance must result in a further consolidation of the inner-political situation of the Soviet Union, and in fact this has already been the result.

How could these tremendous changes and this tremendous advance take place within the short space of from three to four years on the vast territory of a State like ours with its backward industrial technique and with its backward cultural stage? Has a miracle happened? It would have been a sheer miracle had the same thing occurred on the basis of capitalism and small-scale individual peasant production. However, the happening ceases to be a miracle when we consider that it was achieved on the basis of the development of socialist constructive work. It is clear that such an advance could take place only on the basis of the successful building up of socialism, on the basis of socialised labour of millions of people and on the basis of the advantages of the socialist economic system as opposed to the capitalist and small-scale individual peasant agricultural system. It is therefore not at all surprising that the colossal advance on the economic and cultural field which has taken place in the Soviet Union in the period under review should at the same time have meant the liquidation of the capitalist elements and the rapid disappearance of the small-scale individual peasant forms of agriculture.

When the New Economic Policy was introduced, Lenin said that in our country were the elements of five social economic systems: (1) patriarchal economy; (2) small-scale commodity production; (3) private capitalism; (4) State capitalism; (5) Socialism.

Lenin considered that of all these systems, Socialism would gain the upper hand in the long run. We might now say that the first, third and fourth of these social economic systems no longer exist. The second has been pushed into a secondary position; and the fifth, the Socialist system, was the ruling and the one and only dominating force in our national economy. (Prolonged applause.)

In this result lies the basis of the consolidation of the inner-political situation of the Soviet Union, the basis of the strength of its front towards the outside world under the circumstances of capitalist encirclement.

Of all branches of our economic system, the industrial field offers us the picture of most speedy growth. Compared with 1930 our industry has more than doubled its production, and compared with 1913 it has almost quadrupled its production. If we take the volume of industrial production in 1913 as 42.1 per cent, as compared with the total production, then the figure for the share of industrial production in 1933 is 70.4 per cent. In other words, our country has definitely and irrevocably become an industrial country.

Of decisive significance in the process of industrialisation was the growth of production of the means of production. The proportion of this item in the general advance of industry increased during the period under report from 48.5 per cent, to 58 per cent.

The proportion of machine production in the general total of heavy industry already exceeded 26 per cent. This means that Soviet industry is developing on a sound basis.

The proportion of socialised industry in total production grew from 99.40 per cent, in 1929 to 99.93 per cent, in 1933, while the proportion of private industry correspondingly fell from 0.6 per cent, to 0.07 per cent.

This shows that we have already finished with capitalist elements in industry, and the socialist system of economy is at present the only and monopolist system in our country.

But by far the most important of all the achievements gained during the period under report is the fact that we succeeded during this time in training and educating thousands of new people and new leaders of industry.

Eight hundred thousand more or less qualified skilled workers had graduated from factory schools into production, and more than 580,000 engineers and technicians had graduated from higher technical and general educational institutions and technical schools. While it is true that the problem of forces was the most serious of those involved in our development, still it must be recognised that industry is beginning to master this problem. It would, however, be wrong to think that our industry had had

only successes. It had also had its shortcomings. Stalin enumerated the most important of these and dwelt in detail on the immediate tasks of industry. Among these he emphasised the necessity to end the lag in production of metals; the increase of the production of coal in the new mining areas, and particularly in the Far East and in Siberia; the development of the Kusnetzk district into a second Donetz Basin; the serious commencement of the work for the organisation of a new petrol basis in the Urals; the development of the mass production of articles of consumption by all branches of the manufacturing industries, including the food and wood-working industries; to improve the quality of goods, to attain a systematic growth in the productivity of labour, the lowering of costs, and the introduction of business accounting methods.

He also mentioned the necessity to make an end of "depersonalisation" in work, and the tendency to equalisation in the wages system; to put an end to bureaucratic office methods, and to check up the carrying out of decisions and instructions of the directing centres by the lower organisations.

The work of the agricultural industry has been growing during the period under review more slowly than industry, but still faster than industry during the period when individual farming was the predominant system. The necessity to overcome the difficulties created, for instance, by the decline in cattle stocks, and by the necessity for reconstructing and placing the collective farming system on a proper basis, required time and large expense. The period under report was in regard to agriculture not so much one of rapid growth as of the creation of the prerequisites for growth and for rapid progress in the near future.

The information concerning the increase of the tilled area in the period under review reflects the two main lines of agriculture: first of all the line of increasing as far as possible the area under tillage in the most pressing period of the reorganisation of agriculture when collective farms were being founded by the tens of thousands, when they were driving the rich peasants from the land and taking it over for the benefit of the community, and secondly the line of intensifying and improving the yield of the crops rather than securing a further extension of the tilled area, the attempts to secure improved methods of tillage, the introduction of correct alternation of the crops and fallow lands, the increase of the yield per unit, and, where necessary, the temporary limitation of the tilled area to this end.

The reorganisational period in agriculture neared its end in 1932, and the question of raising the yield became fundamental.

Stalin read a table showing the development of gross production of grain and industrial crops and drew the following conclusions: The years of reorganisation (1931-32) showed the largest decrease in the production of grain crops. Flax and cotton suffered hardly at all and advanced more or less evenly, maintaining a high level of development.

The year 1933, the first after the end of the reorganisation period, marked a turning point in the development of grain and industrial crops. This indicated that from now onwards grain crops in the first instance, and industrial crops in the second, will make a tremendous advance on a firm basis.

The most difficult process was that of reorganisation in the stock-breeding branch of agriculture. Statistics regarding the number of cattle showed that during the period under report we made no advance but showed an unabated decline as compared with the pre-war level.

The facts that stock-breeding was mostly in the hands of big kulaks and the intensive agitation for the killing off of cattle carried on by the kulaks during the years of reorganisation, are reflected in the statistics.

In 1933, however, the decline in the number of cattle was reduced to its minimum. In fact, in pig-breeding, progress had already begun and 1933 showed signs of a definite advance.

This means that 1934 should and must be a year of turn towards an advance in all departments of stock-breeding.

Stalin proceeded to give data on the progress of collectivisation during the period under report. He stated the numbers of collectivised households as follows:—

1932, 3.9 per cent.; 1930, 23.6 per cent.; 1931, 52.7 per cent.; 1932, 61.5 per cent.; 1933, 65.0 per cent.

The total number of households collectivised in 1933 are 15,200,000, while the number of collective farms was 224,500.

These figures show that the reorganisation period, during which

the number of collectives and their membership grew at a tremendous pace, was already completed. The later process of collectivisation represented the gradual drawing in, and re-education of, the remnants of the individual peasant households by the collectives.

This meant that the collective farms had definitely and irrevocably won the victory (tremendous and prolonged applause).

The Soviet and collective farms together embrace over 84.5 per cent. of the total grain area of the Soviet Union. This means that the Soviet and collective farms together have become the force which determines the fate of agriculture as a whole and of all its individual branches. If we add the fact that in 1933 the collective farms supplied the State with over a milliard poods of grain, whilst the individual peasant farms, which also carried out their obligations towards the State to the full, provided a total of 130 million poods of grain, whereas in the year 1929-30 the individual peasant farms provided the State with approximately 780 million poods whilst the collective farms provided only about 120 million poods, then we observe clearly that in the period under review the collective farms and the individual peasant farms have completely changed their roles in agriculture. In the period under review the collective farms have become the decisive and dominant factor in our agriculture, whilst the individual peasant farms have sunk to a place of secondary importance and see themselves compelled to subordinate and adapt themselves to the collective agricultural system. The toiling peasantry of the Soviet Union have finally and irrevocably rallied to the Red Flag of socialism. (Protracted applause.)

Let the social revolutionaries, Mensheviks, and bourgeois Trotskyists babble of the peasantry being by nature counter-revolutionary and of its being called upon to restore capitalism in the U.S.S.R., that it cannot be the ally of the working-class in the cause of building socialism, and that it is impossible to build socialism in the U.S.S.R. The facts show that these gentlemen are slandering both the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet peasantry.

They show that our Soviet peasantry has definitely left capitalism and advanced in union with the working-class towards socialism. The facts show that we have already built up the foundations of socialist society in the U.S.S.R. and that it only remains for us to crown it with super-structures.

The strength of the State and collective farms was not only in the growth of the cultivated area and productivity, but also in the increase in their mechanical equipment.

This was shown in the number of tractors, which increased as follows: 1929, 34,900, representing 39,000 horse-power; 1933, 204,100, representing 3,100,000 horse-power.

This was double the number of tractors of which Lenin, in his time, spoke as a distant perspective.

Of no small importance for the advance of agriculture was the creation of political departments in the machine and tractor stations and State farms, and in the supply of qualified workers to agriculture.

During the period under report the Central Committee of the Communist Party had sent to the villages more than 23,000 Communists, and more than 111,000 trained engineering and technical workers.

In the period under review the People's Commissariat for Agriculture alone trained and sent out no less than 1,900,000 tractor drivers, mechanics for the new and complicated agricultural machinery, and chauffeurs. The Soviet State did everything in its power to support the work of the People's Commissariat for Agriculture and the People's Commissariat for Soviet Farms for developing the work of the collective and Soviet farms. However, it cannot be said that these bodies utilised all the available opportunities to the full.

Stalin then pointed out the fundamental deficiencies in the work of these institutions and dealt in detail with a series of problems of agricultural production, including the questions of housing and repairing tractors and agricultural machinery, the introduction of the correct alternation of crops, the improvement of the grain sorts, the use of artificial fertilisers, the struggle against the droughts in the Volga district, etc. Stalin also dealt again with the problems of cattle-breeding. Unfortunately, our agricultural authorities are not directing sufficient public attention to the serious state of our cattle-breeding. On the contrary, they are trying to hush up the matter, an attitude which is not permissible for Bolsheviks. The problem of cattle-breeding must

secure the attention of the whole Party, because to-day this problem is as important for us as the grain problem, now happily solved, was yesterday. It is hardly necessary to say that our Soviet officials, who have already shown that they know how to overcome even the worst difficulties, will also be able to solve this problem. (Great applause.)

Stalin then proceeded to the question of raising the material and cultural standards of the working masses. As a result of the development of our agriculture and industry we have: (1) a tremendous increase of industrial production and a great increase in the production of the main branches of agriculture; (2) and on the basis of this great advance we can book the final victory of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system, both in industry and agriculture, and the development of the socialist economic system into the exclusive system of our whole economic activities with the resultant exclusion of the capitalist elements from all branches of our economic life; (3) the final abandonment by the overwhelming majority of the individual peasant farms of the small-scale individual peasant methods of agricultural production and their unification in collective farms on the basis of collective work and collective ownership of the means of production, the complete victory of collective agriculture over small-peasant agriculture (4) the continuation of the extension of the collective farms by absorbing the remaining individual peasant farms whose number decreases from month to month. It is clear that this historical victory over the exploiters must lead to a fundamental improvement in the material situation and in the whole life of the toilers.

The elimination of the parasitic classes had brought about the disappearance of the exploitation of man by man. The labour of the workers and peasants had been liberated from exploitation. The income which the exploiters squeezed out of the labour of the people now remains in the hands of the toiling masses, and is being utilised partly for the extension of production and the drawing of new sections of workers into production, partly for the direct raising of the income of the workers and peasants.

Unemployment, the scourge of the working class, had disappeared. While in the bourgeois countries millions of unemployed were suffering want and starvation owing to the absence of work, in our country there were no more workers who had no work and no earnings.

With the disappearance of the oppressive yoke of the rich peasants the impoverishment and misery of the rural areas has also disappeared. To-day any collective peasant or individual peasant is in a position to secure for himself a reasonable human existence in so far as he is prepared to do his share of the common work and is not lazy, does not become a tramp and does not attempt to plunder the property of the collective farms. The destruction of exploitation, the abolition of unemployment in the urban centres and the abolition of impoverishment and misery in the rural areas are victories of historical importance and mean a tremendous factor in the improvement of the material situation of the toilers of the Soviet Union. The workers and peasants of the most "democratic" countries of capitalism cannot even dream of achieving such an advance.

The face of our big towns and of our industrial centres has changed.

An inevitable feature of the big cities of the bourgeois countries were slums, the so-called workers' districts on the outskirts of the cities where poor people lived in dark, damp and half-ruined dwellings. The revolution in the U.S.S.R. had brought about the disappearance of these slums. They had been replaced by newly built, good and light workers' dwellings, and in many cases the workers' districts had a better appearance than the centres of the old cities.

The face of the village had changed even more. The old village with the church as its most prominent building, and with the best houses for the police-sergeant, the priests and the kulaks, with its half-ruined shacks for the peasants, had begun to disappear. Its place was being taken by the new village, with public buildings, clubs, radio, cinema, school, library, creches, and with its tractors, harvesting combines, automobiles and motor-cycles. The old distinguished figures of the village were the kulak and the exploiters, the blood-sucking moneylender, the merchant and the speculator, the priest and the police-sergeant. These had disappeared. The distinguished persons now are workers of the collectives and State farms, of the schools and clubs, tractor-drivers and combine-operators, shock brigaders in field cultivation and stock breeding.

The difference between the city and the countryside is disappearing. The city, in the eyes of the peasants, is ceasing to be a centre for their exploitation. The bonds of economic and cultural unity between the city and the countryside are becoming steadily stronger. The countryside receives from the city and industry aid in the form of tractors, agricultural machinery, automobiles, men and means. The cultural abyss between the city and the village is being filled up.

Stalin proceeded to sum up the achievements of the period under report as follows:—

(1) The national income grew from 35 billion roubles in 1930 to 50 billions in 1933. Since the share of the capitalist elements represented less than 0.05 per cent., almost the whole of the national income was distributed among the workers and toiling peasants, the Co-operatives and the State.

(2) The population of the Soviet Union grew from 160,000,000 people at the end of 1930 to 168,000,000 at the end of 1933.

(3) The number of industrial and office workers grew from 14,530,000 in 1930 to 21,883,000 in 1933, the number of manual workers rising during this period from 9,489,000 to 13,797,000.

(4) The total wages of industrial and office workers grew from 13,597,000,000 roubles in 1930 to 34,280,000,000 roubles in 1933.

(5) The average yearly wages of workers in industry grew from 991 roubles in 1930 to 1,519 roubles in 1933.

(6) The social insurance fund for industrial and office workers grew from 1,810,000,000 roubles in 1930 to 4,810,000,000 in 1933.

(7) All industrial workers, except those working underground, were put on a seven-hour day. The underground workers were placed on a shorter working week.

(8) State assistance to the peasants organised 2,890 machine and tractor stations in which two milliard roubles were invested.

(9) State assistance to peasants in the form of credits to collective farms amounted to 1,600,000,000 roubles.

(10) State assistance to peasants in the form of seed and food loans amounted to 262 million poods of grain.

(11) State assistance to poor peasants in the form of tax relief and insurance amounted to 370,000,000 roubles.

As to cultural development, we have the following achievements to record:—

(1) The introduction of universal, compulsory, elementary education throughout the Soviet Union, and raising of the percentage of literacy from 87 at the end of 1930 to 90 at the end of 1933.

(2) The growth in the number of pupils in schools of all grades from 14,358,000 in 1929 to 26,419,000 in 1933, and including elementary schools from 11,697,000 to 19,163,000. In secondary schools from 2,453,000 to 6,674,000. In higher schools from 207,000 to 491,000.

(3) The growth in the number of children in pre-school educational institutions from 838,000 in 1929 to 5,917,000 in 1933.

(4) The growth in the number of higher educational institutions, general and special, from 91 in 1914 to 600 in 1933.

(5) The growth in the number of scientific research institutes from 400 in 1929 to 840 in 1933.

(6) The growth in the number of institutions of the type of clubs from 32,000 in 1929 to 54,000 in 1933.

(7) The growth in the number of cinemas, cinema installations in clubs, and travelling cinemas, from 9,800 units in 1929 to 29,200 in 1933.

(8) The growth of newspaper circulation from 12,500,000 in 1929 to 36,500,000 in 1933.

The proportion of workers among the students in the higher educational institutions comprises 51.4 per cent., and the proportion of working peasants 16.5 per cent.

In Germany, for instance, the proportion of workers among the students in the higher educational institutions in the 1932-33 school year comprised no more than 3.2 per cent., and the proportion of small peasants was only 2.4 per cent. It should be pointed out as a pleasing fact, and as an indication of the growth of culture in the villages, that the participation of the women of the collective farms in the sphere of social organisation and activity has increased. It is known, for instance, that there are at present about 6,000 women chairmen of collective farms, more than 60,000 women members of the boards of collective farms, 28,000 brigade leaders and 100,000 sub-leaders, 9,000 managers of collective farms and 7,000 women tractor drivers. Needless to say, these figures are not complete. But even this little speaks sufficiently clearly of the great growth of culture in the villages. This is a circumstance of tremendous importance because women comprise half the popula-

tion of the country, a great army of labour, and they are called upon to bring up our children who are our future. That is why we should welcome the growing social activity of the working women and their advance to leading positions as an undoubted indication of the growth of our culture. (Prolonged applause.)

The measures taken by the Central Committee in the period under review for the development of State Soviet trading have resulted in a considerable increase of the network of sales centres, an increase in the number of public restaurants which at present feed no less than 19,800,000 people, an increase of commodity turnover in State and co-operative trading, including the large-scale kitchens, from 18.9 milliard roubles in 1930 to 49 milliard roubles in 1933.

However, the present level of commodity turnover is not sufficient to cope with our demands. Our task is to extend Soviet trading still further and to achieve new and decisive successes on this field. The extension of Soviet trade depends on the development of our railways, our inland water transport and our road transport. The railways have succeeded in increasing their freight volume from 133.9 milliard ton-kilometres in 1930 to 172 milliard ton-kilometres in 1933. Inland water transport increased its freightage from 45.6 milliard ton-kilometres in 1930 to 59.9 milliard ton-kilometres in 1933. However, these increases are not sufficient. They are not enough for our economic system. The task of increasing our commodity turnover and at the same time securing fundamental improvements in our transport system is one which must be solved successfully in the near future if we are to make any further progress.

### 3. The Party

The Seventeenth Congress was taking place under the banner of complete victory for Leninism, and the liquidation of the remnants of the anti-Leninist groups. The Trotskyist group had been broken and dispersed. Its organisers were now hanging about the backstairs of the bourgeois parties abroad.

The anti-Leninist groups of the right-wing opportunists have been destroyed and completely disposed of. The organisers of this opposition have long ago abandoned their opinions and to-day they are doing their best to make up to the Party for the damage they have done. Further, the groups with deviations in the national question have also been destroyed and disposed of. The organisers of these groups have either gone over openly to the intervention-mongering emigrants or they are doing penance for their past sins and endeavouring to make good.

The policy of industrialisation, liquidation, of the kulaks and compact collectivisation had triumphed. Experience had proved that the victory of socialism in one country was entirely possible. Obviously these successes and the victory of the Five-Year Plan have finally demoralised all anti-Leninist groupings and smashed their organisation to pieces. To-day the Party is united and solid as never before. (Protracted and great applause.)

This, however, did not mean that the struggle was finished, and the further offensive of socialism unnecessary. It did not mean that there would be no further deviations from the Party line. The enemies of the Party, the opportunists of all shades, and all the opportunist deviators in the national question have been disposed of completely. However, the remnants of their ideology still persist in the minds of individual members of the party and they express themselves frequently. The party cannot regard itself as something apart from the people who surround it. It exists and flourishes in its environment. It is not surprising that sometimes unhealthy ideas penetrate into it from outside. The basis for such ideas and opinions is undoubtedly present in our country because there are still middle sections of the population in existence both in the towns and in the rural areas, and they provide a fruitful basis for the development of such ideas and opinions.

The Seventeenth Party Conference laid down one of the basic political tasks of the Party in carrying out the Second Five-Year Plan as the overcoming of the survivals of capitalism in economy and the consciousness of the people. This was an absolute correct idea, but we cannot say that they had already overcome all survivals of capitalism in economy. Still less can we say that we have overcome these survivals in the consciousness of the people. Capitalist surroundings were continually striving to revive and

uphold these survivals and against them the Bolsheviks must always keep their powder dry.

Stalin proceeded to deal with a number of questions on which confusion still existed among members of the Party—for instance, the question of the building of classless society. Obviously, classless society cannot be established spontaneously. It is necessary to fight to build it by the efforts of all toilers, by strengthening the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by developing the class struggle, abolishing the classes, liquidating the remnants of the capitalist class and fighting against enemies within and without.

Some members of the Party, however, understood the advance towards classless society as a spontaneous process and thought it was already possible to weaken the class struggle and the proletarian dictatorship. According to this view the old must by itself grow into the new, and one fine day they would find themselves in socialist society. If these confused views and non-Bolshevik sentiments were to dominate, the Party would be demobilised and disarmed.

Let us take another question. Under the present conditions the *artel* is the only correct form of the collective agricultural movement. That is quite understandable, first of all the *artel* offers the correct connection of the personal and private interest of the collective peasant with his social interests, and secondly, as a result of this the *artel* is the best means of educating the individualist peasant of yesterday in the spirit of collectivism. As distinct from the *artel*, where only the means of production are socialised, the communes until recently also socialised the private needs of each individual member, that is to say, the members of the commune did not possess and enjoy privately any poultry, cows, grain, garden land, etc. This means that in the commune the personal and private interests of the members were not considered and coupled with the social interests of the whole, but rather the latter tended to be swamped in the interests of petty-bourgeois equalisation. Naturally, this circumstance is the weakest side of the communes. This also explains why the communes have not become generally popular and exist only as isolated exceptions here and there. This, however, does not mean that the communes are unnecessary, that they do not represent a higher form of the collective agricultural movement. No, the commune is a necessary form and it is also a higher form of the collective agricultural movement, but this does not apply to the present-day form of the commune which is based on undeveloped technique and on a lack of products. It refers to the future commune on the basis of a more highly developed technique and a surplus of products. The commune of the future will develop in its final form based on well-being from the existing *artel*. The process of transforming the existing *artels* into communes must take place gradually and by degrees in accordance with how far the collectivised peasants as a whole have realised the necessity of this transformation. These things ought to be clear enough. They ought to be almost elementary principles. However, amongst a section of the Party members there is a considerable amount of confusion in this question. Such members thought that when the Party declared the *artel* to be the principal form of the collective agricultural movement it was thereby descending from a higher to a lower stage of the collective movement. The question arises, why? Allegedly because in the *artel* there is no equality between the members, because differences continue to exist in the *artel* with regard to the personal needs and the personal situation of the members of the *artel*, whilst in the commune equality prevails amongst all the members of it both with regard to their personal needs and their personal situation. But first of all there are no longer any communes in which such equality with regard to personal needs and personal position exists, and secondly, every Leninist knows that equalisation with regard to personal needs and personal position is reactionary and petty-bourgeois nonsense worthy of some primitive ascetic sect, but not of a Marxist and organised socialist society which cannot demand that all its members have the same needs and the same tastes and that in their personal life all its members should live according to the same hard-and-fast scheme.

We cannot demand that everyone shall have similar needs and tastes, and that everyone's personal life shall be moulded according to one model. Such a presentation of the question has nothing in common with Marxism and Leninism. By equality Marxism under-



stands not the "equalisation" of personal needs and habits, but the abolition of classes, which means:—

(1) Equal liberation of all toilers from exploitation after the capitalists have been overthrown and expropriated.

(2) Equal abolition of all private property in the means of production after these have been transformed into the property of the whole of society.

(3) The equal obligation of everyone to work according to his ability and the equal right of all toilers to receive for this according to their work (this is socialist society).

(4) Equal obligation of everyone to work according to his ability and the equal right of all toilers to receive for this according to their needs. (This is Communist society.)

In this connection Marxism assumes that the taste and the needs of the individual members of society are not the same either with regard to the nature or quantity either in the period of socialism or the period of Communism, and that they cannot be the same. In the "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels scoured the primitive utopian socialism which they termed reactionary owing to its propaganda in favour of general asceticism and clumsy equalisation. In his "Anti-Dühring" Engels devotes a whole chapter of biting sarcasm to the radical equalising socialism put forward by Dühring against the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels.

Bourgeois authors delight in representing Marxist socialism as the resuscitation of the old Czarist barrack life in which everything was subordinated to the "principle" of equalisation. However, we Marxists can take no responsibility for the ignorance and stupidity of bourgeois authors.

If such ideas triumphed in the Party then naturally the Party would cease to be Marxist, whilst in the last resort the collective agricultural movement would be disorganised.

Or let us take, for instance, the slogan: "Assist all collective peasants to well-being!" This slogan is not merely a matter for the collective peasants. It applies still more to the workers because we want to assist all workers to well-being; we want to turn them into men and women living in culture and well-being.

Socialism does not mean impoverishment and misery, but the abolition of impoverishment and well-being, and under socialism all members of society will live a life of well-being and culture. However, this clear and elementary slogan has caused a series of misunderstandings and a deal of confusion amongst a section of the Party members. Some members of the Party ask whether the new slogan does not mean that the Party is returning to the old and condemned slogan: "Enrich yourselves!" If everyone obtains a life of well-being and culture, they ask, if poverty no longer exists, upon whom are we Bolsheviks to rely to support us in our work? Shall we be able to get along without the poor? This may appear ridiculous, but it is a fact that such naive anti-Leninist ideas do exist amongst a section of our Party members. These comrades apparently do not grasp the fact that there is a world of difference between the slogan: "Enrich yourselves!" and the slogan: "Assist all collective peasants to well-being!" (1) Only individuals and groups can enrich themselves, whereas our slogan does not refer to individuals and groups but to the totality of the collective peasants. (2) Individual persons and groups enrich themselves with a view to subordinating others to them and their interests, and to exploit them, whilst our slogan for well-being presupposes the socialisation of the means of production in the collective farms and thus excludes any possibility of anyone exploiting anyone else. (3) The slogan "Enrich yourselves!" was put forward in the beginning, even when capitalism was partially restored, at a time when the kulak was still strong and powerful, at a time when the dominant method of agricultural production in the Soviet Union was individual peasant production and the collective methods of agriculture were still in the bud. On the other hand, the slogan: "Assist all collective peasants to well-being!" was put forward at the final stage, at a time when the capitalist elements had already been destroyed in industry, the kulaks broken up and the individual peasant production reduced to a subordinate position in agriculture whilst the collective farms had taken the dominant position in agriculture. Not to mention the fact that the slogan: "Assist all collective peasants to well-being!" is not an isolated slogan, but one to be understood and applied in the closest connection with the slogan: "Make all the collective farms Bolshevik!" Is it not clear enough that the slogan: "Enrich yourselves!" is fundamentally nothing but an appeal for the restoration of capitalism, whereas

the slogan: "Assist all collective peasants to well-being!" is an appeal to destroy finally and irrevocably all vestiges of capitalism by strengthening the economic power of the collective farms and providing all the members of the collective farms with a life of well-being and culture? Is it not clear that there is nothing in common between these two slogans, and that there cannot possibly be anything in common between them? The suggestion that without the poor there can be no Bolshevik work and no socialism is such grotesque stupidity that one is almost ashamed to talk about it. The Leninists rely on the poor sections of the population where capitalist elements still exist, and what is more, the sections which are exploited by these capitalist elements. However, once the capitalist elements have been disposed of and the poor sections freed from exploitation, then the task of the Leninists is not to conserve the poor sections and their poverty after the conditions for their existence have disappeared, but to abolish poverty and assist the poor to a life of well-being and culture. It would be ridiculous to assume that socialism could be built up on the basis of impoverishment and privations, on the basis of the limitation of personal needs, on the reduction of the standards of living of the people down to the level of the poorest sections, who, in any case, do not desire to remain poor and do their utmost to press forward to a life of well-being. Who would want such socialism, if you will excuse me using the word in such a connection at all? That would not be socialism, but a grotesque caricature of socialism. Socialism can be built up only on the basis of a tremendous development of the social productive forces, on the basis of an enormous surplus of commodities, on the basis of a life of the toilers in well-being, on the basis of a tremendous advance in cultural standards. Socialism, Marxist socialism, does not mean the limitation of the personal needs of the individual, but an all-round increase of these needs. It does not mean the abandonment of any attempt to satisfy these needs, or to satisfy them to a limited extent only, but the all-round and complete satisfaction of all the needs of a culturally highly-developed working humanity.

There is no doubt that the confusion which exists amongst certain members of the Party in connection with the poorer sections and the question of well-being is a reflection of the opinions of our "left-wing" bochers who regard the poorer sections of the population as the eternal support of Bolshevism, who idealise these sections under all circumstances, and who regard the collective farms as the arena of a bitter class struggle. In this question also we can see how the remnants of the ideology of the defeated enemies of the Party still obstinately cling to life. If such clumsy and amateurish ideas were to get the upper hand in our Party the collective farms would not be able to point to their successes of the past two years and they would very soon break up.

It must be placed on record that the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of the people are much more persistent in the national question than on any other field. They are more persistent because they have the possibility of appearing in the mask of national problems.

What does a deviation towards nationalism mean, irrespective of whether it tends towards Pan-Russian nationalism or local nationalism? A deviation towards nationalism is an attempt to adapt the international policy of the working class to the national policy of the bourgeoisie. A deviation towards nationalism reflects an attempt on the part of the home "national" bourgeoisie to undermine the Soviet Power and restore capitalism. The source of both deviations is the same: an abandonment of Leninist internationalism. If you want to direct your fire against both deviations, then it must be directed towards the source of both of them, i.e., against those who abandon internationalism, no matter whether they tend towards Pan-Russian nationalism or local nationalism. (Storms of applause.) The chief danger is represented by that deviation which one ceases to oppose whereby it is permitted to develop into a danger to the State. Recently we had a nationalist deviation in the Ukraine, towards Ukrainian nationalism, but this was not the chief danger. However, when the fight against this deviation was abandoned and it was permitted to grow to such an extent that it began to establish relations with the interventionist clique, then this deviation became a main danger.

The same is true of the right and "left-wing" deviations on the political field. In this connection also there is a deal of confusion amongst many members of the Party. Sometimes a fight is conducted against the right-wing deviation and the "left-wing" deviation is left to carry on as it pleases. The struggle against it is

stopped or lessened on the assumption that it is not dangerous or very little dangerous. That is a serious and dangerous error. It represents a concession to the "left-wing" deviation which is impermissible for any member of the Party, all the more impermissible because recently the "left-wingers" have finally landed in the camp of the right-wingers and no longer differ from them fundamentally. We have always declared that the "left-wingers" are in reality right-wingers masking their right-wing opportunism with "left-wing" phrases. To-day the attitude of the "left-wingers" confirms our contention. Let us take last year's numbers of Trotsky's "Bulletin." What do they write about there? How does their "left-wing" programme express itself? They demand the liquidation of the Soviet farms on the ground that they do not pay, and the liquidation of the greater part of the collective farms on the ground that they, allegedly, have in any case no more than a fictitious existence. They also demand the abandonment of the policy of liquidating the kulaks, a return to the policy of granting concessions and the abandonment by the Soviet State of a number of industrial undertakings to capitalist firms under concessions on the alleged ground that they do not pay their way. There you have the programme of the cowardly and contemptible capitulators, a counter-revolutionary programme for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

In what does this programme differ from the programme of the extreme right-wingers? It is clear, there is no difference whatever. The situation is thus that the "left-wingers" openly subscribe to the counter-revolutionary programme of the right-wingers with a view to forming a block with them and fighting jointly against the Party.

Our tasks upon the field of ideological political work are:

- (1) The raising of the theoretical level of our Party to the required standard;
- (2) The strengthening of the ideological work in all the organisations of the Party;
- (3) The carrying on of a tireless propaganda of Leninism in the ranks of the Party;
- (4) The education of the Party organisations and the masses of the non-Party activists who rally round them in the spirit of Leninist internationalism;
- (5) To criticise frankly the deviations of a number of comrades from Marxism-Leninism rather than hushing them up; and
- (6) To expose systematically the ideology of the elements hostile to Leninism.

I spoke of our successes, of the victory of the Party line both on the economic and the cultural field and with regard to the defeat of the anti-Leninist groupings in the Party. Now, however, the question arises: How did this victory come about? How was it won in practice? What struggle, what efforts were necessary to achieve it? These successes and this victory were not won automatically. They were won as the result of a bitter struggle for the Party line. A victory never comes on its own; one must usually win it for oneself. Good resolutions and declarations about the general line of the Party are all right for a beginning, but they mean no more than the will to victory, not the victory itself. If the correct line has been recognised and the correct solution of a problem discovered, then the remainder depends on the success of the organisational work, on the organisation of the struggle for the practical carrying out of the Party line, on the correct choice of the persons necessary, on the control exercised over the carrying out of the decisions made by the leading bodies. Even more than that: after the correct political line has been found, the organisational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself—its carrying out or its failure.

Victory was won by a systematic and bitter struggle against difficulties of all sorts in the path of the carrying out of the Party line, by overcoming these difficulties, by mobilising the Party and the working class to overcome these difficulties, by organising the struggle to overcome these difficulties, by deposing incompetent officials and by choosing the best and most capable comrades for leading the struggle against these difficulties. These difficulties are difficulties of our organisational leadership. They are rooted in ourselves, in our leading officials, in our organisations, in the apparatus of our Party and in the Soviet, economic and labour union bodies and in all other forms of organisation. The power and authority of our Party, of the economic, Soviet

and all other organisations, have grown to an unparalleled degree. And just because this power and authority has grown so tremendously, everything depends, or almost everything depends to-day on the proper functioning of these organisations.

The correctness of the political line of the party has been confirmed by the experience of a number of years. The enthusiastic readiness of the workers and peasants in the work for the construction of socialism has caused the significance of the so-called "objective factors" to sink to a minimum. Thereby the role played by our organisations and their leaders has become an extraordinary and decisive one. What does this mean? It means that the responsibility for inefficiency and deficiency in our work is now nine-tenths on our own shoulders and can no longer be put down to the "objective circumstances." The roots of our difficulties are now to be found in the bureaucracy of the administrative apparatus, in the useless discussions about "leadership in general" instead of a living and concrete leadership, in the departmental construction of our organisations and the lack of any personal responsibility, the lack of personal responsibility in work and equalisation tendencies in the wage system, the lack of a systematic control over the carrying out of decisions, and the fear of self-criticism.

It would be naive to assume that these difficulties can be fought successfully with decisions alone. In order to fight successfully against these difficulties we must raise the level of organisational leadership on all economic fields to the standard of the political leadership, and we must see to it that our organisational work is in fact the practical and actual carrying out of the political slogans and the decisions of the Party bodies. In order to fight against these difficulties successfully the struggle against them must be an organised one, the masses of the workers and peasants must be mobilised and led into this struggle, the Party itself must be mobilised, and the Party and the economic organisations must be cleaned of the unstable, unreliable and degenerate elements.

In this respect the Central Committee is guided by the idea of Lenin that in the organisational work the most important factor is the correct selection of the comrades performing it and the control over the carrying out of the work. A correct organisation of the control over the carrying out of the work is of decisive importance in the struggle against bureaucracy. We can say with conviction that nine-tenths of our errors and deficiencies arise from an insufficient control of the carrying out of our work. The organisation of an efficient control is a task of great importance for the leading central bodies. From the very nature of its organisation the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection cannot provide an efficiently organised control over the carrying out of the work. To-day our economic work has become very considerable in extent and very complicated because there is neither the necessity nor the possibility of any control of this work from a central body. What we need to-day is not inspection but control over the carrying out of the decisions of the centre. Only the Commission for Soviet Control attached to the Council of People's Commissars of the Soviet Union can become such an organisation. This body works according to the instructions of the Council of People's Commissars and it has its representatives on the spot who are independent of the local authorities. In order that this body should possess the necessary authority and that if necessary it should be in a position to call to account any responsible person, it is necessary that candidature for membership of the Soviet Control Commissions should be proposed by the Party Congress and ratified by the Council of People's Commissars and by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union.

As is known, the Central Control Commission was formed chiefly with a view to preventing a split in the Party itself. You are well aware that the danger of a split actually existed, but that the C.C.C. and its organs succeeded in preventing it. To-day, however, there is no longer any danger of a split in the Party. However, there is urgent necessity for an organisation to direct the main attention to the work for the control over the carrying out of the decisions of the Party and its Central Committee. The Commission for Party Control attached to the Central Committee is the only body which could become such an organisation. It works at the instructions of the Party and its Central Committee and it has its representatives on the spot who are independent of the local party organisations. However, in order that it shall possess the necessary authority and in order that it shall, if necessary, be able to call to account any responsible Party official, including

the members of the Central Committee itself, it is necessary that all the members of this Commission should be appointed and, if necessary, deposed only by the highest Party body, the Party Congress.

In concluding his report Stalin declared: To-day we all recognise that our successes have been big and unusual. In a comparatively short space of time the whole country has been put well on the way to industrialisation and collectivisation. The first Five-Year Plan has been carried out successfully. That imbues us with a feeling of pride and confirms our officials in a belief in our strength. That is very good, but sometimes successes have their seamy side. Sometimes they produce dangers which, if they are permitted to grow, can endanger the whole success. There is a danger that these successes may go to the heads of some of our comrades. There have already been such cases, as you know. There is a danger that some of our comrades may get intoxicated with success and become supercilious, that they may blind themselves to our real difficulties in boastful self-confidence. There is nothing more dangerous than this sort of thing because it disarms the Party and demobilises its ranks.

The second Five-Year Plan is now before us and it must also be carried out with success. The Party must therefore make no attempt to rest on its laurels, but on the contrary it must continue to remain watchful and to maintain itself in a state of preparedness. It must not disarm, but increase its armaments. It must not demobilise, but maintain its state of mobilisation to carry out the second Five-Year Plan successfully.

From this we must draw our first conclusion: We must not let the successes we have achieved cause us to become supercilious. We achieved our successes because we maintained the correct Party line and because we organised the masses correctly to carry this Party line into practice. It is hardly necessary for me to stress that we should not have achieved any of the successes we are justly proud of to-day without this preliminary condition. However, to possess the correct political line and to carry it into practice correctly, that is an unusual matter in the life of a ruling Party. Take a look at the countries around us. Can you find there many ruling parties which have the correct political line and are able to carry it into practice? Actually there are no such ruling political parties anywhere outside the Soviet Union, because they are all without any perspective; they are entangled in the crisis and see no way of avoiding the abyss. Only our Party knows in which direction to steer the ship of State and is doing so successfully. Why does our Party possess this advantage over all others? It is because it is a Marxist-Leninist Party, and because it is guided in its activity by the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. There can be no doubt that as long as we remain true to their lessons and as long as we continue to use this compass we shall be successful in our work.

They say that in a number of Western European countries Marxism has been destroyed by the bourgeois-nationalist movement which calls itself fascism. That is naturally absurd. Only people who have no acquaintance with history can talk like that. Marxism is the scientific expression of the fundamental interests of the working class. In order to destroy Marxism the working class must be destroyed, but to destroy the working class is an impossibility. Over eighty years have passed since Marxism entered the world arena. Since then dozens, even hundreds of bourgeois governments have tried to destroy Marxism. And what has been the result? The bourgeois governments came and went, but Marxism remained. (Storms of applause.) Only Marxism has succeeded in winning a decisive victory on one-sixth of the earth's surface, and that just in that country in which Marxism was supposed to have been finally destroyed. (Storms of applause.) It cannot be regarded as an accident that the one country in which Marxism has won a complete victory is to-day the only country in the whole world which knows neither unemployment nor crisis, whilst in all other countries, including the countries of fascism, unemployment and the economic crisis have been dominant for the past four years. No, comrades, that is not an accident. (Protracted applause.) We owe our successes to the fact that we work and fight under the banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

And from this we must draw our second conclusion: We must remain true to the banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin for ever! (Applause.) The working class of the Soviet Union is strong not

only because it possesses a Leninist Party steered in the struggles, but because it has also the support of the million masses of the peasantry. It is strong also because it has the support of the international proletariat. The working class of the Soviet Union is part of the international working class. It is its advance guard, and our Soviet Republic is the child of the international proletariat. There can be no doubt that if the working class of the Soviet Union had not had the support of the working classes in the capitalist countries, it would not have been able to maintain power, to create the preliminary conditions for the building up of socialism and to achieve our socialist successes. The international relations of the working class of the Soviet Union to the workers of the capitalist countries are based on the alliance of the workers of the Soviet Union with the workers of all other countries. That alliance is one of the keystones of the power of the Soviet Republic. The workers in the West regard the working class of the Soviet Union as the shock brigade of the international proletariat. That is very good and it means that in the future also the international proletariat will support the working class of the Soviet Union with all the means at its disposal. However, this places onerous duties on our shoulders. It means that in our work we must show ourselves worthy of our position as the shock brigade of the workers of all other countries. It obliges us to work even better for the final victory of socialism in our country and for the victory of socialism in all other countries.

And from this we draw our third conclusion: To remain true to the end to the cause of proletarian internationalism, to the cause of the fraternal struggle of the workers of the whole world. (Applause.) These are our conclusions. Long live the glorious and invincible banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin. (Storms of protracted applause.)

The Party Congress gives Stalin one ovation after the other. Standing, the delegates sing the "International." The comrades break into shouts: "Long live Stalin!" "Long live the Central Committee of the Communist Party!"

## Politics

### The Chautemps Ministry Sinking into the Morass

By J. Berlioz (Paris).

"We are living at a time when public opinion is supreme, and when one must, whether one wants to or not, obey it," wrote the *Intransigent* a few hours before the resignation of the Chautemps Government was announced. This newspaper gave expression in cautious terms to an undeniable truth, namely, that all the efforts of the Government, of its majority, above all, the Socialist Party, and of its Press, were completely incapable of stemming the mighty tide of popular anger aroused by the demonstration of the decay of the capitalist régime provided by the Staviski affair.

No one believed in the "suicide" of the swindler Staviski, intended by the Government to prevent revelations and to put an end to the affair; the manner in which the police manoeuvred in order to compel Mme. Staviski to retract her original statements, which led to a belief in murder by the police, and to conceal the names of those profiting by several hundred cheques signed by the swindler, only served to increase the scepticism of millions of people.

The resignation of the Colonial Minister *Dalimier*, the avowed protector of Staviski, only strengthened the suspicion entertained against other members of the Ministry, for it was regarded as the beginning of a confession. It was seen, too, that the Premier's private secretary, Dubois, had used his position to get on the board of a financial company. It became known that Paul-Boncour had acted as the former Mme. Staviski's attorney. It was proved, in spite of his innumerable denials, that the Finance Minister Bonnet had had the barrister Guibond-

Ribaud, one of the swindler's agents, on the staff of his secretariat.

The ridiculous punishments tardily meted out under the pressure of public opinion on certain officials of the police on January 22, were considered completely inadequate and only increased the appetite of public opinion, which was indignant, for instance, at seeing the Police-Prefect *Chiappe*, who had supplied *Staviski* with a false passport in order to enable him to escape, untouched.

The parties of the Left, and, above all, the Socialist Party, did their best to reduce the affair to a wrangle among the politicians of the Right, to an "attack by reaction on democracy." Twice in the Chamber *Chautemps* secured large majorities. The Senate was even unanimous in declaring its confidence in him. But one could see beyond this, and everybody was thinking to himself what *Buré* wrote: "The scandal is not a party scandal; it is a scandal of the régime. All the pillars of the Republican temple—parliament, administration, law-courts, police, Press—are tottering." This proves very clearly that the masses have realised the fundamental rottenness of the régime, and for this reason clear-sighted journalists in the immediate service of finance-capital, like *Gignoux* (of the *Journée Industrielle*), found themselves compelled to write extensive articles in order to try to prove that *Staviskism* and capitalism are two different phenomena.

The Government fell. Resolutely opposed to the creation of a commission of enquiry, because it feared the revelations that would there come out, it realised too late that one must throw out a little ballast by accepting, in spite of everything, a commission of this kind, for which Radicals and Socialists of the stamp of *Renaudel* and *Blum* had made efforts to find an acceptable formula ensuring secrecy. Then, however, another immense swindling scandal broke out, that of the Officials' Bank, and it was learned that the Minister of Justice *Raynaldy* had three years ago been a member of the board of directors and a fictitious subscriber to a holding company belonging to a banker called *Sacazan*, a specialist in doubtful concerns. This was the last blow. At first some contemplated dropping only *Raynaldy* and reconstructing the Ministry, but the latter was much too seriously involved; and on the evening of January 27 it announced its resignation *en bloc*, giving as the reason the fact that "public life is controlled by the disturbances provoked by public opinion."

The resignation of the Cabinet is the great game with the safety valve. On leaving the Elysée *Chautemps* said: "Public opinion demands a scapegoat. If my scapegoat is able to calm the people, then I believe that I have served my country well." That means that the bourgeoisie, in appealing to "new men," to persons respected for their honesty and for their initiative, in creating an impression of a moral reparation, of a return to virtue, want to give a fresh polish to their extremely tarnished régime. It is a matter here of a colossal hypocritical attempt on the part of the ruling class, who are conscious of the danger of the great indignation of the masses.

It is this danger which the old democrat *Dulot* described with horror a few days ago as follows: "This time it is perhaps the trial of the ruling classes, opened through the prosecution of the profiteers," and which, in the course of these few weeks, has caused disquieting progress to be made in France along the road to fascism. The groups having avowed fascist tendencies—Patriotic Youth, *Camelots du Roi*, *Coty's Party of French Solidarity*—have been carrying on intensive agitation, especially among the petty-bourgeois classes, and have nearly every day been holding demonstrations in the central streets of Paris under the obvious protection of the police.

The "defenders of democracy" are making as much use as possible of the fascist activity, in order to accelerate the fascisation of the régime on the pretext of protecting the Republic. They all, from *Blum* and *Marquet* to *Herriott* and *Daladier*, assert that they are the greatest Jacobins. This Jacobinism finds expression in the surprisingly undertaken acceptance, thanks

to the complicity of the Socialist president of the Chamber and the whole Socialist Party, of a law which, while ostensibly directed against industrial espionage, actually enables extreme measures to be taken against the workers' correspondents of the revolutionary Press; in the introduction of draft laws for the reorganisation of the centralized and reinforced State police; in the daily batoning down of unemployed demonstrations, particularly in the suburbs of Paris; in the mad attacks made by battalions of police on the 50,000 workers who demonstrated on January 22 in the neighbourhood of the Paris town-hall on behalf of their wages and against the Government and its régime of corruption and theft.

In this manner *Fascists and Democrats are helping each other*, under the pretence of fighting each other, to make use of the *Staviski* scandal for the salvation of capitalism, whose varnish of honesty is rapidly disappearing.

Until the last moment the Socialist Party attempted to save *Chautemps*, and now *Blum* contents himself with the regret that the Premier did not at the first outbreak of the scandal "do something or other" that might have stemmed popular anger and toned down the discrediting of the Government.

The Communist Party has also, in this case, lagged behind the events, and it is certain that a dangerous underestimation of the rapidity of the fascisation of the régime exists within its ranks. It is far from doing enough to place itself at the head of the movement and to lead it along the correct road, in order to nip the fascist agitation and mobilisation in the bud, in order to demonstrate to the masses, now seething with discontent, the only means by which capitalism and the rottenness provoked by it may be swept away: the Soviet power. The superb demonstration in Paris, during which the workers frequently offered victorious resistance to the police, a fine demonstration of five thousand workers in *Marseilles*, meetings showing an unexpected success—all this proves that the masses are waiting for the slogans and the leadership of the C.P.F. Now is the time to come to them as quickly as possible and to spread wide the banner of the C.P. Certainly since the end of the war there has never been so much political excitement, in the towns just as much as in the villages.

## The Organisation of Fascism in Spain

By *Vicente Arroyo* (Madrid)

The economic situation of Spain shows a continuing process of decline in all branches of trade and industry. The level of production in the mining and the foundry industries, the two branches of heavy industry which are of decisive importance for present-day Spain, sank during the course of 1932 by 20.72 per cent. as compared with 1931, whilst in 1933 the decline was still greater. The revenue of the various railway companies fell from 1929 to 1933 by about 40 million pesetas. The balance of Spanish foreign trade shows a drop to 86.36 per cent. in the first months of 1933 as compared with the corresponding months of 1932. The State budget for 1933 closed with a deficit of 484 million pesetas. Unemployment is increasing both in agriculture and industry, with the exception of the armament industries, and the number of unemployed workers who receive no support either from the State or from the local authorities totals about a million and a half.

Parallel with this deterioration in the economic situation of Spain, which naturally hits the toiling masses with particular severity, there is a process of revolutionisation amongst the working class and peasant masses. The year 1933 saw tremendous struggles on the part of the Spanish working class. Over 6,000 strike movements took place, including many local general strikes and many strikes of great political significance, for instance, the strike of the dockers in *Seville* last August, the strike of the transport and building workers in *Barcelona* (not counting the three anarchist putch movements on January 8, June 9 and December 8 which assumed the character of real revolutionary mass movements in a number of districts) which gave evidence of the advance of the revolutionary movement in Spain and of the increasing preparedness of the working class and peasant masses to fight for their immediate demands. The masses refused to let themselves

be diverted from their struggle either by the demagogic promises of the socialist leaders or by the fierce campaign of persecutions carried on by the government—the number of political prisoners in Spain totals over 15,000.

The great finance capitalists and industrialists and the rich agrarian bourgeoisie are becoming more and more aware of the fact that the present regime cannot hold the masses of the workers and peasants within the framework of "legality," despite its very definite fascist character although this is garbed with a pseudo-democratic cloak. The bourgeoisie observes that the masses are rapidly shedding their democratic illusions and that they are beginning to take up the struggle for their own class demands, and therefore the bourgeoisie is striving to crush the revolutionary fighting spirit of the toiling masses by establishing an open fascist regime, a bloody fascist dictatorship.

The organisation of fascism in Spain is no longer a secret for anyone. It is not a question of the hysterical mouthings of Dr. Albinana or of the absurd claims of Primo de Rivera, the younger, who has now left for Germany in order to hold a conference with Hitler, nor is it a question of the organisation of a "Spanish phalanx" along the lines of Hitler's Storm Troops—all in all little more than the antics of a handful of Spanish monarchists and not to be taken seriously. Spanish fascism has found a much more dangerous organiser in the person of Gil Robles, the leader of the "Agrarian Action" (A.P.A.).

Gil Robles, the leader of the strongest fraction in the Spanish Cortes, is the cleverest and most logical organiser of fascism in Spain. Despite his repeated declarations that he is no fascist and that he opposes the fascist policy of Albinana and Rivera—with whom he nevertheless concluded an electoral alliance and with whom he will unite—his whole policy is directed towards the organisation of fascism and, what is more, fascism along German lines. Gil Robles was in Germany for a number of months, by the way, where he studied Hitler's methods and had a conference with Hitler, who promised to send a number of national socialist instructors to Spain to assist Robles. In the meantime this promise would seem to have been fulfilled.

Gil Robles' "opposition" to the Albinana and Rivera groups is purely tactical; it is a clever division of roles. In fundamental questions they are in complete agreement, but Gil Robles is cleverer and more intelligent than either Albinana or Rivera, who openly declare themselves to be fascists and demand the restoration of the monarchy. Gil Robles declares that he "recognises" the republican regime. He declares that he will take power only along "legal" and "democratic" lines in order then to reform the constitution as "antiquated." But in the meantime he is organising fascism in order to seize power when the time comes should he find the "legal path" closed to him.

Gil Robles is well aware of the fact that his hour has not yet arrived. Therefore, although he is the leader of the strongest parliamentary fraction, he is supporting the Lerroux government because this government is pursuing his policy and because he knows that at the moment an open and violent fascist movement is impossible because Spanish fascism has as yet no mass basis. It is just with a view to securing this mass basis that he is organising fascism and subordinating his whole policy to this end.

He is exploiting the increasing unemployment, hunger and misery among the masses of the workers and peasants and the fact that the unemployed were completely ignored by the former republican-socialist government which did nothing whatever to alleviate the situation of the unemployed workers. In order to secure the mass basis he requires for fascism he is exploiting the growing discontent of the masses and their disappointment with bourgeois "democracy." In this way he hopes to win wide support amongst the workers and peasants.

The recruiting of shock troops for fascism is being carried on with all manner of corruption. The unemployed are being promised work or offered alms. This recruiting is going on in all sections of society from the Lumpenproletariat up to the better-paid clerical employees, and even the professional pugilists are not being forgotten.

Particularly characteristic of Robles' methods are his proposals for "supporting" the unemployed which he has now placed before the Cortes. The Bill which he has submitted asks for the ridiculously inadequate sum of 100 million pesetas and declares, inter alia, the following:—

"Voluntary detachments shall be formed to organise a

voluntary labour service to carry out special tasks in common work. These detachments shall live together in special buildings or camps, according to circumstances.

"Members of these voluntary labour service detachments shall receive support to consist of maintenance whilst in service, the fare both ways from their place of living to the camp, and after the completion of their work a supplementary payment whose amount shall be fixed by a mixed commission."

The majority of the workers recruited in this fashion are to be used in the new afforestation scheme of the government. It is not merely a question of securing labour-power for the rich landowners at the cost of the State. It is not merely a question of making a present of millions to the big financiers who would float the loans necessary to carry out such work. It is also not merely a question of depressing the standards of living of the Spanish landworkers and of the working class in general, because, of course, such work would be miserably paid. The human material for the organisation of fascism is to be mobilised in these "voluntary" labour service camps. This aim can be seen clearly from the following passages of the Bill:

"The length of the working day in these camps shall be the same as that officially fixed for other works. However, a number of hours shall be devoted to the physical and mental training of the volunteers."

Physical and mental training of the workers in the language of fascism means the ideological preparation for war and civil war against the revolutionary movement.

Gil Robles is very well aware of the influence exercised on the development of fascism in Germany by the parades and demonstrations of the national socialists, and above all the influence they had on the German youth, and therefore he is preparing similar parades and demonstrations in Spain.

A great demonstration of the youth organisations of the "Agrarian Action" (A.P.A.) is being organised to take place on April 8, and Robles has chosen the Escorial, the former residence of the Kings of Spain in the neighbourhood of Madrid, as the scene of his first parade.

Gil Robles and the Spanish fascists reckon with the benevolent toleration and support of the government, but they are not reckoning with the fighting opposition of the Spanish workers to fascism, but nevertheless, already fascism has had to retreat on a number of occasions in face of the fighting spirit of the masses.

From the first moment the Spanish fascists appeared on the streets the Spanish workers and peasants, the anti-fascist workers' and peasants' militia formed at the initiative of the Communist Party of Spain, demonstrated their fighting determination. The parade planned by the fascists last year in Valladolid could not be carried out because the workers went on a general strike to prevent the parade. Last week the workers in Madrid, Seville and other towns prevented the public sale of the fascist weekly newspaper. In Madrid an armed collision took place between the revolutionary workers and the fascists as a result of which one fascist was killed and eight others wounded. A few days ago the fascist author Garcia Sanchis, who carries on a fierce anti-Soviet campaign throughout the country, tried to deliver a lecture in Bilbao. Despite the fact that he was provided with strong protection in the shape of a detachment of the State "Storm Guards" he was unable to hold the proposed lecture. Collisions occurred and a number of people were injured. The matter was settled by a short general protest strike by the workers of Bilbao. The united anti-fascist front propagated by the Spanish Communist Party is growing everywhere and uniting larger and larger masses of the workers and peasants—Communists, social democrats, anarchists and workers without political affiliations—against the menace of fascism.

On the other hand fascism is becoming daily more and more provocative. The happenings in Germany and the reactionary successes at the recent elections in Spain have encouraged the fascists. The fascist parade organised for April 8 represents a provocation of all anti-fascists throughout Spain. If the fascists finally attempt to carry their plan into action then April 8 is likely to see a violent struggle.

The concentration and strengthening of the anti-fascist force must be carried out immediately. The anti-fascist workers' and peasants' militia who will bear the chief brunt of the coming struggle will undoubtedly give the Spanish fascists a well-deserved lesson.

## Germany

### After Dimitrov—Thaelmann

The Reichstag fire trial is now a thing of the past. The execution of Van der Lubbe and the refusal to permit his body to be taken back to Holland conclude the chain of unexampled defeats suffered by the fascist incendiaries during the course of the Reichstag affair. Thanks above all to the heroic attitude of Dimitrov and to his exemplary conduct at the trial, the original roles as planned by the fascist stage-managers of the trial were completely reversed. The fascist accusers became the accused and the Communist accused became the accusers of the fascist incendiaries. The verdict of the Leipzig court and the summing up of the president of the court which represented a hysterical declaration of innocence on the part of the national socialists completely condemned them in the eyes of the world. No one throughout the whole world is able to accept the insolent contention of the German supreme court that despite its inability to convict the Communist accused, the Communist Party was nevertheless responsible for the burning down of the Reichstag.

Van der Lubbe was the only one who might ever have revealed the secret of the Reichstag fire and who might have named the accomplices which even the German supreme court was compelled to admit he must have had. But Van der Lubbe's mouth was closed for ever, just as before him Hanussen, Bell and Oberfohren, who also knew too much, were put out of the way by the national socialist murderers. Had he been left alive Van der Lubbe would have spoken. According to the statement of a Prague newspaper, Van der Lubbe did speak. He is reported to have protested furiously when he realised that he was going to be executed and to have accused "highly-placed personages," although the national socialists took good care to see to it that no representatives of the press were permitted to be present at the execution. At some time or other the effect of the drugs which turned the garrulous, active and boastful anarchist into a dull and insensate animal throughout the trial, would have lost their effect. The fact that the national socialist authorities refused to surrender Van der Lubbe's body to his relatives after his execution is proof enough that there were traces of poisonous drugs in his organs and that objective medical experts would have been able to find those traces of the criminal methods adopted by the German fascists.

Just as one crime inevitably drives the criminal on to commit the next, so to-day the German fascists are themselves destroying what little illusions the acquittal of the other accused were intended to create concerning the existence of something like justice in the Third Reich. The three Bulgarians and Torgler have been acquitted, but Torgler has been taken to a concentration camp, and his fine "defender," Dr. Sack, has even had the insolence to assert that this was done at Torgler's request owing to the "Communist threats against his life," a lie which Torgler himself has denied energetically to foreign journalists. Dimitrov, Popov and Tanev are also still in the hands of the fascist murderers. Dimitrov's old mother has been rendered helpless and defenceless by the expulsion of her interpreter and companion, and she has been cynically informed that Dimitrov need not wonder at his being held in "preventive arrest" in view of the insulting utterances he made to Goering at the time of the trial.

The international mass struggle for the release of our comrades must not relax for one minute if we are to prevent Goering carrying out the murderous threats he uttered against Dimitrov.

The German fascists are now planning to make up for the failure of the Reichstag fire trial by the trial of the imprisoned leader of the Communist Party of Germany, Ernst Thaelmann. According to all information which has leaked out the German fascists are now doing their utmost not to repeat their mistakes in the Reichstag fire process in connection with the trial of Thaelmann. A few days ago a note appeared in the "Kreuz-Zeitung," obviously inspired by the Ministry of Propaganda, to the effect that the coming trial of Thaelmann was to be staged as a great "show process with sound-film recording and the sending of workers' delegations into the court-room."

But whoever might assume from this that the political questions which the president of the supreme court, Buenger, deliberately suppressed at the orders of higher authorities in the Reichstag fire trial will now be dealt with at least in the trial of Thaelmann, is making a great mistake. The German fascist leaders

are well aware that to deal with these questions and, above all, with the question of the estimation of the political situation in January, 1933, by the Central Committee of the German Communist Party, would mean a new and decisive defeat for the leaders of the Third Reich. The whole house of cards, painfully constructed by Goebbels, according to which in the spring of 1933 the Communists of Germany were planning an armed insurrection, would utterly collapse. And just for this reason the plan of campaign of the Propaganda Ministry is quite different.

Any attempt to bring up and discuss the political questions of the time is to be drowned in an ocean of the dirtiest personal calumnies against the leader of the Communist army of freedom in Germany. The rulers of Germany will not be particular in their choice of weapons to this end. In the Reichstag fire trial they mobilised thieves, burglars and convicted moral degenerates to perjure themselves side by side with the highest ministers of the fascist government. The new galaxy of criminals which is to be presented at the trial of Thaelmann is no better. Goebbels, of the Propaganda Ministry, is planning to pour the whole filth over the head of the leader of the Communist Party of Germany at his trial, which has been invented by the impotent and poisonous hatred of the Trotskyist and Brandlerist bankrupts and by the social fascist watch-dogs of capitalism in order to discredit the leader of the C.P.

But they will discover that they have miscalculated. The German workers, and not only the German workers, know who Thaelmann is. The German proletariat recognises in him, in the Hamburg transport worker, a true son of his class. The workers of Hamburg in particular—as was shown clearly only a few weeks ago by an appeal issued by Hamburg social democratic workers on behalf of Thaelmann—have been able to observe the proletarian revolutionary development of Ernst Thaelmann at close hand, beginning with his activity in the youth and later in the trade-unions step by step until he became the leader of the Communist Party. Not even the greatest wave of filth and slander will be able to reach up and smirch the beloved figure of the leader of the German working class, who is a true proletarian revolutionary who never for one moment lost touch with his class.

The working masses of Germany know that it was Ernst Thaelmann who pointed out to them the socialist path out of the crisis by proclaiming the programme of the Communist Party for national and social freedom.

The poor peasants of Germany know that it was Ernst Thaelmann who lent expression to the will to live of the poor peasant masses oppressed by the junkers and by the intolerable weight of taxation in the peasant relief programme of the Communist Party.

The Communists of Germany and of the whole world know Ernst Thaelmann as the Bolshevik leader of the second largest party of the Communist International, as the passionate defender of the Soviet Union and of proletarian internationalism. They remember how in the heart of French imperialism, in Paris, he addressed a tremendous meeting of French workers and opposed the chauvinist incitement of the French and German bourgeoisie with proletarian internationalism and how he called on the French and German workers to fight jointly against the Versailles treaty.

Ernst Thaelmann, whose whole life has been devoted to the working class, never for one moment considered his personal safety or his personal advantage. He did not leave the German workers in the lurch at the moment of danger as the cowardly social fascist leaders did when the Hitler dictatorship was set up with the assistance and thanks to the treachery of the social fascist leaders. He remained with the German workers up to the last moment of his freedom and fought with them for their emancipation.

The hatred of the fascist murderers against Ernst Thaelmann is their hatred of the coming proletarian revolution, at the thought of which they tremble. They hope to strike a blow against the cause of Communism, the only hope of the oppressed millions of the working people, in striking a blow against Ernst Thaelmann.

Let us prove now in Germany and throughout the whole world in hundreds and thousands of demonstrations of every conceivable variety the unshakeable solidarity of the international proletariat with Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the coming Soviet Germany. Based on the confidence of the million masses of the workers throughout the world, Ernst Thaelmann will defeat the fascist murderers before the court as Dimitrov defeated them in the Reichstag trial. One Dimitrov was not enough for them? They shall have another one.

After Dimitrov—Thaelmann? We are prepared!

# Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

## Opening of the Party Congress

Moscow, January 27, 1934.

The Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. opened yesterday amidst animated bustle. Long before the opening the spacious, renovated hall of the large Kremlin Palace was filled with delegates. The hall now presents a more austere and majestically simple appearance. The clumsy gilded splendour has been removed. The columns, escutcheons and the gallery have disappeared. The dust of several centuries has been swept from the walls. The hall has become bright and spacious.

Above the tribune of the Presidium, between sombre lines of columns, stands Lenin's white bust. At three o'clock the delegates began to take their seats. In the front row sit the delegates from Moscow, Ukraine, and Leningrad. Then come the delegations of the Bolsheviks from the North Caucasus, the Urals, Siberia, Transcaucasia, Kasakstan, Central Asia and other districts, regions and Republics.

Here in this hall are assembled the best sons of Lenin's Party—Bolshevik organisers and leaders of the masses, of the great workers' and peasants' country, builders of industrial fortresses, created by the first Five-Year Plan, militant commanders, watchful sentries of the proletarian dictatorship, leaders of the kolchos masses, workers in the political departments of the Machine and Tractor Stations, fighters for Bolshevik transport, new people who have come to the fore in years of industrialisation and collectivisation.

Separated in groups, the delegates engage in animated conversations, recalling years of struggles and victories between the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Congresses. They exchange experiences. Old comrades meet who fought and worked together. Beneath the tribune a group is engaged in conversation, awaiting the opening of the Congress. Among the groups are Comrades Kaganovitch, Ordjonikidse, Voroshilov, Kossior, Andreyev, Postyshev, Shkyryatov, Mikoyan, and Gorki. On the steps leading to the Presidium sits Kalinin, writing something quickly in a notebook and looking round the hall now and then.

It is four o'clock. Many thousands of delegates and visitors in packed rows fill all the places in the hall, the corridors and newly built gallery. There remain several minutes to the opening of the Congress. Comrade Molotov appears at the Presidium table and is enthusiastically greeted by all present. Then a thunderous ovation as Stalin appears from the side of the hall. All present rise and greet the leader of the Party, the undaunted, courageous continuer of the work of Lenin, the great general of the proletariat. A regular whirlwind sweeps the hall and a mighty

greeting bursts from a thousand hearts: "Long live Stalin! Long live the Central Committee, the General Staff of Bolshevism!"

Lenin's Party stands more solid and mighty than ever, consolidated round its leaders. The strength of the Leninist Party is indestructible. This sounded in the ovations repeatedly shaking the arches of the tremendous hall.

Molotov, in his opening speech, delivered in a hushed hall, first deals with the three years that have elapsed since the Sixteenth Party Congress. He speaks of the Party successes, of the plots of its enemies, and the determination of the Soviet Union firmly to repulse the violators of peace. He speaks of the second Five-Year Plan and of Stalin. Again the Congress greets the leader's name, a wave of applause develops into a mighty roar when Molotov announces that the Congress is opened.

The first speaker is Comrade Khrutchev, secretary of the Moscow city Party Committee, who, on behalf of the delegations from regions and Republics, submits the proposals for the election of the Presidium consisting of 45 members, of the secretariat consisting of 17 members, of the editorial commission 11 members and the mandate commission 16 members.

There then begins the reading of the list of candidates proposed for the Presidium. Each name is greeted with loud applause from the delegates. Stalin's name again evokes an ovation. The Presidium, as well as the other leading organs of the Party Congress, is confirmed. The members of the Presidium take their places.

The agenda is thereupon unanimously adopted:—

(1) Report of the Central Committee, rapporteur Comrade Stalin; report of the Central Revision Commission, rapporteur Vladimirsky; report of the Central Control Commission and of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, rapporteur Eudsutak; report of the delegation of the C.P.S.U. in the E.C.C.I., rapporteur Comrade Manuilsky.

(2) The plan of the second Five-Year Plan, rapporteur Comrades Molotov and Kuibyshev.

(3) Organisational questions (Party and Soviet construction), rapporteur Comrade Kaganovitch.

(4) Election of central organs of the Party.

The Chairman, Comrade Molotov:

"We come now to the first item on the agenda, the report of the Central Committee of the Party. I call upon Comrade Stalin to address the Congress. The Congress rises and greets the leader of the invincible Party of Lenin. The ovation lasts several minutes.

## Opening Speech of Comrade Molotov

Three and a half years have elapsed since the Sixteenth Congress. A comparatively brief period has elapsed since the Congress which placed in the foreground the task of developing and carrying out to an end the offensive against the capitalist elements. We may now say that these years were filled with strenuous struggle of the working class against the enemies of Socialism. They were years of gigantic growth of our industry and the creation of heavy industry as the basis for the technical re-equipment of the entire national economy. They were years of powerful construction of collective farms and Soviet farms, and of desperate resistance to the new regime on the part of the last capitalist class namely, the kulakdom. These years are marked by tremendous victories of Socialism in our country.

The Party consolidated the working class and millions of peasants under the banner of the broad offensive of Socialism and the completion of this offensive. Under this banner we carried on the struggle for the realisation of the first Five-Year Plan. Despite the croaking of our enemies as to the inevitability of the collapse of the Five-Year Plan, the Party succeeded in bringing the Five-Year Plan triumphantly to a close in four years. Now our country has a powerful industry, is equipped with such a technique and such a machinery as enables it to turn out in the

future an abundance of everything that is needed for the technical re-equipment of all branches of national economy—of industry itself, of agriculture, transport, as well as for strengthening the defensive power of our country. The successes in carrying out the first Five-Year Plan prepared the basis for the practical realisation of the gigantic tasks of the second Five-Year Plan, the Five-Year Plan for the complete abolition of capitalist elements and classes generally.

We have already initiated the struggle for the realisation of the tasks of the second Five-Year Plan, and the present Party Congress must say its final word as to the programme of the second Five-Year Plan, the Five-Year Plan for the building of the classless socialist society.

Since the Sixteenth Congress the fight for the liquidation of the kulaks as a class proceeded under the banner of the broad offensive against the capitalist elements. In accomplishing this historical task we succeeded in overcoming not a few difficulties on the way to socialist construction in the village. The present Congress assembles at a moment when the collective farm organisation in the village has finally triumphed, and step by step is doing away with the remnants of the kulaks. We have succeeded in attaining huge successes in agriculture by a correct policy and

great organisational work of the Party in the village, by defeating the kulaks and by the struggle for the organisational and economic consolidation of collective and Soviet farms. The exceptionally good harvest of last year is an indication of these successes. The prospect of a prosperous and cultural life for tens of millions of collective farmers is opened and is already being realised.

There are still a good many unsolved problems. We still have extremely backward branches in our economy. Our advance and mastering of the recently created new technique and new industries is far from adequate. But one thing is obvious and cannot be disputed: The land of the Soviets is triumphantly overcoming each and every difficulty in its path and unswervingly proceeding in the direction of rapid economic and cultural rise to ever greater and greater well-being of the workers and the peasant masses. Therein consists the fundamental difference between the land of the Soviets which is building Socialism and the bourgeois States with their capitalist social order. While during all these years our country has proceeded undeviatingly along the path of rapid economic rise, the capitalist countries up to now have been unable to extricate themselves from the world economic crisis, which has brought with it an enormous increase in the misery and unemployment for the workers and all toiling masses of these countries.

While the facts of every fresh day speak about innumerable and growing forces of Socialism in our country on the other hand the world economic crisis and the growing revolutionary struggles of the workers against capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship provide innumerable proofs of the approaching collapse of bourgeois capitalist social order. That is why there prevails in our country in the working class and in the entire mass of toilers the firm faith in their cause and growing enthusiasm for the building of Socialism. The workers and collective farmers welcome the Seventeenth Congress of Lenin's Party with exceptional enthusiasm. Our Congress is linked up by thousands of ties with the works, factories, mines, collective and State farms as a Congress which expresses the strivings of millions of workers and collective farmers and their firm will to fight for the complete victory of Socialism in our country. Our Congress will mobilise and rally the masses more and more closely around the Bolshevik Party, around the leader and organiser of our victories, Comrade Stalin. (Prolonged applause.)

Our Congress will call forth an ardent response beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, in the hearts of millions of proletarians and oppressed colonial peoples. We will tell them: we indissolubly connect our fight for the victory of Socialism with the revolutionary struggle of the workers of the whole world against capitalism.

While we have many millions of true friends among the workers in the other countries, we naturally have sworn enemies in the camp of the imperialist forces. Lenin taught us that sooner or later those forces will be found in the camp of imperialism which will once more go over to an open attack against the land of Socialism. In the years which have passed we had repeatedly to reckon with the approach of the war danger. To-day particularly in connection with the situation in the Far East, we must intensify our watchfulness and preparedness to defend the great achievements of the October revolution. While undeviatingly pursuing our policy of peace and consolidation of peaceful co-operation with other States, we must take particular care of the fighting capacity of our glorious Red Army. (Stormy applause.)

The Congress assembles ten years after the death of the outstanding leader and organiser of our Party and the socialist revolution—Lenin. There is not and cannot be anybody in the ranks of our Party who does not understand that only on the basis of the practical carrying out of Lenin's teaching, on the basis of realising Lenin's policy, could the Party obtain the great victories in this period. In the consistent realisation in practice of Lenin's teachings lies the great merit of our Central Committee headed by Comrade Stalin, the true follower of Lenin who continues his work. (Loud applause.) During these years the Party has repeatedly repulsed the attacks upon its Leninist general line, attacks coming from opportunist shades. The Party has become more steeled in this fight against Right and "Left" opportunists. The Party is mobilised in order still further to carry on more persistently the fight against all opportunist waverings.

During the last period the Party carried out a cleansing of many of its organisations, focussing on the struggle against

enemies and other elements who have wormed themselves into the Party. It has got rid of degenerates, double dealers, and those who violate Party and Soviet discipline. Our Party, which does not allow itself to become giddy by victories, is now setting before itself as its present task, on the basis of thorough Bolshevik self-criticism, to intensify in every way the fight against shortcomings in the work of all organisations of the proletarian dictatorship, a fight against bureaucracy in all our organs and, above all, in the economic State apparatus, whose fighting capacity must be made commensurate with the political tasks confronting it. The most important task of the Congress is to solve the organisational militant tasks of socialist construction and the further strengthening of the leading role of the Party in this entire construction. Our country has become a country of powerful industry, a country of collectivisation, a country of victorious Socialism.

Our Leninist Party, which is leading the entire work of socialist construction, is steadily growing and becoming stronger as the vanguard of the Communist International.

**Long live the Party of Lenin at its Seventeenth Congress! Forward to new victories under the leadership of the Leninist Central Committee with Comrade Stalin at its head! (Stormy applause, all rise.)**

## Greetings of the C.P. of Germany to the Party Congress of Socialist Victories

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, in the name of the Communist Party and of the revolutionary proletariat of Germany, sends to the C.P. of the Soviet Union, as the leader, the first and the best organisation of the Bolsheviks in the Communist International, the warmest revolutionary fighting greetings on the occasion of its Seventeenth Party Congress—the Party Congress of socialist victories.

The results you have achieved in the victorious building up of socialism are magnificent. The people of the Soviet Union, and with them the whole of the revolutionary world proletariat, can look with pride on these achievements. Never in the history of the world was it possible for the nations—split up into classes—nor was it ever possible for the capitalist mode of production to achieve such gigantic successes in building up industry and agriculture, such a rapid tempo and such a high level of quality.

All the bourgeois theories of capitalist economy being necessary and the only economy which promises any success, have been crushingly refuted by the great successes of your socialist-planned economy, its progressiveness and tremendous superiority. This is all the more significant, as precisely at the present time, in view of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and of the situation in Europe, Asia and the whole world, which is pregnant with war and revolution, hundreds of millions of people are seeking a way out from the capitalist chaos, from the fascist terrorist regime and from the wars and war devastations which are inseparably bound up with capitalism, through the proletarian revolution.

The work of your victorious October Revolution, which commenced under the leadership of the steel-hard Bolshevik Party with the gifted and unforgettable leader Lenin at the head, and continued with Comrade Stalin, Lenin's best disciple, who is faithfully devoted to the working class, at the head, achieved a series of world-historical victories in the building of socialism, towards Communism and the classless society.

The working class of the whole world will recognise from your work that on one-sixth of the globe socialism is not a Utopia, but a reality. They must recognise from your work that there is only one way to socialism—the way of victorious proletarian revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the Soviet Power!

The proletarian revolution drives away the big capitalists, appropriates them, wrests power from them and destroys their terrorist State apparatus. The proletarian revolution transfers the factories, banks and big landed estates into the hands of the workers and peasants. The proletarian revolution creates a new type of State, the Soviet Power, the only democratic form of State. The victorious armed rising of the proletariat clears the way and lays the foundations for the erection of socialism.

Socialism, that is the preliminary stage of the classless society, which does away with the system of rich and poor, of exploited and exploiters. This you have attained, comrades. We in Germany want to achieve this. With you there is no fascism. With you socialism prevails.



You have built thousands of undertakings and opened the gates of new factories to twenty million workers. We have twenty million unemployed in Germany.

You have set up millions of collective farms on the land and are leading the rural population to a happy life. We have an agrarian crisis. The land held by our small peasants is encumbered with debts. It is expropriated by the junkers and the fascist dictatorship.

With the power of the trade unions you have promoted socialist construction, raised the standard of living of the masses, pursued the path of cultural achievements, and trained the masses for collective action. With us fascism has destroyed the trade unions, forcibly removed the factory councils, produced cultural barbarity and incarcerated over 150,000 workers, peasants, small shopkeepers and intellectuals in prisons and concentration camps.

These are two systems. In your country you have socialism—steadily increasing well-being and culture! In our country we have capitalism—fascist terror and starvation!

You workers, peasants and artisans in Soviet Russia have attained the real and true community of the people, the broadest unity of the people, because with the overthrow of capitalism you have created the prerequisites for class unity.

With us the fascist "community of the people" means that the rulers spend as much on one meal as a worker earns in a week, while for the workers horse flesh, herrings and dried potatoes are becoming the daily fare.

With the overthrow of the exploiters in your own country you have created a fatherland, a native country. The workers and peasants have everything that is worth defending. In Hitler Germany, where there prevails a double robbery by our own and foreign capitalists, the workers and toilers have nothing, and also nothing whatever to defend. They can obtain their social emancipation only by first overthrowing the enemy in their own country.

If the German working people wish to attain socialism and well-being, if they wish to create a real native country which is worth defending, then they must unswervingly pursue the path of social revolution.

The so-called "national revolution" in Germany is the greatest development of the dictatorship of the reactionaries, of Thyssen, Siemens, Kloeckner. The proletarian revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party—that is the social revolution which leads to socialism.

With you there is no fascism, with you socialism prevails, because the Party of the Bolsheviks gained the victory over the social democratic, Menshevik splitters and over all opportunists, rallied the majority of the working class under its flag, and became the Bolshevik Party, the only mass party of the Russian proletariat.

With us the social democracy succeeded in maintaining the split in the ranks of the working class and led the German proletariat, not to socialism but to fascism. All their theories and those of their assistant, the counter-revolutionary, Trotsky, have miserably collapsed. The work of the Soviets triumphs over the profaners of Marx and the enemies of Leninism. The social democracy is attempting to continue its disruptive work to-day. It sabotages the daily struggle, the anti-fascist united front of the workers. It uses sham-revolutionary slogans such as "via the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transition stage to democracy," and in a deliberately slanderous manner places the Soviet system on the same level as the barbarous regime of fascism. Inspired by the example of the victory of the Russian working class, we shall increase our efforts in order to win our social democratic class comrades in the factories, workshops, and offices for Bolshevism, to destroy the main buttress of the bourgeoisie in the camp of the working class.

Comrades! The successes you have achieved in socialist construction are the result of irreconcilable class struggle. The more resolutely socialism steers towards the classless society and inspires the proletariat of the whole world in its struggles, the more strongly the Soviet Union, as a factor of peace, disturbs the imperialist warmongers, the more furiously the imperialists strive to commence the imperialist robber and class war against the Soviet Union. The government of Goering and Hitler, the government of incendiaries, has together with Japanese imperialism become the chief warmonger. We assure you that we feel ourselves one with the proletariat of the Soviet Union and its victorious Red class army in the determination, together with the workers of the whole world, to destroy any capitalist robbers who attack the Soviet Union.

Our Party is following the teachings of Lenin that only the Bolshevik mass struggle before the outbreak of war, for the conversion of imperialist war into civil war, furnishes the guarantee of the victory of revolution in connection with war. Our Party has therefore set itself the task of opening among the workers, the youth, the soldiers and in the fascist mass organisations the broadest ideological offensive against the chauvinist pest, of strengthening the fighting organisations in these industries which are essential for the conduct of war, and above all of establishing as soon as possible independent class trade unions.

Comrades! Hatred against the regime of the fascist executioners and wage-cutters is growing from day to day among the German working masses. In Germany, in spite of all the terror, a new revolutionary upsurge is beginning. By means of the fight for trade union rates of wages, against robbing of relief and benefit and compulsory contributions, for unrestricted election of independent factory councils, against taxation robbery and customs duties, against militarisation and terror, our Party is increasing the hatred against fascism and arousing the will to power among the masses of workers. We are propagating our social and national emancipation programme as the only programme of salvation from fascism, starvation and war. We are propagating the political mass strike, the general strike and the armed rising of the German working class for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, for Soviet Germany. Your tremendous socialist victories are a weapon for us in the fight for power. For they show the workers:—

that Communism is the only salvation for them;

that only the unity of the working class on the basis of Marxism-Leninism leads to victory;

that there is no such thing as democratic "West-European" or "national" socialism but only a proletarian international socialism;

that it is possible to build up socialism in one country and that it is realised only through the proletarian revolution; the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet Power.

The example of the Soviet Union is the example of Bolshevism! Under the leadership of the C.P. of Germany, which, thanks to the active support of the C.P.S.U. and through the valuable work of our imprisoned leader, Comrade Thaelmann, has grown to be a Bolshevik Party, the German proletariat will follow the path of the Russian October Revolution.

The Communist Party of Germany greets the Party of Lenin under Comrade Stalin's leadership in brotherly unity on the occasion of its Seventeenth Party Congress with the cry:—

Long live Bolshevism! Long live October! Long live the Soviet Power!

Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

## The Architect of Socialist Society

By Karl Radek (Moscow)

Ten years have passed since immediately after the death of Lenin Stalin stood in the great amphitheatre of the Grand Theatre in Moscow and solemnly promised that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would remain true to the heritage of Lenin in the struggle against capitalism, that it would continue this struggle unswervingly to a victorious conclusion on the basis of the solidarity of the international proletariat, on the alliance of the workers and peasants, by consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and guarding the unity of the Leninist ranks jealously.

For Lenin the victory of socialism meant the organisation of a socialist society. In the last articles which he wrote before his death Lenin stressed with all possible vigour that the organisation of socialist production in the Soviet Union was possible, and that neither the cultural backwardness of the country nor the predominance of peasant production in it was an invincible hindrance to this. He pointed out expressly that the Soviet Union had within its frontiers "everything necessary and in sufficient quantities" for this purpose.

The opposition against Stalin, who unfurled the banner of socialist construction as the immediate task of the October Revolution, came forward with various arguments. In fact this opposition was no more than an echo of the attitude of the Second International with its disbelief in the possibility of socialism.

Up to 1917 the international proletariat had not yet entered into the stage of an immediate and direct struggle for power and for the realisation of socialism. Up to the October Revolution all

the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat had been no more than attempts to guide the democratic revolution into the channels of the struggle for socialism. They were historical advance-guard struggles. These attempts did not end victoriously for the proletariat.

The leaders of the Second International were not engaged in preparing the workers for the proletarian revolution. Kautsky, Guesde and the others looked down with contempt on the careerists whose dreams were centred on cabinet positions, but in reality they were flesh of the same flesh and blood of the same blood, for to them also a real struggle for socialism was unthinkable. The Russian Mensheviks looked down with contempt on the European reformists, but when it came to the point they proved themselves to be also nothing but the hangers-on of the bourgeoisie, nothing but the advance-guard of the bourgeoisie in its struggles against the proletariat. When they declared that the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia was impossible owing to the cultural backwardness of the country, and that such a victory was possible only in the highly-developed capitalist countries, they were saying in effect: we cannot proceed beyond the bourgeois republic with its reformist ministers.

The opposition against the idea put forward by Lenin as early as 1902 in his discussion with Plechanov that the proletariat could be victorious even if it was in the minority provided that it succeeded in securing the support of the proletarian revolution by a peasant war, the opposition against the idea of the possibility of the building up of socialism in one country alone, was in fact the result of the disbelief in the possibility of a victorious socialist revolution in the given historical stage. If, as the Trotskyists contend, the proletariat in the Soviet Union is not in a position to build up socialism, whilst in the countries of Western Europe the forces of the revolution are still in the stage of development, then the only conclusion which can be drawn is that the hour of the socialist revolution has not yet arrived.

That section of the Bolsheviks which declared Stalin's programme for the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union to be an improvisation, a utopia, and even the abandonment of the international tasks of the revolution, proposed in effect the abandonment of any attempt to build up socialism. Under the guise of internationalism they proposed that the proletariat of the Soviet Union should abandon its own international task, namely, the facilitating of the birth pangs of the international proletarian revolution as the result of the victorious building up of socialism in the Soviet Union, by the building up of a classless socialist system of society.

With this the opposition cut itself off from the essential character of the Leninist party, because, in contradistinction to all the parties of the Second International, the Bolshevik party had been built up by Lenin as an instrument in the struggle for socialism. In the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution the Bolshevik Party did not forget its socialist tasks and it regarded this period as no more than a stage in the struggle for socialism. The party of Lenin could not follow the lead of those who represented the survival in its ranks of the prejudices of the Second International. The Bolshevik Party followed Stalin and his supporters because by insisting unswervingly on the carrying out of Lenin's teachings concerning the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union he was continuing the work for which Lenin had created the Party in the first place. Stalin became the leader of the Bolshevik Party, for he was the leader of the struggle for the continuation of the work of Lenin. *Socialism, which thanks to Marx had been transformed from a utopia to a science, guided the proletariat under Lenin's leadership in the struggle for power. After the proletariat had seized power and consolidated its economic position it began, under the leadership of Stalin, to carry socialism into practice.*

Stalin utilised and developed the lessons of Lenin concerning the uneven development of capitalism as the basis for the contention of the possibility of the building up of socialism in one country alone. This fact alone would be sufficient to demonstrate the historical significance of Stalin as the successor of Lenin. But the great service rendered by Stalin in developing the strategic plans of Lenin was followed by a further great service: Stalin carried Lenin's strategical plan into practice in great historical struggles. Thus Stalin not only led the proletariat in the struggle for the carrying out of, so to speak, the national tasks of the October Revolution, but he also created a socialist bulwark for the inter-

national proletariat and thereby facilitated the international victory of socialism. Thus Stalin became the great architect of socialism.

The social conditions which have made Stalin what he is and assured him his place in the history of the struggle for working-class emancipation, may be summed up by saying that more than any other pupil of Lenin he is flesh of the flesh and blood of the blood of the Leninist party.

A son of the working people, Stalin rebelled against the slavery of the religious seminary in which he spent his early youth. He plunged enthusiastically into the study of the algebra of the revolution and quickly grasped that the most important driving force in the revolutionary struggles and the sole leader of those struggles must be the proletariat. As a result of his studies he began to rally the workers in petty-bourgeois Georgia and to work to break them away from the various petty-bourgeois groups which claimed their allegiance not only under the guise of socialism, but even under the guise of Marxism. There were comparatively few workers in Georgia, even less than in Russia proper, and the task of winning them and securing the hegemony in the revolutionary struggle for them seemed utopian. However, this did not dismay Stalin, who had thoroughly grasped the lesson of Marx concerning the proletariat as the demiurge of history, and he concentrated all his efforts on to this task because only its victorious achievement could guarantee the victory of the revolution.

The carrying out of this task demanded an uncompromising struggle against opportunism, and Stalin steeled himself in a tireless struggle against the multitudinous groups of the petty-bourgeois movement. This school of struggle through which Stalin passed in his youth has left ineffaceable traces upon him. One of the chief characteristics of Stalin as the leader of the proletariat since that period is his great and unshakeable thoroughness in the solution of fundamental problems. A second characteristic of Stalin was also developed in these early struggles in Georgia, namely, his keen watchfulness for all evidences of opportunism. With these first results of his "socialist accumulation," an accumulation to which he continually added, Stalin began the task of organising the workers of Baku. Whilst engaged in this task he went through a further decisive stage in his development.

His basis of operations was a powerful centre of the working class, one of those tremendous reservoirs of proletarian energy which later on were to break up Czarism and capitalism. However, at that time the proletariat of Baku was nationally divided and culturally very backward, but this did not deter Stalin. His participation in the struggles of the workers of Baku provided Stalin with his first great experience of that tremendous reservoir of energy represented by the modern working class.

It was in this "Black Town," a town of impoverishment and misery, of Asiatic exploitation, of national bickerings and antagonism, the home of tens of thousands of the slaves of capitalism, which forged in Stalin the iron and unshakeable belief in the working class which made it possible for him to take over fearlessly the task of building up socialism in a backward country. In Baku he learnt how to forge the nationalistic and mutually antagonistic sections of the working class into one great united army of fighting proletarians. In Baku Stalin learned independently to master the nationality question in a way that only Lenin of the other leaders of the proletariat could.

It was in Baku that Stalin developed into the leader of the international proletariat. Baku is on the borderline of Europe and Asia, and Baku was a centre of international capital import. The Nobels, the Rothschilds, the Deterdings, the Urquharts, and the other sharks of international finance capital were at work there. Persian and Turkish peasants streamed into Baku and were joined by fugitive Armenians from Asia Minor. Brutally exploited, these toilers from Asia learned from their Russian fellow-workers the A.B.C. of the revolutionary struggle. Whilst engaged in the work of organising these multifarious masses Stalin grasped the international role of the Russian proletariat—to absorb the lessons of Marxism from the West and to pass them on to the masses of the East.

In the period of the Stolypin reaction Stalin entered the field of Russian politics proper, into the international arena. Stalin was in the front ranks of the disciples of Lenin in the struggle for the maintenance of the revolutionary aims of the proletariat when

the Mensheviks threw off the revolutionary mask and passed from their propaganda for an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie to propaganda in favour of adaptation of the aristocracy of labour to Czarism. In his theoretical study of the nationality question Stalin went far beyond the bounds of his practical experience in Russia. He fought not only against the Georgian federalists, the mensheviks and the others, but exposed also the then rising stars of the Second International, Otto Bauer and Karl Renner, in a clear and brilliant analysis of the opportunism which concealed itself behind a mask of Marxism. It was at that time that Lenin's attention was directed to Stalin, and from then onwards Stalin became Lenin's nearest co-operator in the struggle.

Stalin was removed from leading positions in the Bolshevik movement again and again by the agents of Czarism. Again and again he was flung into prison and sent for many years into banishment, and in this period he became one with the main cadres which the Leninist party was building up in illegality and in the legal organisations as none other of Lenin's disciples did. At illegal meetings and conferences, at the discussions of the editors and contributors of the "Pravda," in discussions with the workers' deputies in the Duma, in the cells of the Czarist prisons, in secret discussions on the way to places of banishment, he tested all the links in the party chain, he discovered the strong points and the points of leverage, he learned to know the qualities of the bricks which were later on to serve in the building up of the Soviet power.

Released by the *February Revolution*, Stalin set to work to inform himself rapidly of the situation and of the tremendous work which had been performed in the meantime in Lenin's laboratory from which he had been separated so long. Hand in hand with his great teacher and with unshakeable coolness Stalin joined in the work of organising the Party of the working class for the struggle for victory. This *unshakeable coolness* did not desert him for one moment. At the Sixth Party Congress which was held illegally at a time when the rulers of the moment had been victorious he announced openly that the aim of the coming revolution was the *building up of a socialist society*.

Stalin grew and developed in the struggles which formed the Party and brought it victory. Stalin embodies all the historical experience of the Party. The teachings of Marx and Lenin were not merely theories which he had adopted as a result of his study in books; they were the generalisations of the experience of his own life which was a part of the life of the fighting proletariat. Only the combination of a clear, far-seeing Marxist-Leninist conception with the most intimate connection with the main cadres of the Party which led the revolution could have created the revolutionary leader capable of taking Lenin's place.

The leader of the proletariat is selected in the struggle for the fighting policy of the Party, in the struggle for the organisation of the coming struggles. Stalin, who under Lenin had been one of the most prominent leaders of the Party, became the recognised and beloved leader of the revolution as the result of an inner-party struggle of great fundamental significance. Two questions formed the centre of this struggle: is Marxism-Leninism a uniform and indivisible strategy which guarantees the victory of the proletariat, and is the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union possible? In this struggle Stalin mobilised not only the main forces of those who had gone through the whole historical development of Bolshevism, but also the millions of new Party members.

The party struggle which lasted four years not only removed Trotsky from the leadership, a man who had always been a nucleus of the Bolshevik Party, but also those elements of the old Leninist leadership who lacked the necessary understanding of Leninism and the will and courage to lead the millions of workers and peasants under Stalin's guidance into the struggle for a new and higher stage in the development of the revolution. The victory of the Leninist Central Committee with Stalin at the head was the preliminary condition for the laying down of the fundament of socialism.

In a backward capitalist country the working class can seize power if the bourgeoisie is weak and unorganised and if the working class itself is sufficiently strong and sufficiently steeled in the struggle to lead the masses of the peasantry against the bourgeoisie. But it can build up socialism only if it first creates a modern large-scale industry. This was Lenin's lesson and it was supported by Stalin as early as 1921. For Stalin the whole first period of the New Economic Policy and the strengthening of peasant agriculture was nothing but a means to mobilise sufficient

forces in order to advance from the stage of the miserable peasant nag to the stage of large-scale industrial machinery.

In the period when the first Five-Year Plan was still being drawn up all the difficulties inevitably facing the process of industrialisation inevitably arose. It was necessary to create a wave of enthusiasm throughout the country. The slogan of *self-criticism* which Stalin flung into the ranks of the proletariat met with a powerful response. The appeal for *socialist competition* and for the *formation of shock brigades* let loose powerful streams of working-class energy.

But the situation in the villages was more difficult. The Kulaks began not only to resist the process of socialist industrialisation, but also to organise those sections of the peasantry who were dependent on them materially and ideologically for a struggle against the Soviet power. This struggle of the Kulaks against the Soviet power not only roused all the remnants of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union to increased activity, but it also found a response even amongst certain sections of the Communist Party itself.

The right-wingers craved that the struggle of the Kulaks would inevitably lead to a breach between the proletariat and the peasantry and that in order to avoid this the pace of the process of industrialisation must be slackened, the Kulaks must be given freedom of development. The danger represented by Trotskyism was that it was making for a breach with the masses of the middle peasants and thus playing into the hands of the Kulaks, that by shaking the iron discipline of the Leninist party it was opening the door for the victory of the Kulak counter-revolution. However, the right-wingers supplied the Kulaks with their fighting slogans and became directly the agency of the Kulaks in the ranks of the party itself. The determination with which Stalin carried out the Five-Year Plan and liquidated the Kulaks as a class was an expression of an invincible confidence in the correctness of the lessons of Lenin concerning the possibility of the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The first task was to mobilise milliards of roubles, that is to say, a tremendous accumulation of supplies, raw materials and labour-power. Never in the history of humanity has a State in times of peace collected such a mass of values in such a short space of time. When the capitalist world discovered that the Leninist party, that Stalin, were not contenting themselves with merely announcing the coming building up of socialism, but that they actually intended to begin with the work, the bourgeoisie prophesied that the whole affair would end up like the tower of Babel. Where would the Bolsheviks be able to obtain such quantities of *qualified workers, foremen and engineers* as would be necessary to carry out such tremendous plans? However, the capitalist world was not quite certain of the justification of its own prophecies and therefore it decided to take a hand in the game and accelerate the development of the tremendous constructive work into the prophesied confusion.

At the instructions of the general staff of the world bourgeoisie, the old lackeys of the Russian bourgeoisie, noted scholars and engineers who had been permitted by the proletariat to continue at their jobs, began to mix up the cards, to draft false plans, to create difficulties for future development, to cause obstructions of all sorts and to deflect the work into a blind alley. At the same time they drew up a plan to destroy the constructive work completely in case of a war of intervention on the part of the international bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union.

But the saboteurs had reckoned without their host. With the eagle eye of its class mistrust the proletariat observed the machinations of the class enemy and the iron hand of proletarian justice fell heavily and destroyed the plans of the wreckers. The posts occupied by the traitors were taken by the new proletarian generation of engineers. They had not the training and experience of the old engineers, but they had a burning desire to fulfil the will of their class. Stalin issued the new slogan of *catching up and passing the advanced countries of the capitalist world on the field of industrial technique*. The Soviet Union experienced a tremendous cultural revolution.

The idea of collectivisation means a tremendous transformation not only in the economic life of the country, but also of traditional customs and habits which have existed obstinately for a thousand years and more. Stalin's reckoning on the victory of the collective farms turned out to be well-founded. It was based

on the growing strength of the victorious proletariat. It was based on an appeal to the intelligence of the peasants as toilers, upon the power of the organisation which represented the interests of these scores of millions of toilers and must lead them to a life of well-being and culture. And finally it was based on confidence in the capacity of the Bolshevik Party to manoeuvre on the tremendous fields of the Soviet Union.

Based upon the great growth of industry and on the increased activity of the masses of the poor peasants the Communist Party, having smashed the opposition of the right-wing capitalists led by Bucharin, Rykov and Tomski, proceeded under the leadership of Stalin to make a direct attack along the whole front against the capitalist elements in the villages. Socialism gained its first fundamental victory in the villages. The collective farms embraced the majority of the peasant farms.

The second attack of socialism on the capitalist elements in the villages began. The land was covered with a network of tractor and agricultural machinery stations. And in order to strengthen this front the Party created the Political Departments connected with these tractor and machinery stations and with the Soviet farms.

The extent of the sowings and of the harvest in 1933 demonstrated to the world the second great victory of socialism in the villages. It proved to the world that the great mass of the collective farmers were now convinced of the stability of the collective agricultural movement and of the advantages of the movement for the peasants, that they regarded the collective agricultural movement as the path to a new life of well-being and culture.

In order to achieve in five years a task for which normally fifty years would have been necessary an unparalleled wave of enthusiasm on the part of the masses of the toiling people was necessary. The rate of development laid down in the Five-Year Plan and the degree of exertion necessary to carry it out were not fixed arbitrarily by Stalin.

By laying down the basis of socialism the Soviet Union struck a deadly blow at the capitalist world which was writhing in the throes of its deepest and most severe crisis. Stalin and the Central Committee of the Communist Party know that the world bourgeoisie is not prepared to let the building-up of socialism be completed in peace. The years which have followed the death of Lenin have at the same time been years in which world capitalism has armed itself feverishly. This fact has faced the leaders of the world revolution with Stalin at their head with the task of arming the builders of socialism in their own defence. This task was completed in the years of the first Five-Year Plan.

Standing on the Lenin Mausoleum surrounded by his nearest collaborators Molotov, Kaganovitch, Voroshilov, Kalinin and Orjonnikidze, Stalin in his simple military greatcoat surveyed critically and thoughtfully the hundreds of thousands of proletarians who marched past the tomb of Lenin with the firm step of the advance-guard of the future victors over the capitalist world. He knew that he had fulfilled the promise that he had made ten years ago at the time of Lenin's death. The whole of the working masses of the Soviet Union and the international revolutionary proletariat know it too.

Unshakeable confidence arises like a great wave towards the rock-like figure of our leader, the confidence of the workers of the world that the general staff of the coming victorious world revolution is assembled around Stalin on the plinth of the Lenin Mausoleum.

## Fight Against Imperialist War

### The Danger of War in the Balkans

By B.

The tremendous crisis which is shaking the whole capitalist world has also smashed a breach in the Versailles system in the Balkans. The capitalists and rich landowners in the Balkan countries are relying more and more on the war card to help them out of their difficulties. In most of the Balkan and Danube countries the extreme chauvinist and reactionary imperialist groupings have already got the State power in their hands. The seizure of power in Germany by Hitler and the resultant rise of a fierce wave of chauvinism and nationalism, the increased activity of Italian imperialism in the Balkans, and the appearance of Great Britain with revisionist proposals have all increased the tension in the State of Southern Europe almost to breaking

point. In addition to this, the fear of capitalists and rich landowners of the soviet revolution in the countries of the Balkans causes them to make headlong for war as the only way out. The situation in the Balkan countries is so charged that the topic of war is on everyone's lips as though it were something expected at any day.

French imperialism, which, together with its vassals Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Belgium, is striving to maintain the Versailles system intact, is compelled to carry on a struggle on two fronts—against the expansionist activities of fascist Italy and fascist Germany. This struggle can be seen clearly in the Balkan States and in the basin of the Danube, where the economic, political and strategic spheres of interest of the hostile revisionist and anti-revisionist imperialist groups collide with each other and where, in addition, there is an extreme intensification of the internal class and national antagonisms.

In recent years the Italian-Yugoslavian antagonism, the influence of Italy in Hungary and Austria and the efforts of Italian imperialism to dominate Albania, Bulgaria and Greece have led to an increasing intensification of Franco-Italian antagonism.

In its efforts to gain a firm footing in the Balkans Italian imperialism collides with Yugoslavia, a product of the Versailles Treaty, which under the slogan "The Balkans for the Balkan People!" is striving to establish its own hegemony on the Balkan peninsula. Italian imperialism is therefore now pursuing an energetic policy of isolating Yugoslavia. With this aim in view Italian imperialism is doing everything possible to draw the peoples plundered and badly treated by the Versailles Treaty—Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary and Austria—into the orbit of Italian policy and to surround Yugoslavia with a ring of hostile States all opposed to the Versailles Treaty.

In order to prepare for war more effectively the imperialists are compelled to adopt all sorts of complicated methods and manoeuvres. Italian imperialism, which is carrying on a struggle to secure a revision of the Versailles Treaty, whilst at the same time brutally oppressing the Croats and Slovenians in Istria, the Germans in South Tyrol, and the colonial peoples in Italy's African colonies, is also doing its utmost to exploit the discontent of the Croats, Montenegrins, Macedonians and Slovenians, who are groaning under the yoke of Versailles, in order to create a military bloc in the interests of Italian imperialism. On the other hand, the Pan-Serbian imperialists who shed bitter tears over the wrongs of their suffering brothers, the Croats and Slovenians in Istria, are busily engaged in consolidating the Versailles yoke and consolidating their own power over the Croats, Slovenians, Macedonians and Montenegrins, and they aim at conquering Istria, Trieste and Gorizia under the guise of a war of emancipation. They are not only exploiting the national revolutionary movement in Albania against Italian imperialism, but, under the pretext of "emancipating Albania from the Italian yoke" and under the slogan "the Balkans for the Balkan Peoples!" they are preparing to occupy Albania and to seize the Aegean harbour Salonica and to establish their undisputed hegemony over the Balkan Peninsula.

Italian and German imperialism are acting jointly in their struggle against the division of the world dictated by the Treaty of Versailles. However, the formation of a permanent imperialist bloc between Italy and Germany is rendered very difficult owing to the conflict of interests between the two powers in the basin of the Danube and in the Balkans. The interests of German and Italian imperialism are contrary not only in Austria. Not only a unification between Germany and Austria would be opposed to Italian imperialist interests, but also Germany's attempts to penetrate economically and politically into the Balkans and the Near East.

In the meantime French imperialism is paying considerable attention to the question of consolidating its interests in the Balkans, as its position there offers it the valuable possibility of a basis for attack against both Italy and Germany, and in consequence it is doing everything possible to strengthen the Little Entente. Undoubtedly French imperialism has been very successful in securing uniformity in the war preparations of its vassal powers.

The main pillars of the Little Entente are military co-operation, a struggle against all attempts to revise the Versailles Treaty, and a struggle against the growing "Hydra of revolution." However, it must be pointed out that French imperialism has not suc-

ceeded in creating a solid economic basis for the "unity" of the countries of the Little Entente. This was seen clearly at the last economic conferences of these countries. This fact is being taken into careful consideration by the leaders of German and Italian foreign policy in their expansionist aims in the Balkan countries. The relations between the Versailles and the anti-Versailles powers are being strained particularly as a result of the most important items of imperialist antagonisms in the Balkans. The Balkans with their intense national and class antagonisms and with their differences in the ranks of the ruling class concerning the form and methods of fascism are becoming more and more like to a boiler under intense pressure and likely to blow up at any moment.

The situation in the Balkans bears the character of the eve of a new imperialist war, and it behoves the working masses to strengthen their struggle against nationalism and chauvinism and against the danger of war. The working masses in town and country must combine their daily struggle in wage questions, in questions of working hours, taxation and national oppression with an energetic struggle against the imperialist war policy of their rulers. Organised actions against the preparations for war must be carried out. The struggle against the war-mongers and against the danger of war must be combined with the struggle against the remnants of the feudal system and against national oppression with a view to precipitating the agrarian and national revolution in the Balkans.

In view of the struggle which has now begun for and against the Versailles Treaty we must bring forward our own plan for the abolition of the whole Versailles system against both the imperialist group opposing the Versailles system and the other group which supports Versailles. We must show all the oppressed peoples of the Balkans the path to national emancipation which has been successfully taken by the peoples of the Soviet Union.

## The U.S. Flight to Hawaii

By O. G. Bosse (New York)

The flight of six naval airplanes from California to Hawaii on January 11 was of great military significance. It was the longest not-stop mass flight yet made, exceeding the longest hop of the Balbo fleet by one-third, though the latter started with four times as many planes. The 2,400 miles flown took 25 hours, averaging 100 miles an hour and attaining 120 at times. Both Japanese and American military experts acknowledged at once the value of the flight for the coming war in the Pacific. The distance from Hawaii to the Philippines is 3,400 miles, with a number of islands on the way, and such planes flying from the Philippines could easily bomb Japanese cities, and possibly do so even from Hawaii.

The planes were reported to be ordinary patrol seaplanes of a U.S. Navy flight squadron, large twin-motored VP bombers with crews of 30 officers and men. They are equipped with a large number of bombs and so heavily loaded with gasoline that it took over two hours for some of them to get off the water. Precautions similar to those in the Balbo flight were taken, warships being stationed every 300 miles along the route, and each plane being in radio communication with the ships and with each other. Advantage was taken of very fine weather, though fog set in later.

Commander McGinnis, in charge of the squadron, stated that enough fuel was left to continue on to Midway Islands, 1,200 miles nearer Japan, though fuel consumption figures were kept secret as being of military importance. Two years ago patrol planes made the flight from Honolulu to Midway Islands and returned to Hawaii. Last September McGinnis' squadron made a non-stop flight of over 2,000 miles from Norfolk, Virginia, to the Panama Canal Zone. These planes will remain in Hawaii, and will bring the total number of patrol planes there to 48. They will take part in the semi-annual advanced base operations, during which the air fleet will manoeuvre on all the Hawaiian islands.

Japan reacted immediately to the flight, its military officials characterising it as creating "an entirely new situation in the Pacific." What they meant, of course, was that Hawaii was now only a day's journey from the U.S., instead of many days; only a stop on the route to Guam, the Philippines and Japan—a direct threat to Japanese cities. How closely Japan followed the flight is shown by the fact that Japanese oil tankers "happened" to arrive in San Francisco just as the squadron left; also that she had many unofficial observers at Honolulu to report the arrival of the seaplanes. American military experts hailed the flight as

evidencing the practicability of sending any number of such squadrons from the U.S. "in a time of national emergency." The air bases built and under construction in the Philippines, the Aleutians Islands in Alaska, etc., make it comparatively easy for modern bombers to attack either Japan or Siberia.

One press report states that the planes that made the U.S.-Hawaii flight (made by Consolidated Aircraft) are of the same type that are being sold to Chiang Kai-shek. A description of Curtiss pursuit planes, called Curtiss Hawks, was published in the "New York Times" on January 14. Since Nanking is under the thumb of the U.S., especially in case of war against Japan or the U.S.S.R., it is significant to read that Chiang has at least 50 of these bombers, which are more powerful than any Japan has. They each carry 500 pounds of bombs, two machine guns, have a top speed of 200 miles per hour, and are stressed for diving up to 350 miles an hour.

The U.S. is designing pursuit and bombing planes which, it is claimed, will be 90 miles an hour faster than present planes, and attack planes 70 miles faster. Both, the "New York Times" states (12-3-33), are ready for production if and when orders are placed by the army and navy. The Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, representing nine-tenths of the industry, are asking Roosevelt to set aside 79,000,000 dollars of so-called public works funds for purchasing war planes. This is in addition to hundreds of millions already set aside from these sources for warships, the army and aviation.

The five-year aviation plan of the Navy Department calls for 1,000 planes, of which 919 were on hand last July. Since the plan was adopted, an airplane carrier, an airship and 15 cruisers have been built which will need 212 more planes. Seven ships now under construction will also need planes. At the end of last year the navy ordered 21 new planes with a fuel range of over 3,000 miles; 20 such planes had been delivered earlier in the year (possibly the ones that made the Hawaiian flight). The annual report of the navy's Bureau of Aeronautics discloses the fact that plans are being made for the complete standardisation of army and navy air equipment, to put all the forces on a war basis.

American militarists are excited because British and French "disarmament" agitation is concentrated on cuts in the number of bombers. They say that this is because the U.S. is strongest there. Its Martin bombers, for example, are said to be "far and away superior to anything yet shown in the skies of Europe" ("New York Times," 1-17-33), having a top speed, with load, of 200 miles an hour.

Both Britain and the U.S. claim to be in fourth or fifth place in military aviation. The 1933 report of the War Department, however, admits that the U.S. total air strength (army and navy) ranks it second or third. It adds: "Moreover, and very important, lying behind our Air Corps is an industrial capacity for airplane manufacture exceeding that of any other nation." (p. 33.) France and Italy spend one-sixth of their war budgets on the air forces, Japan one-eighth, but the U.S. one-fifth. The War Department boasts that "no other arm of service of our army is relatively so well prepared as is the Air Corps. . . . Our general situation minimises, and under present conditions almost eliminates, the possibility of unsupported air attacks of any great size being launched against the U.S." (pp. 32-33.) The number of war planes in the U.S. is given at 2,853, compared with 4,000 in France.

But commercial planes are to a great extent really military. The "New York Times" aviation editor says (1-7-34) in this connection: "The great British transports and French air-liners are designed as bombers and troop carriers, whose secondary importance is their earning capacity as commercial planes. Hence the argosies of Imperial Airways and Air France are all bombers, stressed for bombing loads, built under the eyes of military men. Therefore the scrapping of the lumbering biplanes now classed as 'bombers' would mean very little if war should come, because of the overnight conversion of the commercial planes to military duty." This writer, in close touch with the military authorities, admits the same is true in the U.S.

The American military Boeing and Martin bombers grew out of the Boeing monomail, and the new Douglas commercial planes "are holding the attention of both the army and navy." The latter company's Northrop attack plane as well as its new ones are outgrowths of air mail and fast passenger transport planes. These facts show that any estimate of war plane strength must consider commercial planes, or it is worthless.

## The Decisions of the XIII. Plenum and their Concrete Application

# The Crisis and the Perspectives of the Fascist Dictatorship

By Sepp Schwab

The Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., in its resolution, placed on record that a revolutionary world crisis is maturing, and that the capitalist system is profoundly shaken all over the world. The difference in the estimate of the present international situation from that of a year ago appears most clearly when it is remembered that at the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., in September, 1932, a revolutionary situation could be pointed out for a part of the capitalist countries (China and Spain), or the rapid maturing of the prerequisites for the revolutionary crisis (Germany and Poland)

The increasingly desperate efforts of the bourgeoisie to check the revolutionary upsurge of the working class by the application of fascist methods of rule and the establishment of an open fascist dictatorship in the heart of Europe, and to make preparations for the redivision of the world by means of armaments and war preparations, are opposed on the other hand by the mighty economic and political increase of power in the Soviet Union, which serves to stimulate the hatred and the war-mongering of the most reactionary and aggressive of the imperialist powers. But this power, and its clear proletarian peace policy, have become the strongest bulwark of the world's peace, the greatest preventive of war. The existence of this power in itself inspires the class struggle of the proletariat, which is rising to a higher stage.

The Thirteenth E.C.C.I. Plenum arrived at its conclusion regarding the maturing of a revolutionary world crisis after a very thorough discussion and a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the whole economic and political situation in the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. Every detail of the phenomena presenting a certain possibility of overcoming the lowest point of the economic crisis in a number of branches of industry in the leading capitalist countries during 1933, and of the existing, though slight, increase of production in a number of countries as compared with 1932, as also, on the other hand, of the elements intensifying the growth of the general crisis of capitalism, especially the increasing urge of the proletarian masses towards the seizure of power, was carefully weighed and judged.

The peculiarity of the present situation lies in the fact that:—

(1) The existence of certain possibilities for overcoming the lowest point of the economic crisis is accompanied at the same time by a general aggravation of all the antagonisms and all the factors of the general crisis of capitalism, to an extent rendering this crisis a revolutionary world crisis.

(2) The interweaving of the economic with the general crisis of capitalism has already led to such an aggravation of the general crisis, that even a stagnation of the economic crisis, or an actual economic revival, is only of a temporary character, and does not lead to a weakening of the general crisis of capitalism.

(3) On the contrary, the measures taken by the bourgeoisie for overcoming the lowest point of the economic crisis—measures taking as a rule the form of political interference in economy, forcible measures in favour of monopolist capital, drastic reduction of the standards of living of the broad masses, autarchy, nationalisation of debts, armaments and preparations for war—are measures bound to lead at the same time to an aggravation of the general world crisis, to an increase of class antagonisms and of the antagonisms of interests within the bourgeoisie.

(4) Precisely during the past year the opposition between the two worlds, the capitalist and socialist worlds, the imperialist states and the Soviet Union, underwent a great change in favour of the Soviet Union, and to-day overshadows the whole capitalist economy of the world. The struggle among the imperialist states is decisively dominated by this opposition. The class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist countries is being decisively influenced in favour of the working class by this opposition.

The factor of decisive importance for the struggle of the working class all over the world at the present juncture is not the existence of certain possibilities for overcoming the lowest point of the economic crisis by the bourgeoisie, but the rapidly growing aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, its increasingly political character, the accelerated approach to a revolutionary world crisis.

The developments in Germany in the course of a year of open fascist dictatorship demonstrate clearly and strikingly precisely this fact of the profound aggravation of the general crisis, in spite of the existence of a certain stagnation in the development of the aggravation of the economic crisis. The fascist dictatorship has been able to take advantage of the split in the working class brought about by social democracy for the purpose of smashing all the mass organisations of the proletariat; with the aid of the trade union bureaucracy it has been able to carry out the incorporation of the trade unions; and with the aid of unprecedented terrorist methods it has been able to reduce further the standards of living of the toiling masses to the advantage of the employers and of monopolist capital. But the fascist dictatorship has not been able to crush the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the C.P.G. It has not been able to prevent the beginning of a new revolutionary upsurge. And, in spite of all, incorporation and concentration camps, it has not been able to do away with the class struggle.

On the contrary, the class antagonisms are acuter to-day than they were a year ago. And, what was not the case a year ago, masses of the petty bourgeoisie are beginning to turn away from the fascist dictatorship and to turn towards the revolutionary proletariat. Hatred is growing in the works and factories. Actuated by the desire to divert the growing hatred of the masses into other non-revolutionary channels, even Catholic priests mount their pulpits to speak against the ruling regime.

The fascist dictatorship has placed an abundance of power in the hands of monopolist capital such as has never been possessed in any country by such a small upper stratum of the bourgeoisie. The decisively important parts of the whole economic apparatus of the bourgeoisie are controlled to-day by financial and monopolist capital. The whole state power is exclusively in their hands. They have hundreds of thousands of armed terrorist bandits at their call. And yet the fascist dictatorship has not been able to solve a single one of those problems for the solution of which the bourgeoisie placed state power in the hands of Hitler. The parasitic nature of the ruling upper stratum, and of its economic system, has become more self-evident than ever. And the antagonisms in the camp of the bourgeoisie, if not so plainly visible as a year ago, are not less than they were at that time.

The work provision programme of the fascist dictatorship, the decisive measure by which it hoped to be able to obtain a permanent mass influence, has, in spite of an increase of production in a number of branches of industry, proved a failure in principle, since it has become evident that the system of putting the whole of the workers on short-time with reduced wages, with the aim of increasing production, is not leading to the desired result. The work provision programme has proved a failure from the moment it became apparent that, in spite of the enormous advantages granted to employers, the number of persons given employment could not keep pace with the figures proclaiming the victorious abolition of unemployment.

The stimulation of production, as a measure carried out by the methods of force and robbery against the working class, has proved a failure further demonstrating the unstable position of the fascist dictatorship. Between June and November over a million workers were thrown out of work, in December alone the

number was 350,000. The fascist rulers are unable to induce their employers to keep the workers over the winter in the interests of the maintenance of fascist rule. Practically all that is left of the work provision programme of the fascist dictatorship is the reductions in the wages and salaries of the workers.

The further decline in the income of the working class, even as compared with 1932, has been accompanied by developments showing that for the peasantry and the middle class, too, the measures taken by the fascist dictatorship have had only a temporary effect, and that the measures taken have improved the position of a small minority at the expense of the great mass, resulting in the further aggravation of all antagonisms. The bankruptcy of the work provision programme has at the same time rendered apparent the bankruptcy of all its promises to aid the peasants and the middle class.

During the year of fascist dictatorship the German bourgeoisie has not been able to bring about any alleviation of the pressure of the Versailles system in its foreign policy. The German bourgeoisie has achieved no successes in its foreign policy. The aggravation of the whole crisis of the Versailles system has led to an aggravation of the whole of the imperialist antagonisms in Europe. Germany has become the seat of the conflagration of the coming new world war. Germany is the motive factor driving towards war for the whole of Europe. The burdens incurred by the preparations for war, thrust by German fascism on to the shoulders of the toiling masses, are greater than the burdens of reparations payments have ever been.

The increasing acuteness of all antagonisms has brought with it an extremely acute situation for the German bourgeoisie. Its foreign political situation is considerably worse than it was a year ago. A year ago, for instance, the possibility of a peaceful affiliation of Austria to Germany still existed, but to-day that is no longer the case. To-day any attempt to force this union would mean the commencement of a European war.

The German bourgeoisie has succeeded in reducing to a minimum the sum of interest and debt which it has to pay abroad. It appears to have been successful, in spite of the continued credit inflation, in hiding from the masses the factors of the open inflation. But the German bourgeoisie has not been able to annul its debts, it has only shelved them for the moment. It has not been able to limit the elements of the growing danger of inflation. A total income of 40 milliard marks at most is opposed by an increasing circulation of paying media (including bills of exchange and cheques) of about 15 to 18 milliard marks. The amount of the current and frozen credits amounts to approximately double the total annual income of the whole population.

Economically, financially, home and foreign politically, the situation of the German bourgeoisie has worsened visibly in the course of the year, and the elements of the growing acuteness of the general crisis of capitalism have increased. The German bourgeoisie has not been able, with the means placed at its disposal by the fascist dictatorship, to prevent the further accumulation of revolutionary indignation among the masses. The struggle carried on by the C.P.G. during the past year against the fascist dictatorship has forced the bourgeoisie and its fascist dictatorship to measures and manoeuvres which have made the weakness of the ruling regime more conspicuous than ever in the eyes of the masses, and have made the masses more determined than ever to secure the overthrow of this regime.

The decisively important factor in the present situation is that—under the influence of the struggle of the working class under the leadership of the C.P.G. against the fascist dictatorship—every economic-political measure, every measure taken to secure the political leadership of the bourgeoisie in the struggle of the two classes and of the two worlds, must become a disruptive measure, accelerating the overthrow of capitalist rule.

The bourgeoisie, in reorganising its tottering dictatorship by fascist methods, with the object of creating a firmly welded power, takes a measure which under present conditions leads not only to the intensification of its class terror, but to the strengthening of the elements leading to the disorganising of its power.

To-day it is not a question, as at the time of the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Italy, of a transition from a revolutionary crisis to a partial stabilisation, but a question—as the revolutionary upsurge in Germany again proves—of the seizure of power by the workers and peasants in Germany, of the transition from the end of the capitalist stabilisation to the revolutionary crisis in the whole world.

## The Labour Movement

### The Fight of the British Miners for Wage Increases

By A. A.

In connection with the expiration of the collective agreement of the miners of **South Wales and Lancashire** at the end of January, the miners in these districts, and the mass of the miners as a whole, are very sharply confronted with the question of how to achieve the restoration of wage cuts.

The masses of the miners are more and more firmly stating that the time has come to put an end to the uninterrupted offensive of the mine owners. The masses of the miners are more insistently demanding an increase in wages. The leaders of the miners' organisations, afraid of this growing movement for increased wages, are persistently opposing it with all kinds of prescriptions for improving the situation of the miners. The resolution adopted at the December Conference of the **Miners' Federation of Great Britain** sums up all the "demands" of the leaders of the miners' trade unions. The resolution places the question of the creation of a "national" apparatus for the regulation of questions applying to wages in the foreground, demands that the government put through a new law about minimum wages, a minimum which would take into account the increase in prices since 1914.

All these proposals as a whole are directed against the interests of the masses of the miners. A national organ for the regulation of wages exists for railroad transport, and all its activity has already shown in practice that it entirely defends the interests of the bourgeoisie. Did not the "wage board" of railway transport adopt decisions to lower the wages of the railway workers in Ireland in 1933; did not the "wage board" adopt a decision to lower the wages of the railway workers of England in 1933, a decision which was not carried into effect owing to the firm resistance of the masses of the workers, owing to the courageous strike of the 5,000 Irish railwaymen, which lasted about two months? Such "wage boards," like all organs of class collaboration, all ostensibly "impartial" organs such as the Chambers of Industry, Industrial Courts, etc., etc., entirely and unconditionally defend the interests of the bourgeoisie, and are created only for the purpose of "democratically" covering up this offensive of the bourgeoisie upon the working class. The Ministry of Labour, in its official report, itself acknowledges that there was a lowering of wages in almost all branches of industry in 1933, as in the preceding years, as a result of the "mediation" of these organs.

The whole resolution adopted by the majority of the Conference of the **Miners' Federation of Great Britain** once again confirms the fact that not only the day-to-day practice of the reformists is directed towards betraying the interests of the masses of the workers, but that all the "principles" of the trade union bureaucrats basically contradict the interests of the masses of the workers.

But the masses of the workers are less and less inclined to believe their official leaders. The masses are more and more insistently raising the question of getting an increase in wages by means of struggle, and that the joint action of the army of 700,000 miners can make the mine owners put a stop to their constantly developing offensive upon the miners and have the former rates of wages restored.

At the **M.F.G.B.** Conference the voice of the miners in **South Wales** was strongly heard in the speeches of **Comrades Evans and Horner**, who demanded the organisation of a struggle for the increase of wages, and exposed the policy of the leadership of the **Miners' Federation of Great Britain** as a policy betraying the interests of the masses of the miners.

This question of the increase of wages must be in the centre of all the demands of the miners. The miners came out in favour of and fought for the introduction of the seven-hour day, for more safety in the mines, and so on, and will continue to do so.

But the basic demands which can mobilise the masses at the present moment are the demands for increasing wages, the payment of a minimum weekly wage, as the only path for the defence of the interests of the entire army of the miners who are not working a full week.

The miners of **South Wales** will fight for the conclusion of a national collective agreement, because an end must be put to

splitting up the forces of the miners, which was instituted by the Baldwin government in 1926, because a national collective agreement will create the condition for a united struggle of the 700,000 miners of Great Britain. But the struggle for a national collective agreement should not serve as a brake for the immediately developing struggle of the miners of South Wales—the South Wales miners should immediately defend their basic demands, the demand for increased wages.

The struggle of the miners of South Wales should serve as a starting point for the struggle of the miners in all the coal districts. Numerous miners' strikes in separate mines in all the coal districts of the country show the fighting spirit of the masses of the miners and confirm the readiness of the miners to defend their interests by all means. The miners of the other districts of the country should give notice for termination of their agreements and join the struggle of South Wales. In Scotland, the United Mine Workers' Union have already announced their readiness to terminate the collective agreement and to carry on an active struggle in defence of the interests of the mass of the miners. The example of the United Mine Workers of Scotland should be followed by all the districts, all the lodges that are really prepared to defend the interests of the mass of the miners. The miners of Scotland, Yorkshire, Durham, and other districts should bear in mind that the joint struggle with South Wales is the best guarantee of a successful struggle. They must not postpone matters for a single hour or a single day, but must commence vigorously to make agitational and organisational preparations for a joint struggle with South Wales.

The fight of the miners will also be a lead to the entire working class, many sections of which are now raising demands for increased wages. The Executive Committee of the South Wales Miners' Federation now consists of working miners, including several militants. The Executive Committee expressed itself in favour of increased wages at its meeting of December 30, but at the same time the representatives of the press were informed that the Executive Committee is "for peace." The militant members of the Executive Committee should explain to the workers what position they took at this meeting, as the masses of the miners expect that their new Executive Committee will defend their interests. It is necessary to prepare in the lodges for the struggle to set up committees of action where possible and to establish close contact with the unemployed miners. Concrete demands in accordance with the interests of the unemployed miners should be put forward alongside of the general demands for the introduction of the seven-hour working day without a reduction in wages in the mining industry and demand the withdrawal of the new bill on unemployment insurance.

The struggle for preparing and organising the action of the miners should be accompanied with strengthening the Rank and File Movement and the drawing of new followers into the ranks of this movement.

Together with South Wales and Lanarkshire, all out for the struggle for an increase in wages, for upholding the miners' standard of living, which has been reduced by the decisions of the arbitration boards, the partial attacks in the separate mines, and the general increase in prices of food.

## The Wage Cutting Offensive of Swedish Social Democracy

By K. J-n (Stockholm)

In the past year the Swedish employers, with the active assistance of the social-democratic party and trade union leaders, have continued their offensive against the workers, which was launched at the beginning of the crisis. Wage cuts ranging from 5 to 30 per cent. have been imposed on almost all categories of workers. Unemployment has not declined, as is shown by the following figures:—

October 31, 1931	16.4 per cent.
October 31, 1932	21.8 per cent.
October 31, 1933	20.2 per cent.

The building workers are not included in these statistics, as they have been on strike since April, 1933, so that the number of unemployed has in reality considerably increased also in the past year. Output shows a decline of nearly 10 per cent. in the past year.

The worsening of the general situation can also be seen from the fact that the number of those in search of work is continually

rising; to every hundred who have been provided with work it amounted: in 1931 to 257, in 1932 to 395, and in 1933 to 538.

"Fackföreningsrörelsen," the organ of the trade union federation, put forward at the beginning of the year the slogan that strikes must of course be avoided as far as possible.

In the majority of labour conflicts the social democrats have assisted the employers in carrying out wage cuts. In shipping, the reformists were unable to prevent a strike in spring, which was decided on by a 90 per cent. majority, but the leadership of the struggle was left in their hands, so that they were able to prevent the strike of a big portion of the mercantile fleet. They initiated secret negotiations with the employers behind the backs of the strikers, and suddenly concluded a fresh agreement, according to which the old wage rates were reduced by 5 per cent. When the seamen demanded a ballot vote and refused to accept the agreement, the social-democratic and Brandlerist trade union leaders agreed with the shipowners upon the introduction of a black list in order permanently to victimise all the adherents of the revolutionary opposition.

The captains of the steamers were instructed to engage only those seamen who can produce a white card: this card is issued by the trade union bureaucrats, who, of course, are very careful in issuing them, after having expelled hundreds of oppositional members from their unions. The Red Trade Union Opposition succeeded by means of tenacious work in organising such a powerful opposition in numerous docks that the white cards became ineffective. The seamen elected their own committees, which had to see to it that the engagement of seamen was carried out regardless of the political adherence of the worker. Cases have been very frequent lately of all the seamen refusing to be engaged on the basis of the white cards, so that the captain is compelled, in spite of the furious opposition of the trade union leaders, to engage the seamen selected by the workers themselves.

During the seamen's strike fierce collisions took place in several docks between the strikers and the organised blacklegs. The social-democratic government mobilised its whole State apparatus in order to protect the strike-breakers, who have been provided with rifles. Numerous seamen are still imprisoned on account of their participation in these struggles, and the social-democratic Ministers stubbornly refuse to grant them an amnesty.

An open struggle broke out in the building trade already in April, when the employers peremptorily demanded a 20 per cent. wage cut. Ever since then 35,000 building workers have been on strike. In this strike also the social-democratic party and trade union leaders are endeavouring with all means to sabotage the struggle. The Communists propagated the extension and intensification of the struggle, but they did not succeed in overcoming the sabotage of the reformist and Brandlerist trade union bureaucrats. The employers are obstinately insisting on their original demand and reject any compromise. In order to break the resistance of the workers, the building workers' union has now ceased to pay out strike benefit to a considerable part of the strikers, so that the latter have only the support given them by the Workers' International Relief.

Fresh collective agreements involving wage reductions have been concluded in the past year for the following categories of workers:—

Agricultural workers, 7 to 10 per cent. wage cut; miners in central Sweden, 5 to 8 per cent.; quarry workers (percentage not mentioned); seamen, 5 per cent.; electro-chemical industry, piece-rate wages reduced; forest workers, 4 to 6 per cent.; iron miners in Graeagesberg, 6 to 10 per cent.; iron miners in Norbotten, 14 to 17 per cent.; building material industry, 7 per cent.; tailors, 8 to 12 per cent.; forest workers in Upland, 10 per cent.; printers, 5 per cent.; workers in railway workshops, 5 per cent.; telegraph workers, 5 per cent.; glass workers, 3 per cent.; furriers, 2 to 5 per cent.; hairdressers, 5 to 9 per cent.; painters and grainers, 5 to 9 per cent.; furniture workers, 3 per cent.

Collective agreements affecting about 200,000 workers and which expired in autumn last have been prolonged for a further year on the insistence of the reformists, which, in view of the depreciation of the currency and the increase in foodstuff prices, is tantamount to a wage cut.

The number of the unemployed amounts to about 350,000, out of 1,200,000 wage workers. As there does not exist any proper unemployment insurance in Sweden, only a small portion of the unemployed receive unemployment benefit.



# Struggle Against Unemployment

## National Convention Against Unemployment in the U.S.A.

By I. Amter (New York)

The National Convention Against Unemployment, called by the Unemployed Councils in Washington on February 3 to 5, is occurring at a most significant time in the history of the country.

The National Industrial Recovery Act (N.I.R.A.) has failed to fulfil a single one of the hopes that were held out to the workers in connection with reviving industry and trade. The glowing hopes that it gave the workers have collapsed, so that the government has been compelled to resort to further measures. The first is the inauguration of a programme of temporary jobs (C.W.A.) to conclude on February 15, and the second is the presentation of the biggest budget by Roosevelt that the country has faced since the world war—a budget of 10,000,000,000 dollars.

In spite of the propaganda that has been carried on, the millions of unemployed have not gone back to work. Roosevelt announced at the beginning of September that "five million workers have returned to work." There was no basis for the assertion except the contention of the chief statistician of the National Recovery Administration that "2,700,000 have found work, 300,000 boys have been placed in the reforestation (military forced labour) camps, and probably (!) a miscellaneous million more have found work." Even this figure would make only 4,000,000, but the government is used to juggling figures. In an analogous situation, in the spring of 1930, Hoover declared that there were only 2,460,000 unemployed, while a census taken immediately afterwards proved that there were between six and seven million unemployed.

But even the figure of 4,000,000 is false. A worker given a few days' work a week, or a week during a month, has been called "employed." He is taken off the list of unemployed and thus helped to build up the figure of 4,000,000.

Although production rose from April to July, this did not mean that a number of workers corresponding to the increased production obtained jobs. Facing the probability of higher labour costs, the employers instituted tremendous speed-up in all the factories. They introduced all kinds of labour-saving machinery and rationalised production in an unheard-of manner.

During these months production increased immensely, so that when the codes under the National Industrial Recovery Act (N.I.R.A.) went into effect in July a significant drop in production immediately ensued. The capitalists had piled up merchandise for stock and for speculation, in the hope that with so-called higher wages, more money would be put into circulation. This was the ostensible aim of the N.I.R.A. But this did not take place. On the contrary, workers were steadily laid off, and in November alone **580,000 were discharged** from the manufacturing industries. General Johnson, head of the N.R.A., gave the cotton and silk manufacturers permission to cut down operating time to 75 per cent. Although the codes called for maximum hours of 40, this did not mean that the workers worked full time. On the contrary, they worked part time, and with the order of Johnson were cut down to 75 per cent. of that time, with corresponding cuts in their wages. The hosiery industry was put on a three days' basis.

The steel industry, with many fluctuations, dropped from 59 per cent. of capacity in July to 20 per cent. and now (January 10) is working at less than 30 per cent. Auto production is less than 40 per cent., and building operations are almost at a standstill; 80 per cent. of the building trades workers have been jobless for more than two years, according to William Green. More than 1,000,000 railroad workers are unemployed; 250,000 miners have been driven out of industry through rationalisation.

Thus the millions have not returned to work, but fully 17,000,000 remained unemployed.

The second section of the N.I.R.A. was devoted to "public works." The government made an appropriation of 3,300,000,000 dollars for public works. Although the Act contained distinct specifications for using the fund "also" for building war vessels, naval bases, etc., nevertheless great stress was laid on the likelihood that an extensive public works programme would be launched. This did not take place—the projects which were laid

out will not be put into operation till June or July of this year, more than one year after passing of the Act! The greater part of the fund, however, has been allocated for war purposes. This was one of the real aims of the N.I.R.A.—to consolidate capital, effect mergers of the big capitalist concerns, put them more directly into the government, help their financing, ensure their profits, etc., and prepare for war.

Thereupon Roosevelt announced a "civil works" (C.W.A.) programme, with an appropriation of 400,000,000 dollars out of the public works fund for work for 4,000,000 workers at 50 dollars a month. Any school child can calculate that 400,000,000 dollars at 50 dollars a month will not suffice for 4,000,000 men for twelve weeks.

This programme, which was heralded with much noise, however, served to raise new hopes in the hearts of the unemployed. Again we are informed that 4,600,000 have received jobs, but this is equally false. At the very time that the announcement is made, thousands of workers are being laid off the jobs on every kind of pretext. Although allotments to the various states may have approximated 4,000,000, only a fraction has actually been put to work. The programme terminates on February 15, but new hopes are being held out that it may be continued till May 1.

Favouritism—recommendations by political bosses, A.F. of L. officials, etc.—is being shown. Discrimination against Negro workers, who received the least relief and now are getting no jobs. Discrimination against foreign-born workers, who were given a minimum of relief and now are being thrown off the jobs. Single workers, young workers get no jobs. Thus the C.W.A. is a mere stop-gap and does not remedy the situation.

Roosevelt has completely ignored the question of unemployment insurance. This was a major promise of the election campaign of 1932, and no doubt was greatly responsible for his election. Unemployment and social insurance is becoming a central issue for the whole working class. Although the campaign for unemployment and social insurance has been weak during the past year, corresponding to a retardation in the unemployed movement, nevertheless the sentiment for insurance is growing.

Prior to the convention of the A.F. of L. in Cincinnati in November, 1932, Green pronounced unemployment insurance "unamerican" and "against the dignity of American labour." At the convention Green and the Executive Council were compelled to change their position in order to counteract the movement for the Workers' Bill. The movement has gone forward, and in order to dampen it a committee of experts has been appointed by the government to bring in a bill. According to report, the committee, led by Dr. Leiserson, who has represented the government in many labour struggles, is preparing a bill similar to the bills which have been introduced in the state legislatures and either were defeated or shelved "for the period of the crisis."

These bills are not unemployment insurance measures, but what are called "job insurance" plans. They provide in general for a fund to be raised by contributions by the worker, employer and state; a fund for each worker would have to accumulate, which would require more than a year; then if the worker has worked 18 weeks in the year (which is unlikely, owing to the seasonal nature of all industries to-day), he will, after a waiting period of four weeks, be entitled to 40 per cent. of his average wage, but at no time more than 10 dollars a week for a maximum of 26 weeks in the year. This is the most "liberal" of the bills. Excluded from insurance are all migratory workers, agricultural, domestic, public and civil service workers. Of course, the present army of 17,000,000 unemployed is excluded.

The Workers' Unemployment and Social Insurance Bill is the only bill which covers the whole working class for the full period of unemployment, part time, sickness, accident, old age, etc., through funds raised by the employers and the government, and controlled and administered by the workers. Despite the weak campaign that has been conducted by the Communist Party, the Unemployed Councils of the revolutionary unions, more than 1,700 locals of the A.F. of L., 470 locals of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, three State Federations of Labour, numerous central labour bodies (local bodies), and four municipal councils have endorsed the Workers' Bill. The campaign is now being pushed by the Unemployed Councils, the A.F. of L. Committee for Unemployment Insurance and Relief, the Fraternal Federation for Social Insurance, etc.

This is the situation that confronts the workers and deter-

mines the programme of the Convention Against Unemployment in Washington. Seventeen million are unemployed; 3,000,000 transients are travelling the country and, together with the resident single unemployed, face being forced into "civilian labour" camps to work for their board alone or for 5 dollars a month; 300,000 boys are in the Civilian Conservation Camps, and their number is to be increased to 1,000,000 by summer, according to the War Department; 10,000,000 children are going hungry; 1,500,000 boys and girls are graduating from the high schools and colleges each year and cannot find work.

The central demand of the Convention will be the enactment of the Workers' Unemployment and Social Insurance Bill by the U.S. government. It will demand a system of public works—workers' homes, schools, hospitals, nurseries, etc., in working-class sections. It will demand trade union rates on the C.W.A. and other jobs; jobs without discrimination at decent wages, or adequate cash relief for all workers. Abolition of all forced labour; against lay-offs; for dismissal wage; for purchase by the government of surplus products from farmers and farm organisations for distribution under workers' control, in addition to cash relief; for unity of employed and unemployed in all struggles.

The Convention will demand that all war funds be used for relief, work and unemployment and social insurance. This will require the biggest united front campaign of all workers and working-class organisations.

The Convention will review the work of the Unemployed Councils, help to eliminate its shortcomings, and lay the basis for a broad Unemployment Council movement, to embrace not only the unemployed in the neighbourhoods, but all working-class organisations, one of whose main problems to-day is unemployment. The development of new leading forces and the mapping out of a national campaign, particularly for the Workers' Bill, will have to be given proper attention.

The National Convention, occurring at the most difficult time of the year, will be of the greatest significance in mobilising the workers in the struggle against hunger, against the growing fascist measures, and against war.

## In the International

### Statement of Comrade Remmele

After discussing the matter with comrades of the Party leadership and after a profound consideration and examination of our disagreements and my fractional attitude towards the C.C. of my Party within the past months, I have come to the following conclusions:—

(1) I declare that my theory about "Western European Communism," which contests the Bolshevik character of the Party, was in essence false. This theory is inimical to the Comintern, it cannot be tolerated in any Communist Party, as it is one of the counter-revolutionary slanders of the Second International.

The C.C. of the C.P.G., with Comrade Thaelmann at the head, was, and remains, the sole organiser and central point of the revolutionary class struggle in Germany, is imbued with Leninist spirit and filled with Bolshevik vigour; it is the vehicle of the liberation struggles of the working class from capitalist enslavement and the sole organiser of the proletarian revolution in Germany.

(2) In my presentation of the transition to the fascist dictatorship in Germany, I attributed special importance to the 22nd of January (the S.A. march past the Karl Liebknecht House) and reproached the Party leadership because in this connection it only called for a counter-demonstration and did not take any far-reaching measures. From this the idea arose that I reproached the Party leadership because it had not called for the armed insurrection. In this connection I declare that in January there did not exist in Germany the prerequisites for an armed uprising and if the Party leadership had called for an armed insurrection it would have committed a great mistake.

My statement that the German working class has suffered the most serious defeat since 1914, and the conclusions linked up with it, are false in their substance and content. I emphasise the fact that after mature consideration I have revised my opinion on this question.

(3) I immediately recognised my formulation of the "epoch of fascism" in the letter to the C.C. of the Party as a serious Menshevist-opportunist mistake which is especially dangerous precisely at

the present time as it is one of the theories of the Second International and its agents, Trotsky and Brandler, which they must uphold in order to conceal their true character as helpers and abettors of imperialism, in as much as they make it appear to the workers that fascism is something independent of imperialism, something that is purely accidental and not something that necessarily belongs to it. The "epoch of fascism" is in contradiction to Lenin's theory on the epoch of imperialism, which is the epoch of moribund capitalism, of imperialist wars and of the proletarian revolution; it is therefore anti-Bolshevik and counter-revolutionary.

The theory on the dictatorship of the lumpen-proletariat is just as Menshevist. Fascism is the most concentrated form of the dictatorship of finance-capital, whereby the sections that I characterise as lumpen-proletariat (part of the S.A. and the S.S.) are only retainers in the service of finance-capital, the rule and the monopoly positions of the trusts and the syndicates. The Second International and its helpers must uphold the theory of the dictatorship of the lumpen-proletariat in order to conceal its own role in the service of finance-capital. In the letter to the C.C. of the C.P.G. I made the mistake of using similar expressions in my formulations to those belonging to the arsenal of the Second International:

(4) After the transition to the fascist dictatorship in Germany, and after the Party went into illegality, I sent a letter to the Party leadership in which I made accusations against the activity and the policy of the Party leadership and demanded that a Party discussion be held on the policy of the Party. At the same time I carried on oppositional conversations with other comrades who moved in the same direction as my accusations in the letter to the Party leadership. I was corresponding with Comrade Neumann, who had sent me an anti-Party letter. Despite the anti-Party character of the letter, I did not inform the Party Committee of this. In that way I have carried on fractional work against the Central Committee of the Party, at the same time when it organised the heroic struggle of the C.P.G. against the fascist dictatorship, under conditions of illegality. In this situation my demand for a Party discussion was inimical to the Party.

(5) The revolutionary proletariat of Germany which, under the leadership of the heroic Communist Party, has since then entered the heroic period of its liberation struggle, acknowledges only one command, in this situation, fully justifying its existence: **A united, solid front of all the fighters of the revolutionary vanguard!** Many of our best and bravest comrades have been murdered—entire sections of our best Party cadres are in the hands of the sadistic torturers of finance-capital which is murdering the people and are imprisoned in the penitentiaries and concentration camps, we daily witness new mass murders and threats of death, and despite all that, new cadres, tens and hundreds of thousands of revolutionary class fighters, scorning death and astonishing the whole world, again and again arise for world-liberating Communism. Every day the heroic C.P.G. again and again unfurls the immortal banner of the World Communist Party. **Bolshevism**, the unconquerable weapon of the revolutionary world proletariat, which in the October Revolution has shown the absolute and unrestrained victory of socialism over capitalism in the first world historical triumph over the capitalist class and in socialist construction in the Soviet Union, once again proves its invincibility and the inevitable victory of the whole world proletariat over murderous capitalism in the glorious heroism of the revolutionary working class of Germany under the leadership of the valliant C.P.G. and the daring Y.C.L.G. The present heroic fighting period of our Party surpasses the best glorious periods of our Party history that were full of sacrifices which belong to the most glorious periods of the international revolutionary liberation struggles of the world proletariat. This period is proof of the concentrated force and experience of our best revolutionary traditions, extended, strengthened and surpassed by new and still greater force and energy, by new and still greater experiences which arise from the present daily struggles and which together guarantee the final victory of the proletariat over its class enemy. The present struggle of the C.P.G. against imperialism, fascism and social fascism will be one of the most glorious pages in the history of the revolutionary liberation struggle of the world proletariat.

By openly and unreservedly recognising my mistakes, I follow the path of conscientiously fulfilling my revolutionary duties in the heroic struggle of my Party.

## Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

# The Working Class of the Soviet Union in the Second Five Year Plan

By L. F. Boross (Moscow)

The bourgeois press throughout the world is devoting much less attention to the programme of the second Five-Year Plan which is laid down in the recently published theses of Comrades Molotov and Kuibyshev for the Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. than was the case when the first Five-Year Plan was published.

This restraint is understandable, too. The bourgeois press had very painfully burnt its fingers when it dared to sneer at the first Bolshevik Five-Year Plan as a phantasy which cannot be fulfilled. But reality has even far exceeded this "phantasy." It now seems to the bourgeois press that there is again the danger of making itself ridiculous, although the new Five-Year plan, even in its statistical programme, is still more "phantastic" than the first Plan. As against 50.5 milliard roubles in new capital investments during the first Five-Year Plan, the second Five-Year Plan provides for a programme of investments of 133,400 million, or 133.4 milliard roubles. That this is no phantasy is already shown by the first year of the second Five-Year Plan, with its sum of investments amounting to more than 25 milliard roubles. The annual value of production (expressed in the unchanged prices of 1926 to 1927) will increase from 43 milliard to 103 milliard roubles:

Even the immensity of this sum, which happens to consist of the astronomical 12 figures, is, however, overshadowed by the tasks which the new Five-Year Plan sets itself in all spheres of social life.

The most substantial social achievement of the first Five-Year Plan, from the standpoint of the goal of the struggle of hundreds of years, one can say the century-old dream of the best of the international working class, was the elimination of unemployment. The chief feature of the fate of the workers, **insecurity of proletarian existence**, was abolished upon a tremendous territory of two continents. The condition that the worker does not possess anything else but his labour power was put an end to in the practical experience of 160 million people. The working class of the Soviet Union is to-day master in the country. It is the sole **possessing** working class in the world, the only work-class which owns the treasures of the earth, the factories, works and other wealth to an extent which the overthrown Russian bourgeoisie never even dreamed of.

The working class of the Soviet Union not only liberated itself from age-old insecurity, but also many millions of toiling peasant families were freed by it from the age-old misery of the peasants' fate and converted into real owners, into collective peasants who work upon their large farms with the most modern means of production, and who, after a short struggle to master collective methods of work, have already been able to raise their standard of living by leaps and bounds.

Thus the first Five-Year Plan already showed the wage and agricultural labourers of the capitalist countries that the proletarian revolution, that the Soviet power, represents the only way out of misery, enslavement and insecurity. But the second Five-Year Plan goes considerably further in this respect.

Even the first Five-Year Plan already brought the toiling masses a strong improvement in their material and cultural standard of living. But this development of the individual standard of living, for various reasons, proceeded more slowly than the development of the social wealth of the entire class, as was expressed in the rapid advance of socialist construction. The working class, during the first Five-Year Plan, had to act very economically with its tremendous wealth. It had to direct its main efforts towards building the foundations for socialism, its Soviet state, to reinforce and to extend the stronghold of the international proletariat against the intentions of the capitalist world to annihilate it. This demanded a certain amount of economy in the manu-

facture of articles for immediate consumption. But the fact that the proletarian state—the Soviet Union—has to-day become the strongest power in world politics, that through its gigantic might it is even in a position at least to curb the imperialist appetite for plunder, proves that the working class knew how to manage correctly its enormous class wealth.

The second Five-Year Plan is already building further upon this strong foundation. But it brings the toiling millions not only a further increase in their standard of living, but an **unmistakable** change in their whole manner of living. It will show the toiling masses in a striking manner that the working class, that the toiling masses, if they follow the Communists, not only know how to fight and to attain victories, but also understand how to correctly make use of what they have won in struggle. The proletariat which has created for itself unparalleled class wealth during the first Five-Year Plan, creates in the second Five-Year Plan such a **well-being of the masses**, such well-being of the decisive masses of the proletariat and the toiling agricultural population, a well-being affecting tens of million of people, of which the working class did not even dare to dream of formerly. In order to be able to correctly estimate the development of the second Five-Year Plan, one does not have to wait until the entire programme is carried out. One only has to compare the life of the masses in the towns and villages as can already be seen in the first year of the second Five-Year Plan which has just ended, with everything that took place up to now. Wherever one looks, one can already see the **germs of this progressively developing socialist well-being**. It can be seen in the shops, in the large factories, in the government and co-operative stores, in which the workers make demands such as the average Russian worker, and partly even a worker of the most advanced capitalist country, hardly knew of (suits made to order instead of ready-made clothing, expensive musical instruments, radio apparatus, carpets, confectionery and perfumery goods in enormous quantities, but especially books, books and books, and other cultural objects of all kinds). One sees this developing well-being in the filled barns of the collective peasants, who are no longer contented with having enough to eat and being dressed warmly, but who are developing a real storm upon the material and cultural goods offered to them by the new socialist life. One sees it in the theatres and other cultural institutions that are filled every night, one sees it in the luxurious mass sport grounds of the working class, in the magnificently equipped workers' clubs, one sees it in the entirely new, care-free mode of life of the young generation so rich in content, which altogether no longer knows capitalism. One sees it in the higher schools of learning which annually train hundreds of thousands of workers' and peasants' children for leaders of the new socialist life. One sees it in the research institutes equipped according to the last word of science, in the proletarian scientists who if it were not for the October Revolution would probably have been illiterates all their lives, and who are now working on world-moving discoveries. One finds this **genuine well-being**—although it is only beginning to develop—affecting real masses in all spheres of life. And if this well-being is at present still embracing various sections of the population to an uneven degree, then the only criterion in this connection is no longer inherited capital or inherited nobility, but only work. It is not the enslavement and exploitation of others that brings well-being to the individual, but exemplary work which will advance all the class comrades. For the first time in world history, the path to well-being is really open to all toilers, for the first time in world history it is already being trodden at least by the decisive millions of toilers of the enormous land of the Soviets.

The first Five-Year plan was a period of tremendous victories, achievements of world historical significance, but at the same time

also of great difficulties. The working class of the Soviet Union had, in the first place, to create the means of production for itself. The amount of articles of consumption which was simultaneously increasing had to be distributed among a working class which had trebled numerically in the course of the Five-Year Plan, apart from the developing needs of the toiling population in the villages. In the first Five-Year Plan there was also an enormous increase in consumption, but this was primarily reflected in the fact that ever larger masses of people were for the first time in their lives assured of an existence worthy of human beings. This has brought about certain difficulties in supplying the people, as well as the desperate resistance of the remnants of the class enemy against the new collective system of agriculture. The working class has already essentially overcome those difficulties. While the second Five-Year Plan provides a two-and-a-half-fold increase in food and articles of general consumption, the number of workers will increase by one-third.

But, as there are no longer any unemployed, this increase in the numbers of workers takes place from the members of the families of employed workers and collective farmers, and does not restrict but, on the contrary, furthers the possibilities of increasing the standard of living of the individual toiling families. The remnants of the class enemy in the villages which have not yet been completely annihilated are to-day confronted by a mass of millions of class-conscious, class-vigilant collective peasants, steeled by the struggles of the past year and experiences of victory, with the political departments of the machine and tractor stations at their head. The technical and organisational forces of the proletariat have also grown to an extraordinary extent in the struggles for mastering the technique of production.

It was not in vain that the year 1933 was characterised by the Bolshevik Party as the last year of difficulties. The second Five-Year Plan of course places more gigantic and more difficult tasks before the working class than the first Five-Year Plan had done. But the relation of forces has shifted in favour of the working class and the other sections of the toilers led by it to such an extent that these gigantic tasks are no longer of such a convulsive nature as was characterised by the difficulties which have now been victoriously overcome.

But these difficulties represented the main ideological weapon of the international bourgeoisie and, above all, its fascist and social-democratic agents, against the liberation struggle of the proletariat in their own countries. By pointing out these difficulties—magnified and distorted a hundredfold in their agitation—they tried to keep the proletariat back from the path which the Communists had called upon them to follow. The overcoming of these difficulties now means that the further advance of the toiling masses of the socialist towns and villages to a state of socialist well-being will be expressed in much more visible and open forms than was the case heretofore. The execution of the second Five-Year Plan, which has already successfully begun, will show the toiling masses of the capitalist countries and the colonies that Communism is not only the only way out, but also the only desirable goal, the goal of their longing, the goal of their dreams. It not only has to show them that only the Communists show them the path to a free, socialist life, but that this life is also really worth every sacrifice, every effort which fighting for it in the capitalist countries will still cost.

The second Five-Year Plan thereby places in the hands of the Communists in the capitalist countries the sharpest and most excellent weapon that history has ever offered to any revolutionary party. If they prove able to handle this weapon correctly and in a Bolshevik manner in their day-to-day revolutionary struggles, then the second Five-Year Plan is bound to be a powerful instrument of the proletarian world revolution. Therein lies its great importance.

## The Lenin Celebrations in Moscow

Moscow, January 22, 1934

Ten years ago the mighty heart of Lenin ceased to beat.

From the platform of the Great Theatre, the same platform from which Lenin so often roused the world with his stirring words, Comrade Kalinin, his voice choked with tears, commenced

his commemoration speech. He said: "I do not find the words which should now be said. I believe that the most important and biggest task of our Party is to preserve the achievements of which Lenin was the creator. Lenin is dead, but his sublime figure remains for all time in the memory of the proletariat of the whole world. Lenin will live for ever. Lenin's best comrade-in-arms and friend, Stalin, took the fighting banner from the stiffening hand of the leader, and raised it boldly and high over the earth."

Ten years ago, there was heard from the platform of the Grand Theatre the words of Stalin's pledge:—

Leaving us, Lenin bequeathed to us the task of guarding the unity of our Party as the apple of our eye.

Leaving us, Lenin bequeathed to us the task of preserving and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, of strengthening with every means the alliance of the workers and peasants.

Lenin bequeathed to us the task of strengthening and extending the Soviet Union.

Leaving us, Lenin charged us to remain true to the principles of the Comintern.

We swear to carry out his commands! All Bolsheviks, the whole of the revolutionary proletariat, sinking their banner before the mortal remains of the leader, swear to fulfil Lenin's Testament.

Ten years have passed since then. From the same platform, Kalinin, on January 21, 1934, opened the commemoration meeting on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the death of Lenin.

Ten years ago the heart of the greatest man in the world ceased to beat. Lenin died, but Leninism lives. To-day we can ask ourselves the question: What have we done in these ten years? Lenin spoke of the necessity of promoting socialist heavy industry to the utmost. We have done this and are doing this. Lenin said that so long as we have the small individual peasant farms in the country, so long will there exist the possibility of the restoration of capitalism. We have solved the most difficult task of collectivising the overwhelming majority of the peasant farms. We have liquidated the big peasantry as a class. The results of the harvests on the collectivised fields are the most convincing proof of the tremendous advantage of the collective farm over the individual farm. This is the best monument to Lenin.

Lenin never confined the development of the revolution within national limits. The development of socialist economy, the victory of socialism in our country is the best service to the world proletariat.

The whole of the meeting stood up in honour of the memory of Lenin. The strains of Chopin's funeral march penetrated deep into the hearts of all present.

At the table of the Presidium these stood Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich, Kalinin, Voroshilov, Ordshonikidze, Kuybychev, Rudzutak, Schwernik, Yenukidze, and others. The appearance of Stalin, whose name is inseparably connected with all the victories of the proletariat of the Soviet country, was the signal for a stormy ovation from the whole hall. It seemed as if there would be no end to the applause and cheers.

The chief speech was delivered by Comrade Stetzky. He dealt with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and its fight for emancipation from the yoke of exploitation in the whole world. He spoke of Marx and Engels, who for the first time in history pointed out to the proletariat the path of revolutionary struggle and victory. He spoke of how Lenin took up the banner of Marx, and how, later, Stalin took the fighting banner from Lenin's hands. Stetzky expounded to the meeting the fundamentals of Lenin's teachings. He spoke of the difficult, but victorious, path of the Party, of the ruthless fight against the opportunists of all shades.

Stetzky concluded his speech with the cry: For the victory of the cause of Lenin, of the cause of Communism in the whole world!

After Stetzky, Comrade Adoratsky, the Director of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, spoke.

The commemoration meeting ended with the singing of the battle hymn of the workers of the whole world, with the "Internationale."

Published weekly Single copies, 2d. Subscription rates: Great Britain and Dominions, 12s. per year. U.S.A. and Canada, five dollars per year Remittance in STERLING per International Money Order, Postal Order or Sight Draft on London.

Published by UNTHANKS BOOKSHOP 31, Dudden Hill Lane, London, N.W.10, and Printed by THE MARSTON PRINTING CO (T.U.), 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.2.