

Opponents of Trade Union Unity
Problems of Latin America
Hillquit's Memoirs Reviewed

WORKERS OF THE WORLD,
UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.
10

Price
10c

*Basic Material for Discussion Preparatory
to the Seventh World Congress*

•

THESES, REPORTS, SPEECHES

of the

Thirteenth Plenum

of the

Executive Committee of the C. I.

in one volume

520 pages—cloth—price 65 cents

•

This book, bringing together the main materials of the Thirteenth Plenum, is the outstanding guide for discussion of questions on the agenda of the Seventh World Congress. Included in the volume are the theses and decisions, the reports of Kuusinen and Pieck, the speeches of Manuilsky, Piatnitsky, Knorin, Wan Ming and Kang Sin, and Okano.

Only a few copies are available. Order yours at once.

•

*For sale at any of the bookstores listed
on the back cover, or from*

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French,
Chinese and Spanish

VOL. XII

MAY 20, 1935

No. 10

CONTENTS

THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL IS AGAINST TRADE UNION UNITY	535
ANSWER TO THE OPPONENTS OF THE UNITED FRONT AND TRADE UNION UNITY	544
LETTER FROM THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL	549

DISCUSSION FOR THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE C. I.

OUR FIGHT AGAINST GERMAN CHAUVINISM	551
<i>By</i> RUDOLPH GERBER	

PROBLEMS OF SOUTH AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

STRUGGLES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF SOUTH AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA	564
THE EVE OF REVOLUTION IN BRAZIL	577
<i>By</i> KEIROS	

IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE VICTORY OF PUBLIC SOCIALIST OWNERSHIP AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY	589
<i>By</i> E. PASHUKANIS	

BOOK REVIEW

THE MEMOIRS OF A SOCIAL OPPORTUNIST	599
<i>Reviewed by</i> F. I. MINGULIN	

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, \$2; six months, \$1; single copies, 10 cents

REACH THE MILLIONS

With These Classics of Marxism-Leninism

●

STATE AND REVOLUTION— <i>V. I. Lenin</i>	10c
THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO— <i>Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i>	5c
FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM— <i>Joseph Stalin</i>	10c
MARXISM VERSUS LIBERALISM—The Stalin-Wells Interview	2c
A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS— <i>V. I. Lenin</i>	3c
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE SOVIET UNION— <i>V. M. Molotov</i>	3c
FOOD FOR ALL—Abolition of the Bread-Card System— <i>V. M. Molotov</i>	3c

●

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF V. I. LENIN

8 VOLUMES—\$8.00

(formerly \$23.00)

●

Into the trade unions and other workers' organizations with Marxist-Leninist literature!

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

The Amsterdam International Is Against Trade Union Unity

"The working class has sufficient forces at its disposal to beat back the offensive, to defend its interests, and to prevent the outbreak of a new international bloodbath. But to achieve this, what is needed is its united efforts in the struggle against the common enemy, what is needed is that all trade-union organizations should undertake united action against the bourgeoisie so as to realize the direct and general aims of the working-class movement, what is needed is that the trade-union movement, which has been split, should have its unity re-established."

THIS is the main point of the most important document that has appeared in the international trade-union movement in recent years, namely, the appeal made by the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labor Unions (Profintern) to the Amsterdam International of Trade Unions.

The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) made the proposal to the leaders of the Amsterdam International that a joint discussion take place about the conditions, methods and forms of unifying the world trade-union movement, about joint demonstrations on May 1, etc., and particularly about concretely proceeding to re-establish the free trade unions in Germany and unifying the trade unions in France and Spain.

The leaders of the Amsterdam International, who have tied the trade unions to the chariot wheel of capitalism by their policy of class collaboration, have, on this occasion as well, one so full of importance to the international working class, decisively rejected this proposal made by the Profintern—thereby continuing the split in the ranks of the working class and collaboration with the bourgeoisie, while ignoring the mighty urge for the united front and trade-union unity in the ranks of the millions of members of their own organizations.

The bourgeoisie are rallying all their forces so as to cast the whole weight of the crisis onto the shoulders of the toilers. The exploitation of the workers has increased to an extraordinary degree. In spite of two and a half years of depression, the standard of living of the masses is being ever worsened. In spite of the fact that there are 17,000,000 more unemployed than there were at the beginning of the world economic crisis, inroads into social insurance still continue. The youth of the working class, deprived of all prospects for the morrow, are being driven into the forced labor camps, become declassed, and become an easy prey for the fascists and those engaged in recruiting cannon-fodder for a new imperialist bloodbath. In a number of capitalist countries, and in Germany first and foremost, the split in the ranks of the working class, due to the policy of class collaboration pursued by the Social-Democratic leaders, has made it possible for the bourgeoisie to deal heavy blows at the working class, to establish a bloody fascist dictatorship, to smash up the trade unions and to transform them into pariahs without rights in capitalist society. The workers must expect hunger, poverty, fascism and to be completely deprived of their rights, they must expect a new imperialist bloodbath, if they stand

silently by and watch how the capitalist offensive develops, if they do not unite their ranks for joint action. The example provided by the Austrian Schutzbundlers and the miners of Asturias in Spain is an indication to all workers that the fascist offensive *can* be beaten off, and at the same time points to the means to be adopted and the path to be taken in the struggle against fascism. This is, first and foremost, united action by the working class.

The Communist International has been carrying on an intense struggle, since the time when the fascist dictatorship came into being in Germany, to bring about the united front of the proletariat against the capitalist and fascist offensive, against the military gambles of the imperialists, and has approached not only the Social-Democratic workers but also their organizations, both national and international. The leaders of the Second International, to whom the Comintern directed its proposals regarding a joint international struggle to liberate the proletarians of Germany, to give freedom and life to those held prisoner by German fascism, to give freedom and life to those who defended the barricades set up by the Austrian Schutzbund, and to the heroes of proletarian Asturias, have invariably replied in the negative.

On the other hand, the real united front of the proletariat has been built up in the fire of class battles. And it was only when taking into account this mighty urge of the workers towards unity of action, and the fact that the united front was being established in various countries with a view to carrying on a concrete struggle, that the leaders of the Second International, while rejecting unity of action on an international scale, were compelled to make at least partial concessions to the demands made by the masses of Social-Democratic workers, and to withdraw the ban on the establishment of the united front between the individual sections of the Second International and the Communists. For the fact that the united front has been brought about in France and Spain, in Austria and in the Saar, showed very wide masses of proletarians what a force united action by the working class represents, and what could be achieved in the struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive if the united front of the proletariat were brought about in good time, and if all those who participate in it carry on the struggle to the end.

Who is there who could now *convince* the Socialist workers of France that unity of action with the Communist workers in February, 1934, did *not* inspire the ranks of the proletariat with a mighty enthusiasm to give a victorious repulse to the fascist offensive, and that the united-front pact did *not* strengthen the proletarian front against the offensive of the French bourgeoisie? *Who* could *prove* to the Austrian Schutzbundlers who, at the initiative of the Communist Party, re-established their fighting proletarian organization on the basis of a united front with the "Revolutionary Socialists", that the united front did *not* prove to be a mighty lever for re-establishing the fighting power of the Austrian proletariat the very next day after the Schutzbund was defeated in its first open battle? *Who* would dare to *deny* that the united front was an *inexhaustible source of energy* for the proletarians in Spain who rose up in arms against fascism, and that their struggle would have achieved greater success had not only the Communists and the revolutionary trade-union organizations unswervingly fulfilled their united-front obligations to the end, and had the entire class collaboration policy pursued by Social-Democracy in the preceding period not placed tremendous obstacles in the way of the establishment of a complete

united proletarian front and of rallying the anti-fascist, people's front around the proletariat?

Fundamentally only the first steps have been taken towards establishing the united front of the proletariat. But these first examples of united front action by the working class have infused new life into the international working-class movement, and have scattered to the winds the defeatist legends spread by certain theoreticians of the Second International about a "counter-revolutionary situation" and about an "epoch of reaction", legends to the effect that it is allegedly useless to organize active resistance to the capitalist and fascist offensive, and that the working class has allegedly only one thing to do—namely, to retreat, to cast themselves without a struggle at the mercy of the victors, and to implore a softening of the bourgeois regime. These first actions have already shown that the united working-class front is incompatible with the policy of class collaboration, and that only the bourgeoisie and those who strive to secure unhindered collaboration with the bourgeoisie are interested in the working class being split.

It is not for nothing that the international bourgeoisie as a whole were alarmed by the appeal made by the Communist International regarding the united front. It is not for nothing that the *Times* was highly indignant at the very thought that the Labor Party might participate in a united "Communist Front" to defend the Spanish workers. "One thing is absolutely clear", wrote this pure-blooded newspaper of the exploiters.

"Anyone who unites with the Communists extends the Communist front." The *Times* scares the Laborites and gives them the threatening warning that:

"The Marxian theory is so widespread that if you scratch the continental Socialist who thought he was a Democrat, you will find a Communist. . . . The British Labor Party is the most powerful section of the Socialist International, and it must, in correspondence with the declarations made in its own country, come forward unequivocally for an alliance only with the friends of democracy."

In other words, "Down with the united front with the Communists!" This is the line which the diehard *Times*, the "friend of democracy", advised the British Labor Party to adopt. The *Times*, by the way, seems to have been needlessly disturbed. . . .

A gigantic struggle between the classes is taking place for the capitalist or the revolutionary way out of the crisis. From the very beginning of the world economic crisis, the leaders of the Second International undertook the thankless task of *doctoring capitalism*. We all remember how the British trade unions took part in the Ottawa Conference, and the memorandum issued by the General Council of the T.U.C. to the National Government in regard to the International Conference held in 1933, a memorandum which called forth Chamberlain's flattering estimate that it "almost expresses the policy of the government". We all still remember the resolution adopted by the Brussels Congress of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, which called on all countries to follow the famous "Roosevelt Plan", and also the declaration made by Jouhaux that he "congratulated the American Federation of Labor on their support for the efforts" being made by President Roosevelt.

Now, when the bourgeoisie throughout the world are exerting unbelievable efforts to bring about capitalist prosperity anew, at the expense of a reduction in the standard of living of the masses, when wages and social insurance are being reduced throughout the world, or when such reductions are being prepared on a wide scale, when the cost of living is being artificially raised, and when in a whole number of cases united action by the trade unions has secured success in the struggle of the workers against the capitalist offensive, the reformist leaders of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals are calling on the masses of workers to prepare themselves for the struggle "for socialism", are calling on them "not to scatter their forces" on the "petty exhausting" struggle for day-to-day demands. There was a time when these very leaders identified the struggle for day-to-day demands with the struggle for the ultimate aims of the working class. Every success in the day-to-day struggle, they said is a "slice of socialism". Now, just as then, these slogans of the reformist leaders represented and now represent their rejection of the struggle to do away with the capitalist system. But whereas the policy pursued by the reformist leaders of the trade unions was at that time directed towards satisfying the day-to-day needs of the masses of workers to a certain extent, now, on the other hand, their slogans imply that they are abandoning even this as far as the workers are concerned. Such slogans can never become the slogans of united-class battles. Their starting point is the privileged position of certain sections of the proletariat *outside* of the general united front of the proletariat, and imply that they are seeking their own way out along the lines of compromise with the ruling class.

The same is true with regard to the question of *trade-union unity*. This is one of the sorest questions facing the international working-class movement since the end of the war. The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) was established because the reformist leaders of the trade unions, in helping the bourgeoisie to beat off the proletarian revolution after the war, and in working hand in glove with the world bourgeoisie to defeat the mighty proletarian October Revolution, expelled the revolutionary workers from the trade unions, mercilessly suppressed all democracy in the unions, left the trade unions and split them if they, the reformists, proved to be in the minority, and ignored the interests of the very wide masses of unorganized workers, thereby deepening the split in the ranks of the working class. The entire history of the Profintern (R.I.L.U.) is a history of the struggle for the unity of the trade-union movement. As against the whole of international Social-Democracy, the Communists have never split up the trade-union movement.

Where is the revolutionary trade union which has expelled Social-Democratic workers from its ranks for being Social-Democrats? *Where* is the revolutionary trade union that has demanded that Social-Democratic workers should sign documents renouncing association with the Social-Democrats under the threat of unemployment and of depriving them of their benefits? Who split the ranks of the railwaymen of France in 1921, when the revolutionary workers obtained an overwhelming majority at the railwaymen's conference? Who split the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers of Czechoslovakia in spite of the fact that only an insignificant minority declared in favor of the reformists? Who split the trade unions in Rumania?

From the very first days of its existence, in face of the capitalist offensive, the R.I.L.U. issued the slogan of a united trade-union front. And from the very first days of its existence, the R.I.L.U. declared at

all its Congresses that it was ready to unite with the trade unions organized in the Amsterdam International to carry on the class struggle, on the one condition only, that there should be proportional representation at the unity congress, and that trade-union democracy, in favor of which the leaders of the Amsterdam International are so fond of uttering wordy declarations, should be strictly observed. But it is precisely because the united front hindered the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and made immediate concrete action necessary, that the reformist leaders turned it down, and in opposition to this advanced the demand for "the unity of the movement" and "unity of organization". But, in actual fact, they also turned down unity of organization, by interpreting it as meaning subordinating the entire world trade-union movement to the reformist leaders of the Amsterdam International. "We are the trade unions", declared the reformist leaders of the Amsterdam International.

We need only cast our minds back to the history of the trade-union movement in the biggest capitalist countries in recent years, to convince ourselves of the extent to which the need for the united front and for trade-union unity has matured, and what obstacles lie in their path.

In *France* the united front pact concluded between the Socialist and Communist Parties also served as a tremendous stimulus in the struggle for the unity of the trade-union movement. Here the period of the propaganda carried on by the Communist Party in favor of the united front, which served to rally the masses on a wide scale for the struggles which came to a head last year, is passing to the state where the united front is being established in the mass battles of the proletariat. But the struggle for the unity of the trade-union movement has met with tremendous difficulties as the result of the open resistance offered by the reformist leaders of the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) But the urge towards trade-union unity is so great, that, in spite of this resistance, it has been possible in France for the first time since the reformists split the trade-union movement in 1922 to bring about concrete forms of unifying various trade unions. It is sufficient to point to the example of the railwaymen's union, three-quarters of whose members were already united in January, 1935. And this is not merely a gathering together of the members of the Railwaymen's Trade Unions, but at the same time represents a real strengthening of the trade union as a class organization where the masses have a clear sense of the idea and importance of this unification.

The unity of the trade-union movement would have faced the leaders of the C.G.T. with the necessity of breaking with their whole line of class collaboration. Herein lies the source of all their resistance to unity. Leon Jouhaux, the leader of the C.G.T., in his speech made at a meeting of the National Federal Committee of the C.G.T. in October, 1934, openly declared the following:

"As regards an increase in the membership of the trade unions as a result of unity . . . allow me to say that I don't believe in it. . . . Do you think that you will gain much by uniting with your opponents of yesterday, and by parting with your friends of today and yesterday! . . ."

It is for the same reason that the leaders of the C.G.T. altogether reject the united front with the unitary trade unions (the revolutionary C.G.T.U.). In exact line with the exhortations of the diehard *Times* they reject the proposals made by the C.G.T., they reject joint action on the

anniversary of the February events, their argument beings that "the workers and the masses of the people in our country are firmly convinced of the superiority of the regime of freedom over the regime of dictatorship, irrespective of the nature of the ticket with which this regime covers itself".

This provocative method of drawing comparisons between the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R., on the one hand, and the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie on the other, to prepare which the reformist leaders did not a little by the policy they pursued by class collaboration, has become the common property of all the reformist leaders of the international trade-union movement who wish to undermine the great cause of uniting the trade unions of the proletariat.

Did not Coopers, the representative of the Dutch trade unions, declare at the Brussels Congress of the Amsterdam International that "the Amsterdam Trade Union International must come out precisely and clearly against the Communists: we make no distinction between Communism and fascism"? Did not Citrine, the chairman of the Amsterdam International repeat the same thing at the recent congress of the American Federation of Labor? The reformist leaders of the C.G.T. prefer to maintain contact with the "neo-Socialists" and with the "social minister" Flandin, to the united-front pact between the Communists and Socialists, against which they are carrying on undermining work, by instilling the idea into the minds of the French workers that the fascist danger in France "has been postponed", and by diverting the discussion away from the inconvenient question of class collaboration, pursuing, instead, a *formal* discussion about the independence of the trade unions. For what can be the nature of the "independence" of the C.G.T. when its leaders support all the measures adopted by the ruling parties of the French bourgeoisie? Do not the reformist leaders of the trade unions in each capitalist country support the Social-Democratic leaders? In France itself, do not the leaders of the C.G.T. call on their followers to vote for the Socialists at the parliamentary elections? It can only be a question of one sort of independence, namely, that of the class trade unions of the proletariat being independent of the bourgeoisie and its State.

In England the General Council of the T.U.C. has unswervingly pursued a policy of open class collaboration over a period of nine years, following the general strike and the miners' strike. The General Council of the T.U.C. plays a leading part in the Amsterdam International. The German free trade unions which, in the period of the relative stabilization of capitalism, attempted once again to win the position they formerly held in the International Federation of Trade Unions, have been smashed up by fascism and in fact do not exist. And so, in order to re-establish the shaken equilibrium, the leaders of the British trade unions, instead of raising the question of bringing about *international unity in the trade-union movement* so as to increase the fighting power of the working class against fascism, which has destroyed the trade unions in a whole number of capitalist countries, are directing the whole of their energy towards drawing the American Federation of Labor into the Amsterdam International. And they *counterpose* the A. F. of L. to the mighty army of 20,000,000 members of the trade unions of the U.S.S.R., and are still further intensifying the slanderous campaign against the Soviet trade-union movement for the benefit of the ultra-reactionary leaders of the A. F. of L.

At the same time the General Council of the T.U.C. has decisively

rejected all proposals regarding the united front, in spite of the growing efforts of the masses of the British proletariat to bring about fighting unity. For the establishment of a united front would signify the growth of the economic struggles of the British proletariat, a point which possibly does not enter the calculations of the leaders of the General Council who are clearing their way for ministerial posts, in view of the forthcoming parliamentary elections, and who do not wish to "annoy" the British bourgeoisie. The Scottish Mine Workers' Union has made the proposal that the Scottish miners' revolutionary and reformist unions be amalgamated—*with no results*. The Communist Party of Great Britain advanced united-front proposals in connection with the movement of the unemployed, *with no results*. The leaders of the General Council preferred to give a guarantee of their loyalty to the British bourgeoisie, by publishing in October of last year their famous *Black Circular* according to which no local trade council will be recognized by the Trade Union Congress "if it allows delegates into its ranks who are in one way or another connected with Communist or fascist organizations, or with organizations subordinate to them", and in its last letter threatens to expel those trade councils from its ranks which do not subordinate themselves to the General Council and begin to operate the *Black Circular*. But here as well, the idea of trade-union unity is making its way not only to the masses of trade unions, but is also occasionally covering entire trade-union organizations.

The question then arises, who is against the unity of the trade-union movement?

In the U.S.A. after the splendid strike in San Francisco, Green, the chairman of the A. F. of L., issued a general circular regarding the expulsion of Communists, which met with resistance from the wide masses organized in the trade unions affiliated to the A. F. of L. Even the Socialist *New Leader* had to recognize the extent of this resistance. In the U.S.A., where company unions are so widespread and where even the A. F. of L. unions have to fight for their mere recognition, the establishment of a united front and of trade-union unity would play a tremendous role in helping the trade unions to penetrate all enterprises and all branches of industry. Only a few weeks ago the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. made the proposal to the leaders of the A. F. of L. that they jointly prepare the struggle for the economic demands of the workers and for the recognition of the trade unions in the automobile, textile and steel industries. *With no results!* Here also the idea of trade-union unity can already record symptomatic successes, for instance, in the steel industry.

In *Czechoslovakia* where the reformists split the trade-union movement 13 years ago, the leaders of the revolutionary trade-union federation made a proposal to unite the trade unions in Czechoslovakia during the recent congress of trade unions belonging to the Amsterdam International. *With no results!*

In *Poland* the struggle of the revolutionary trade-union opposition for the unity of the trade-union movement on a class basis, and for the unification of parallel trade unions, has met with the determined resistance of the leaders of the P.P.S. and of the Bund. It is only very recently that the leaders of the so-called Landrat, which is led by the Bund, have agreed under the pressure of the masses and of the development of the united front by the revolutionary trade-union opposition, to engage in negotiations about establishing trade-union unity. But concrete facts showing that the unity of the trade unions is being

brought about by the organizations themselves in the localities (in Tomashev, etc.), are becoming more and more numerous.

In *Greece* the unitary trade unions are carrying on a splendid struggle for the united proletarian front, and when the reformist leaders split their own reformist unions, the leaders of the unitary trade unions protested energetically *against* splitting the reformist unions into *reformist* groups.

Who then, stands for the unity of the trade-union movement?

In fascist *Austria* where the reformist leaders in the days immediately following the February battles left the free trade unions to their fate, the Communists took the initiative in re-establishing the organizations which had been destroyed, and in continuing their activity underground. Some of the former leaders of the trade unions, under the guidance of the Amsterdam International, then began in their turn to establish new *parallel* organizations. Hitherto, all proposals regarding the unification of both organizations, made by the Central Commission of the Trade Unions, which has by its courageous revolutionary work in the enterprises achieved important successes in re-establishing the free trade unions, have met with no positive results.

In *Spain*, the unity of the Asturian miners, rendered secure by the bloodshed in the heroic October battles, immediately led to the unification of the miners' unions in Asturias. A similar movement from below is going on throughout the country, one which has embraced a section of the officials of the reformist unions and even certain of their leaders who are beginning to recognize that their only salvation from fascism lies in bringing about the united front on the widest possible scale, and in rallying all the forces of the proletariat for the struggle, and primarily in securing the unity of the trade unions.

Finally, in *Germany* where, on the admission made at the Paris Conference of the Second International by Aufheiser, one of the former leaders of the A.D.G.B. (Reformist Trade Union Congress), the reformists "have lived through their own trade-union policy, which *itself proved on the boundary of National-Socialist policy*", the proposals made by the Communists regarding the joint re-establishment of the free trade unions which the revolutionary trade-union opposition and the Red Trade Unions are joining, are being met with determined opposition from the overwhelming majority of the reformist leaders.

The question then arises, *who is against the unity of the trade-union movement?*

The masses of workers throughout the whole world are following with very great alarm the bacchanalia of the fascist pogrom-mongers, and the actions of the voracious capitalist hounds who are attempting to transfer the whole burden of the crisis onto the backs of the toilers, and who are ready, for the sake of their profits, to fill up the trenches with the corpses of millions of workers slaughtered in a new imperialist war.

The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) is convinced that its proposal *received the full endorsement of all workers organized in the trade unions and met with a mighty response from them*. But the leaders of the Amsterdam International have remained true to their policy of maintaining the split in the international trade-union movement. Their reply to the proposals of the R.I.L.U. repeat the worst arguments of the bankrupt leaders of the A.D.G.B. (reformist Trade Union Congress in Germany) who went to no little trouble so as to clear the way for National-

Socialism, a fact recorded by their own comrades at the Paris Conference of the Second International held in 1933.

The fact that the Bureau of the Amsterdam International has rejected the proposals made by the Profintern and the bureaucratic excuse made by referring to the decisions of congresses and of the General Council of the Amsterdam International at Weymouth, *i.e.*, the rejection of trade-union unity under the flag of the formula "the unity of the trade-union movement is the Amsterdam International", shows that the Amsterdam International has completely forgotten the interests of the working class in face of the furious onslaught of fascism and that the leaders of the Amsterdam International are deepening the split in the trade-union movement. They show, finally, that there is a deepening of the divergence between the millions of trade-union members in the Amsterdam International who are thirsting for struggle against fascism and for united action, and their leaders who are deepening the split in the ranks of the proletariat and weakening the latter, at the very moment when their worst enemy is undertaking the offensive. The leaders of the Amsterdam International bear the full responsibility for this policy before the proletariat throughout the world.

The Red International of Labor Unions, unlike the Amsterdam International, whose influence does not extend beyond the bounds of several European countries, is a trade-union organization with world ramifications. It is not a question of liquidating the international center of the revolutionary trade-union movement, the R.I.L.U., and of clearing the way for the leaders of the Amsterdam International to carry on their day-to-day cooperation with the bourgeoisie. It is a question of bringing about trade-union unity on a world scale. And this can and will be brought about only if the negotiations are carried on on the basis of equality between the two Internationals, if unity is built up on the basis of trade-union democracy, on the basis of proportional representation in the leading bodies and for the struggle against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and war.

This is why the Profintern (R.I.L.U.) for whom trade-union unity is not a question of doing away with one organization in favor of another, or of the petty personal pride of its leaders, but is the mighty question of uniting all the members of our class into powerful united trade-union organizations so as to deliver a decisive counter-blow at our class enemy, calls on all members of trade unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International to discuss the proposals made by the Profintern at their meetings. The R.I.L.U. calls on all trade-union organizations in all countries to carry through a ballot of their members on the following issues: for or against joint action by all the trade unions, for or against trade-union unity. The Profintern (R.I.L.U.) calls on all trade-union organizations in all countries not to wait for the results of the ballot but to organize united action on the first of May. The Profintern is ready at any time, in spite of the fact that the Amsterdam International has rejected its proposals, to discuss these proposals with it.

Time does not wait. Our responsibility is great. Let all those who are for the destruction of hated fascism, who are against oppression and exploitation by capital, who are in favor of free trade unions, and in favor of the workers living a better life, who stand for Socialism, muster their forces for united action by the working class:

For the United Working Class Front!

For the Unity of the Trade Unions!

Answer to the Opponents of the United Front and Trade Union Unity

TO THE BUREAU OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION
OF TRADE UNIONS

CITIZENS:

The Executive Bureau received your negative answer to the proposal of the Red International of Labor Unions of March 7 concerning joint organization of May First, assistance in the amalgamation of the trade unions in France and Spain, restoration of the free trade unions in Germany, and initiation of negotiations on international trade-union unity.

You write that in view of the decision of the Congresses and General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions in Weymouth, the united front and unity of action are out of the question and that "a conference on the three points proposed by the R.I.L.U. can give no practical results".

Your repudiation of joint action does not meet the interests of the working class. Hardly any member of any trade union can deny the appalling conditions of the working masses caused by the offensive of capital against their living standards, growth of fascism and of the fascist organizations, and the resulting necessity for the workers to unite all their forces, all their trade-union organizations for a joint struggle against their common enemy.

The wages in all capitalist countries were reduced markedly during the period of the crisis. Even according to evidently minimized official data, the working class lost tens of billions of dollars in wages alone. The exploitation of the workers increased tremendously as the result of the savage speed-up and direct economic and political pressure brought to bear on the working class. Simultaneously with the unheard-of growth of poverty, suicides and prostitution, social insurance and social legislation are worsened and completely done away with in such countries as Austria, Germany and Poland. With the exception of a few countries where curtailed State insurance still exists, millions of unemployed have to live on charity doles. Instead of benefit fixed by law at the expense of those responsible for unemployment, *i.e.*, the employers and State, the workers are getting miserable doles; instead of work, they are sent to labor camps. Only the war industry works at full speed; it works to enable the imperialists to secure a new redivision of the world by means of a new world war, even though it would cost tens of millions of human lives again. Monopoly capital, which strives for a further intensification of exploitation, established a fascist dictatorship in a number of countries and smashed not only those workers' organizations which declared against collaboration with the bourgeoisie but also the trade unions which cooperated with the capitalists. In the heart of Europe, in Germany, the dictatorship of frantic fascist murderers was established. This happened because the working class of Germany did not come out in a united front against oncoming fascism, because the leadership of the German Federation of Trade Unions (A.D.G.B.), the most powerful section of your International, expelled the revolutionary workers and not only kept rejecting the united front but always

sabotaged joint action, describing as provocateurs all those who called for joint strikes and for a real struggle against the fascists. The leadership of the A.D.G.B. kept repeating from year to year that a united front against capital would be to no effect and now you are literally repeating the bankrupt policy of the A.D.G.B. leaders, a policy which cost the working class of Germany so much. Do not the world-shaking events in Germany and Austria cry out about the necessity for the greatest possible consolidation and unification of the working-class forces in the struggle against the capitalists? Is it not clear what a great role the rebuilding of the free trade unions in Germany would play in overthrowing fascism, this main instigator of the world war?

If we consider the results of the economic struggles of the past period, we shall see that in this field as well, the split and the repudiation of joint action, which was by no means called forth by the interests of the working class, were very disastrous for the workers. Hundreds and thousands of strikes in France, U.S.A., Czechoslovakia, Poland, Great Britain, Belgium, the Scandinavian and Balkan countries were defeated because the united front of capital was faced by the split front of the working class as the result of the class collaboration policy pursued by the leaders of the reformist trade unions. On the other hand, a large number of strikes were successful, thanks to unity of action of the workers of all tendencies, based on class struggle. Were there not scores of cases of the failure of strikes because of weak and inadequate international solidarity, because the capitalists of one country were backed up by capitalists of other countries during a strike, the strikers getting no necessary support and assistance on the part of the organizations of their own international? Remember the strikes of the miners, transport workers, textile workers, etc., in Great Britain, Germany, France and Czechoslovakia. Where then is international solidarity? Where is the elementary community of class interests? Who can refute these irrefutable facts?

There is no attempt even in your letter to prove that joint action of the workers on May First, or assistance in amalgamating the trade unions of France and Spain, and assistance in rebuilding the free trade unions in Germany are not demanded by the interests of the international proletariat. You simply reject a united front with the revolutionary workers, at the same time practically supporting a united front of the leaders of your international with the bourgeois parties in the government of Belgium (Delattre), the united front between Leon Jouhaux, Vice-President of the Amsterdam International, with Garnier, President of the Chamber of Commerce of France and with the big officials on the National Commission for Public Works, the composition of which is determined by a special decree issued by Lebrun, President of the Republic, on March 30, 1935. Many other examples could be given of the leaders of your international finding the basis for a "united front" and for "joint action" with the representatives of the employers' organizations. At the same time you have no desire to establish a united front between the trade unions affiliated to the Red International of Labor Unions and the trade unions affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions in the struggle for the common demands of the working class as a whole.

The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions rejects a united front without the knowledge and consent of the trade-union masses but in their name, while in a number of countries the members of the trade unions affiliated to your international eagerly and energetically come out for a united front and unity of action. The most striking proof of this may be furnished by the general strike in February last year

and by many economic strikes in 1934 and in 1935 in France during which the members of the Unitary General Confederation of Labor and of the General Confederation of Labor fought shoulder to shoulder, by the armed battles of the Austrian workers, by the strikes and armed fights of the workers in Spain, during which the members of both the trade union internationals fought together against the common enemy, and finally by the setting up of a number of unified trade unions in France, Austria and Spain which unite the workers affiliated to the Red International of Labor Unions and to the International Federation of Trade Unions.

As to the part of your letter dealing with the question of international trade-union unity, it deliberately complicates and confuses the question which is clear to the working masses. The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. proposed to discuss the question of the *forms, methods and conditions of the unification of the world trade-union movement* at a conference of the representatives of both the Internationals. In answer to this concrete proposal you refer to the resolution of the General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions in Weymouth. This resolution of yours proposes, as a preliminary condition, to form unified trade-union centers in every country through the affiliation of the revolutionary trade unions to the so-called "regular" organizations and through the liquidation of the R.I.L.U.

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is also of the opinion that international trade-union unity can and must be built on the basis of trade-union unity in every country. The R.I.L.U. is not only "ready to encourage the restoration of trade-union unity in all countries" but carries it through in practice, in conjunction with its sections. Considerable successes have been achieved in this field in France and even under the conditions of illegal work in Spain and Austria. The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions rejects unity of action proposed by the R.I.L.U. with a view to creating a powerful unified trade-union movement in these countries, which would greatly facilitate and accelerate the organizational merging of the Trade Union Internationals. You have refused even to hold negotiations on this question, rejecting *unification* on the basis of agreement and insist on an absolutely inadmissible formula of the liquidation and dissolution of the revolutionary trade unions, thereby helping to aggravate the split.

As for the question of "regular" organizations, you do not proceed in your decisions from the fact of the actual existence of the Red International of Labor Unions and from the active struggle waged by the revolutionary trade unions against capital but from the formal questions belonging to the past. You talk about "regular" organizations. But what are these "regular" organizations? Who seceded from whom? If we were to adopt your viewpoint it would mean that your trade unions in Holland are to reaffiliate to the syndicalist National Labor Secretariat from which they disaffiliated; it would mean that the reformist Railwaymen's Federation and a number of other federations of France are to return to the corresponding unitary federations, which they left in 1921, after the revolutionary workers received the overwhelming majority of votes at the congresses; and that the reformist union of agricultural workers of Czechoslovakia is to return to the Red Union of Agricultural Workers from which a small minority seceded. If we were to adopt your viewpoint it would mean that the reformist Federation of Trade Unions in Rumania should have affiliated to the revolutionary trade unions which had a considerable majority during the Congress of 1923 in Klausenberg. You are probably aware as well of the fact that the enormous majority of the Finnish Trade Union Federation con-

sisted of R.I.L.U. adherents and that the adherents of your International seceded from the unified trade-union center being backed up by not more than one-fifth of the organized workers. The adherents of your International are now at the head of the Finnish Trade Union Federation only because the Finnish Government smashed the old trade-union federations and arrested hundreds of functionaries. The situation is similar in Jugoslavia and in a number of other countries.

You know perfectly well that it is not the matter of "groups" but of hundreds, thousands and millions of workers who are playing a great role in the class struggle of the proletariat of their countries and of the whole world. Organized in the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. there are at present over 19,000,000 workers and employees who play an outstanding role in the destinies of their own country and of the international labor movement. The revolutionary trade unions of China, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Japan, Cuba, Chile, U.S.A., Italy, Canada, Philippines, Austria, Germany, India, South Africa, Argentina, Uruguay, Mexico, etc., are waging a struggle against the bourgeoisie. Although in some countries the number of members of the trade unions, driven underground, declined for the past three years as the result of terror, unheard-of persecutions and mass murders (Japan, Italy), even the bourgeoisie does not venture to deny the tremendous significance of these trade unions in the class struggle of the proletariat. An international trade-union organization under the present conditions cannot but have illegal trade unions in its midst in order to help the workers' organizations to become legal by means of its struggle.

It is not a matter of "seceded groups". The congresses of the General Council of your International may pass as many resolutions on this question as they wish but it is a *question of an international trade-union organization uniting the revolutionary workers of the world*. It is the question of an organization which is anxious for trade-union unity, realizing full well the degree and extent of our differences of opinion. Unity of the world trade-union movement can and will be established only if the negotiations are carried on *on the basis of the equality* of both the Internationals, only if unity is built on the basis of trade-union democracy, on the basis of proportional representation in the leading organs for the struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and war.

The R.I.L.U. Executive Bureau rejects therefore any ultimatums whatsoever and *confirms once more its readiness to discuss, in conjunction with the representatives of the International Federation of Trade Unions and with the representatives of the trade-union centers of all countries the forms, methods and conditions of the unification of the trade unions in every country and on an international scale*. The attitude of the Bureau of the International Federation of the Trade Unions which has rejected the negotiations is one of preserving and deepening the split, whatever phrases about unity are used to disguise its policy.

It is not a question of liquidating the trade unions affiliated to one of the internationals, of liquidating one of the internationals in favor of the other, nor of the affiliation of one trade-union organization to the other, but it is a question of the merging of parallel trade-union organizations on the basis of *broad trade-union democracy, of building a unified trade union in every industry, a unified trade-union federation in every country and a unified trade-union international*. He who wants to struggle in deed against the offensive of capital, against fascism and war, cannot and must not be opposed to unity of action and to trade-union unity.

The number of members of your trade unions who insist on the necessity for a united front and unity is ever growing. This may be

shown by the existence of 561 unified trade unions in France, by the newly started amalgamation of the reformist and revolutionary trade unions in Spain, by the formation of illegal trade unions in Austria, through the joint efforts of the Communists and Social-Democrats. Your answer is not the answer of millions of workers organized in your international. The vital interests of the working masses imperatively dictate the necessity for unity of action. The R.I.L.U. wants to know their opinion. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to render a general and mass character to the joint demonstrations on May First. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to accelerate the amalgamation of the trade unions in France, Spain and elsewhere, on the basis of the class struggle, and through joint action against capital. The R.I.L.U. will do all in its power to rebuild the free trade unions in Germany, the trade unions which will wage a real struggle against fascism. The R.I.L.U. *will do all in its power to build a unified trade-union movement in every country and a unified trade-union international on the basis of the class struggle.*

The restoration of trade-union unity will not only strengthen considerably the fighting power of the working class, but also serve as a starting point for the influx of huge masses of unorganized workers to the amalgamated trade unions.

The trade-union split caused by the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie brought innumerable disasters to the working class. The bourgeoisie shifted the whole burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the toilers. In a number of countries the fascists smashed the trade-union organizations. The danger of imperialist wars threatens the working class again as in 1914. The actions of the trade-union leaders during the war, when they placed the trade unions at the service of the militarists, are still fresh in the memory of the workers. Such a utilization of trade unions can be avoided by the establishment of the united front, by the struggle against the capitalists and by the carrying out of trade-union unity. Therefore, it is necessary that the members of all the trade unions take this matter into their own hands.

The Executive Bureau proposes to the organizations affiliated to the R.I.L.U.:

a. To address the corresponding trade unions of other tendencies with the proposal to organize joint meetings, demonstrations and strikes on May First against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the impending war.

b. To arrange for joint meetings of the members of the trade unions affiliated to both the Internationals for the discussion of the question of unity of action and trade-union unity.

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. proposes to the trade-union organizations of both the Internationals to organize a *referendum amongst the trade union members on joint action and on the establishment of trade-union unity.* Thus, it will be left to the membership mass to decide this cardinal question of the international labor movement.

We will pass over our proposal and your answer to the judgment of the members of the both Internationals. Let the working masses give their decisive answer. The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. is firmly convinced that the *members of your trade unions and a considerable portion of the functionaries, realizing the gravity of the situation, will declare for the united front and international trade-union unity.*

With trade union greetings,
 EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE RED INTERNATIONAL
 OF LABOR UNIONS

Letter From the Amsterdam International

TO THE RED INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR UNIONS

CITIZENS,

The Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions, which acquainted itself at its meeting held on March 14, this year, with the proposals set forth in your letter from Moscow, dated March 7, instructed me to answer you as follows:

The attitude of the International Federation of Trade Unions towards the Communists' proposals for unity of action, a united front or a common front, was so often established and confirmed by the decisions of the Congresses and of the General Council, including the recent decisions made in Weymouth, on August 29, 1934, that it may be considered that this attitude is sufficiently known to the workers' trade-union organizations of the world. The Bureau has neither the right nor the desire to abandon this line of conduct, established by the congresses and sessions of the General Council of the International Federation of Trade Unions. On the other hand, the International Federation of Trade Unions which observes trade-union discipline cannot accept on an international scale a united front rejected on a national scale by all its affiliated national trade-union centers.

Therefore the Bureau of the I.F.T.U. believes that a conference for the discussion of the three points of the united front, proposed in your letter, can give no practical results.

As for the problem of restoring organizational unity of the international trade-union movement, the Weymouth resolution of August 29, 1934, determines the attitude of the I.F.T.U. and says, basically, as follows: The International Federation of Trade Unions has been struggling for trade-union unity since 1919; this Federation declares that this unity is now more necessary than ever and considers that the I.F.T.U. is the base on which the workers of the world can unite. Therefore the I.F.T.U. calls again upon the workers of all countries to join the regular organizations and through them the International Federation of Trade Unions. The latter believes that through applying the slogans of unity put forward by Moscow, the Communist trade unions and the Red International of Labor Unions are prepared to take up this path.

The Bureau was able to state with great satisfaction that the National Trade Union Center of Norway, which kept aloof from the International movement for many years and consequently aroused certain doubts as to its viewpoint on International trade-union unity, made a decision clarifying this question, at its last Congress, held in December, 1934. In agreement on all points with the spirit of the decisions of the International Federation of Trade Unions, this attitude of the Norwegian Trade Union Center is outlined in its letter dated February 14, and addressed by the Norwegian Secretariat to the R.I.L.U., in the formal question worded as follows: "Is the Red International of Labor Unions prepared to encourage the restoration of trade-union unity in all the countries where certain groups in the past disaffiliated from the National Trade Union Center? A Trade Union International should be based on one national organization in every country."

Therefore it is necessary that the Red International of Labor Unions inform the Bureau of the I.F.T.U. first of all whether it is prepared to accept the preliminary conditions which the International Federation of Trade Unions (and also the National Trade Union Center of Norway) consider necessary with a view to the realization of this international trade-union unity.

Accept, Citizens, our Trade Union Greeting,
on behalf of the Bureau of the Inter-
national Federation of Trade Unions.

V. SCHEVENELS, *General Secretary*

Our Fight Against German Chauvinism

By RUDOLPH GERBER

I. PRE-CONDITIONS

THE plebiscite in the Saar gave a clear reflection of the growth of German chauvinism, a wave of which took hold of even that part of the country where the proletarian population is in the majority. Since March 16 these chauvinist sentiments are assuming new and sharp forms. Many millions of toilers are giving way to the chauvinist outburst, although they are learning from experience that the Hitler dictatorship, *i.e.*, the dictatorship of finance capital, only means an intensification of oppression and exploitation. The wide extent to which the slogan "For Germany in spite of Hitler" is spread shows that the influence of this chauvinism covers not only the circle of conscious supporters of the fascist dictatorship, but also those far beyond its bounds.

"It is impossible to discern the line dividing the venal eulogist of the hangman, Nicholas Romanov, or of the mutilators of Negroes and Natives of India, from the ordinary philistine who, thanks to stupidity or supineness, is swimming 'with the current'. In truth, such distinction is not important. What we witness is a broad and very deep ideological current whose origins are closely interwoven with the interests of the land-owners and the capitalists of the great nations." (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, p. 99, International Publishers, New York.)

This wide extent of the chauvinist movement in Germany shows that it is not sufficient to criticize fascism in order to carry on the struggle against chauvinism. But it is just such a limitation, as pointed out by Comrade Pieck in his article in *The Communist International*, that has been widely practised hitherto in our work. Chauvinism has taken deeper roots than fascism has, and mere criticism of fascism will not touch the roots from which chauvinism, and fascism, which is closely linked up with it, can draw new strength.

This partial rejection of the special struggle against chauvinism, which goes beyond the general bounds of the struggle against fascist demagoguery, is rooted theoretically in a mistaken estimate of the nationalist movement directed against the oppression of the Versailles Treaty. The growth of chauvinism in Germany must be a surprise to everybody to whom Scheringer and the *Aufbruchkreis* journal seemed the limit of the German nationalist movement, to everybody who compared the highly-developed imperialist country, Germany, though temporarily defeated and plundered, with countries like China under the rule of Chiang Kai-shek. In his criticism of the Junius pamphlet, Lenin speaks of the *possibility* (but *not* of the likelihood) of national revolutionary wars on the part of imperialist countries that have long been in existence, but at the same time points to *the conditions* with which such a possibility is bound up:

"If the European proletariat should turn out to be helpless for 20 years, if the present war should end in victories of a Napoleonic character, and in the enslavement of a number of live national States, if non-European imperialism (Japanese

and American in the first instance) should also hold out for 20 years, without passing to Socialism, by reason, for instance, of a Japanese-American war, then a great national war would be possible in Europe. This would be the development of Europe *backwards* for several decades. This is unlikely. But it is *not* impossible. . . ." (Lenin, *Works*, "About the Junius Pamphlet", Vol. XIX, p. 182, Russian Edition.)

There is no need to go into great detail in order to prove that these conditions, which Lenin considers unlikely, have not come about, primarily because of the victory of the proletariat over one-sixth of the globe, and because of the international consequences following on this victory.

This mistaken estimate of the German nationalist movement onesidedly took as its starting point the epoch when the German bourgeois national movement without a doubt bore a historically progressive character, although by comparison with the rest of bourgeois Europe, it was behind the times. The national unification of Germany was hindered and to a certain extent contradicted by the bourgeois national development of the neighboring countries. Hence at the time when the bourgeois revolution was being prepared, *certain partly reactionary features* of German nationalism came forward, as compared with the neighboring countries (France in 1813 and 1830, Poland in 1830 and 1848). The leading role of the Prussian Junkers who found their support in Russian tsarism, with the unification of the empire, and the special role played by the Junker Army in this period when there was a tremendous national upsurge, to a very great extent intensified these contradictions. And during the war of 1870-1871, the reactionary character of German nationalism began to come to the forefront quite clearly.

Thus at the foundation of the chauvinist war line in the imperialist period were such pre-conditions as are by no means consistently bourgeois revolutionary. German imperialism entered the capitalist competitive field later than the other powers, and therefore deprived of its share in the division of the globe, fought for a new division of the globe, for its "place in the sun", while the aggressive character of this demand was inevitably combined with openly reactionary slogans.

In the pre-war period the social basis of German chauvinism was the *petty bourgeoisie on the one hand*, and, on the other hand, the *labor aristocracy* which with its revisionist social-chauvinism introduced certain specific shades into chauvinist calumny, as, for instance, such slogans as "the defense of the conquest of the workers", "now we can lose something more than our chains", "we shall vote for the war budget if the people are given new rights", "the development of civilization in the colonies" and "war against tsarist absolutism".

Versailles created a situation of a special kind in Germany by placing it in a position of being an imperialist country oppressed by other imperialist countries, while the people there, accustomed to oppress and exploit other peoples, were now themselves subjected to national oppression. The petty bourgeois and the whole middle class crowd that surrounded him howled about "the good old times", about the glorious army, the colonies, etc. They shouted louder, the more they were expropriated by inflation. Apart from the petty-bourgeois elements there were also others, as, for instance, first and foremost the unemployed intellectuals, the petty-bourgeois youth and those of them who, though driven out of their economic positions, were still possessed of abilities. Partly these were "professional counter-revolutionaries", free lancers under Noske, Ebert and others. But these were only the active minority

of those millions, whose protest against Versailles, which had deprived them of the prospects that faced their lives, met with the intense support of the masses as a result of the pressure of Versailles on all sections of the population. There was no time when German nationalism was simply a movement for independence without aggressive and chauvinistic tendencies. The year 1923 brought about a turn. It brought not war, but the beginning of the restoration of German economy with the aid of help from abroad, with the aid of the Dawes Plan. On the other hand, as a result of the opportunist mistakes of the C.P.G., it did not bring revolution and with it the leadership of the proletariat over the frantic petty bourgeoisie, and as a result the latter became transformed into a potential fascist reserve of finance capital, all for the same constant reason that the proletariat later on as well did not succeed in securing the leadership over these elements by developing the mass struggle.

For there were two possible ways of doing away with Versailles and Dawes. One was the *proletarian* way under which the native expropriators should be expropriated along with the foreign ones, under which the toiling masses of Germany, in alliance with the exploited and oppressed masses throughout the whole world, and especially the masses in the Soviet Union, should conquer power, freedom and socialism. The other possibility was a finance-capitalist, chauvinist solution under which a certain weakening of the foreign yoke, as far as the native finance capital was concerned, would be purchased at the price of a still greater pressure on the toiling masses, under which the funds needed for imperialist armaments would be squeezed out of the latter, the masses in the last analysis being driven forward as cannon fodder to the field of battle in spite of their own vital interests. Our propaganda has suffered partly because of the mistake that we have made in not noting the second possibility due to an impermissible simplification of the question. Versailles had two sides to it. On the one hand, the inclusion of defeated German imperialism in the system of world imperialism and of anti-Soviet war, and to *that extent* it could not be done away with prior to the proletarian revolution; but at the same time it strengthened a definite co-relation of forces between Germany and the other imperialist powers, and to *that extent* it required revision to a certain degree at the expense of the toiling masses. These masses should have been shown that *this* way of revising Versailles could only be brought about *at their own expense*. It was just this (and not the assertion that this revision was not complete, and that it needed to be questioned) that should have been at the basis of our propaganda.

In recent years the dual character of the imperialist development of Germany in the period of relative stabilization was of fundamental importance for the development of German chauvinism. *At one and the same time*, four to five thousand millions of marks of capital were imported, while approximately half that sum was exported. The bourgeoisie in Germany at one and the same time fought against the participation of foreign capitalists in the exploitation of Germany, and at the same time fought for new colonies, for territory in the East, etc. German nationalism fought against the really existing national oppression of the German people, but at the same time laid claim to the right to the national oppression of other peoples. The crisis meant that the question was raised of the choice between the two possible ways of doing away with Versailles, and this struggle developed in the form of a struggle between finance capital and the proletariat for leadership

over the petty bourgeoisie. We were not in a position to ensure leadership over the petty bourgeoisie by the proletariat, by the organization of proletarian mass struggles, and it was thus that it became possible for finance capital to direct the wrath of the petty bourgeoisie against Versailles, against the proletariat, and enabled them even to exert their influence over certain sections of the proletariat.

Our program of national and social liberation, put forward in 1930, was an attempt to divert this stream into another channel. The first pre-condition for the successful operation of this program was action by the working class in a broad united front. The next link in the chain, with the aid of which it would have been possible to win over the National-Socialist petty bourgeoisie, was, consequently, the Social-Democratic workers and the drawing of them into the organization of mass struggles in the factories .

The C.P.G. did not succeed in doing this for several reasons. We were unsuccessful in including the anti-Versailles agitation into the general bounds of the liberation struggle of the proletariat. In the years 1930-31 there was a slackening down, a fact to which Comrade Thaelmann referred in his articles in *The Communist International*. The Party gradually straightened its line—at no time in the Party was such an energetic campaign for proletarian internationalism carried on as in the year 1932. The influence of this program over the supporters of Hitler, who were already wavering at the end of 1932, depended on the fighting power of the proletariat, but, in spite of the good beginning, this latter turned out to be too weak, and the petty bourgeoisie followed Hitler against the proletariat.

At the present time Germany has done away with very fundamental elements of the Versailles system. It does not pay debts and reparations, and is arming itself within the bounds of its own economic possibilities, which are extremely tense. It not only seeks a revision of the territorial clauses of the Versailles Treaty, but it wishes to oppress other peoples. It wishes to bring about a new redivision of the globe, and holds robber plans first and foremost against the Soviet Union. German chauvinism at the present time is under no circumstances a national movement for independence; it implies an exceptionally provocative spirit of conquest and militarism directed particularly against the U.S.S.R.

II. THE BASIS AND POSSIBLE SPHERE OF INFLUENCE OF GERMAN CHAUVINISM

What are the objective possibilities at the disposal of fascist finance capital for influencing the masses in a chauvinistic spirit? Let us look, first and foremost, at the *economic* basis. A considerable part of the growth of German production, following the lowest point of the crisis period, has been covered by direct and indirect preparations for war. The production of arms alone, and the supply of the two million army with war supplies, as reckoned for in the first period of mobilization, demand at least 2,000 million marks. It is hardly likely that the building on the one hand of barracks, aerodromes (we are aware of 64 such, protected and camouflaged), strategic roads, fortifications, etc., and the supply of important substitutes (the new machinery alone for the production of oil costs 300 million marks), and the transfer of military enterprises to the central regions which are relatively less capable of being attacked from the air, etc., will require much less expenditure.

Mass consumption has grown to a slight degree, while the renewal and extension of the production apparatus is in the main concentrated in

open and camouflaged military-industrial enterprises. The military-economic sector is developing at the expense of the rest of the national economy, and is engulfing an ever greater portion of the social product. The thousands of millions of marks invested in armaments, if we do not speak of the profits of the various capitalists who are doing well out of armaments, represent "productive expenditure" from the point of view of finance capital as a whole, only if they provide new possibilities during the war period for the investment of capital, and new sources of profit. On the other hand expenditure on armaments renders it easier for finance capital to unite all the forces of the bourgeoisie with a view to letting war loose. Even the beer factories, whose market has been cut down as a result of the poverty of the masses, find a certain compensation in the shape of the production of boxes for military supplies (we have the necessary information in this regard).

Such is the objective side of the expenditures being made on armaments. Subjectively the worker who has been brought again into the productive process, or the small handicraftsman or shopkeeper whose budget has but slightly improved, needs a special degree of class consciousness to understand that the cause of this improvement is a return of only part of what Hitler and his like have taken away from him. He only sees the primitive fact, that, as Hess declares, "armaments give work and bread". It goes without saying that this creates a definite basis for chauvinistic war slander.

From the organizational point of view, chauvinist propaganda under fascism receives very strong support through the medium of all kinds of fascist and unified mass organizations, among which the various kinds have to be distinguished.

First, there are the directly party, youth and military organizations which serve this propaganda (the differences noted between the National-Socialist Party and the Steel Helmets from an inner political point of view play no part as far as the stirring up of war is concerned), and also organizations after the fashion of the "League of Germans Abroad".

Second, professional organizations of various kinds, to a very great extent based on compulsion (primarily, of course, the "Labor Front"), the forced labor camps, etc.

Third, there are a whole series of unified organizations which altogether cover the overwhelming majority of the population, at least the town population (and among these of special importance as far as influencing the youth is concerned are the Sports Leagues).

Fourth, organizations which clearly serve for the preparation of war. Among these latter, along with organizations which have the task of raising the military qualifications, and of organizationally preparing conscious fascist elements (the National-Socialist motor drivers' union, the National-Socialist Airmen's League, technical first aid) we find such an organization as the Anti-Aircraft Defense League, a wide organization though to a very great extent based on compulsion. It is clear that we cannot here introduce a clear line of demarcation between compulsion and ideological pressure. In the schools and other educational institutions many young people belong to the Hitler Youth League only by reason of pressure exerted upon them, but this does not exclude the fact that ideological influence is brought to bear on them by rousing chauvinistic sentiments among them. In the same way, the majority of those who pass through the forced labor camps, in spite of the compulsory nature of the work they do, are not guaranteed against being influenced by the militaristic atmosphere which prevails in these camps.

On the other hand, such an organization as the "Labor Front", compulsory though its character, contains the possibility of exerting ideological influence over its members. These possibilities are mainly brought about by the subordinate "Strength and Joy" organization, the privileges of which are utilized by a considerable section of its members as partial compensation for the membership dues they pay. The "unified" organizations, although this unification has in many respects left a great number of flaws (we do not speak of the conscious opposition of the class conscious proletarians) have, as a result of the chauvinistic direction, taken over many years by the petty bourgeoisie and the labor aristocracy, become centers of infection, whose influence penetrates deeply even among those sections of the people whose outlook is anti-fascist. Finally, even in so far as anti-aircraft defense shows the masses how near and serious is the war danger and in so far as it has a dampening effect, willy-nilly, on the hurrah patriotism of the street demonstrations, at the same time it creates a definite and fatalistic view on war as of something unavoidable, and creates the feeling that "we must defend ourselves, otherwise we will be wiped out by gas attacks".

From the ideological point of view, in addition to the traditional forms of chauvinistic war mongering, fascism creates *new* methods of providing a "scientific" foundation for German chauvinism, particularly by its racial theory. The special advantage of this theory for the exploiters is that along with the internal political functions directed against the class struggle ("justifying" exploitation on the grounds that the exploiters belong to the highest race, and diverting the wrath of the petty bourgeoisie at finance capital, against "Jewish competition" in its own ranks), it also spreads the story about "the higher value" of "the refined man of the north", *i.e.*, justifies all the conquests in view, and thereby transforms war from a social category (to be prevented by the alteration of social conditions) into a phenomenon allegedly established by nature itself, *i.e.*, one that can not be held off by any means, as a "biological" phenomenon.

To what extent are the various classes and sections of the toiling population susceptible to this chauvinist agitation, carried through by means of force? Among the town petty bourgeoisie we must distinguish office employees, civil servants, etc., from the "old" petty bourgeoisie (the small shopkeepers, handicraft workers, etc.). The first of these, without a doubt, have been from the very beginning, relatively, fascism's most reliable mass basis. Their position in production, or even in the State apparatus of domination as "junior officers", renders them without a doubt the most reliable bearers of the chauvinist poison. The "independent" petty bourgeois have without a doubt far stronger anti-fascist sentiments. It must, however, not be forgotten that along with the powerful historical spread of chauvinism among precisely these elements, a section of these, particularly the youth, are searching after compensation in the shape of jobs in the war and police apparatus, as a result of the loss of their old "reliable" economic position.

We can see a similar duality in the position of the peasants. Among the small and middle peasantry anti-fascist discontent is assuming big dimensions, but even apart from this we presume (on the simple basis that the majority of these peasants suffer more from the burden of interest, taxes, monopolies, etc., than from the lack of land) that the attempts of the Nazis to divert the attention of the peasants towards the conquest of territory in the East have not got great chances of success. Nonetheless, this problem exists for the younger sons of the

kulaks and for the upper section of the middle peasantry. It is precisely so as to draw into the war apparatus this human material which is highly valuable in respect to the carrying on of a reactionary war, that the famous law regarding the inheritance of farmsteads was invented (from the point of view of "pacifying the village", highly inadvisable). While for instance the absence of company officers makes it necessary to transform the old Reichswehr non-commissioned officers into lieutenants and captains, a section of the town and village petty bourgeoisie inevitably sees a way out of the declassified fate that threatens them, in military service. About a quarter of a million people, who have found a means of livelihood in military service, represent a great danger in respect to their ideological influence over other sections of petty-bourgeois origin, from under whose feet the ground has been cut.

Hence the slogan "esteem labor and honor the worker" (it is clear that what is in view is not the "lower person") and hence the demand (which is by no means the fruit of the ideas of some fool) about providing secondary school diplomas for the provision of the "best" places as factory apprentices, etc. It is clear that such people cannot render a powerful influence over the masses, if only because the petty bourgeois always strives to put a social barrier between himself and the "lower" elements, and also because such elements cannot be placed in what are in reality important jobs in the factories.

More important is the *other* side of the efforts of the fascists to penetrate the ranks of the proletariat. There is no doubt that the minority of those who have passed through the forced labor camps who can be drawn into the productive process (and in the conditions of the crisis of capitalism this can *only* be a minority), at first feel a certain calm and develop definite hopes, and while such sentiments last, these new elements from the forced labor camps will be the bearers of the chauvinist poison spread there. But it is clear that such influence is not long lasting (at least on the *proletarians* whose life goes on in the factory). Very soon the surroundings of production in which such a proletarian finds himself, the constant struggle he has to carry on, the exploitation he undergoes, and the feeling of proletarian solidarity which he has, all serve as a counter-blast to the temporary influence of the discipline of the barrack. They are not insignificant, in so far as new elements are continually coming from the camps into the factories, but they do not play a decisive role. Only the basic masses of the workers in the factory can be the decisive factor. And here we come to the question of the position adopted by the qualified sections of the workers who formerly to a great extent were members of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions. These workers are against Hitler who tramples their rights underfoot, enslaves them and reduces their standard of living. But the labor aristocracy which used to be the bearer of the influence of Social-Democracy among the masses of the workers are also not on the side of Hitler. However, the intensified war preparations (and for certain sections of workers employed in the war enterprises this is connected with high wages) can be a canal for spreading fascist influence and partly also for the passage of the labor aristocracy to support for fascism. The tense struggle now going on among the Social-Democratic workers for united working-class action is at the same time a struggle as to which line is to be adopted by the former Social-Democratic workers, a chauvinist line or an internationalist line.

There can be no doubt that certain possibilities exist for a new social-chauvinism coming into being, even though on a limited scale.

What distinguishes it from the old social-chauvinism is the impossibility of setting the question of "guns against the rights of the people", since the mere demand of these rights of the people implies the violation of the totality of the fascist dictatorship, and is in any case a departure from its legal position. The new social-fascism is compelled to satisfy itself with "hopes" for future positions in the "labor front", in the confidence councils, etc.

The last question regarding the mass influence of chauvinism among the proletariat is the degree to which the class-conscious elements have succeeded in coping with the complicated problems of our relations with the imperialist army, without slipping away unconsciously from making use of it for revolutionary work. It would be foolish to pass by the existence of certain serious symptoms in this connection. Especially among the working youth with their fighting spirit, the joy connected with the possibility of receiving arms, and of getting military experience (this joy is at times unconsciously shown in a certain satisfaction that an end will be put to the horrors of unemployment by military service), has led to a certain endorsement of military affairs *as such*. Such sentiments were bound to weaken the revolutionary outlook which alone could justify joining the army, and, in general, resistance to militarism. Under certain circumstances such sentiments render certain workers susceptible to chauvinist influence, which can be spread in very fine forms, for instance, by way of hints by the officers that the Reichswehr would not follow Hitlerism, and that they would use a war to have a "clean up", etc. Although such cases of uncertainty by former class-conscious workers occur in only single instances, it must be recognized that such cases sound a warning note of the danger which threatens us if we are insufficiently concrete in the slogans we issue regarding war. If we one-sidedly advance to the forefront the idea of the inevitability of war, and its revolutionary side, and in the last analysis war is even shown as the only way out of fascist slavery, then all this inevitably weakens the resistance to chauvinism. As against this the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. stressed that "only such a Bolshevik struggle before the war for the victory of the revolution provides a guarantee of the victory of the revolution in connection with the war".

III. OUR TASKS

In outlining our tactical tasks we must make our starting point the change in the objective situation.

Now the main object of our attack is not Versailles, but German imperialism and its fascist dictatorship.

What has remained of Versailles is the national oppression of the German outlying regions, against which we without a doubt have carried and continue to carry on a most decisive struggle. But in this connection also, it would be clearly incorrect to simply deny the possibility of overcoming national oppression in one or other of these outlying regions by the imperialist path. Such possibilities can be quite realized by way of imperialist robber plunder (for instance, the German regions in Czechoslovakia, the Memel region or Austria). But what is important for us is to show the toilers of these outlying regions, that such an imperialist way of destroying national oppression is not in their interests, and that they must expect national liberation not from Hitler's bayonets, but from international solidarity with the proletariat of the oppressing nationality. It is possible, and we must recognize this openly, that this path may be more long drawn out. But then this

way will lead, not to fascist slavery and a new imperialist mass blood-bath, but to the real social and national liberation of the toilers, both of the nationality concerned as well as of other peoples. Today we are *against* linking up Austria, and the German regions in Czechoslovakia, etc., to Hitler Germany. Both in Germany itself, of the oppression of which we have now no cause to talk, and in the regions taken away from it and still subjected to national oppression, we have to swim "against the stream". In both sectors of the front, the C.P. of Germany must concentrate its fire against German chauvinism. To direct a concentrated fire against Czechish, French, Lithuanian and other chauvinism is the task of our class brothers who belong to the oppressing nations. In a State with many nationalities we must still more concretely define Liebknecht's slogan to the effect that "the enemy is in our own country", in the sense that the main enemy speaks one's own language.

In our *agitation and propaganda* the main thing is not simply to show the essence of fascism as exploiter, as well as its foulness, senselessness and criminality, which we do pretty thoroughly and which of course we must continue in the same spirit, but while not limiting ourselves to this we must deal in detail with the various chauvinistic arguments raised, and refute them.

The fascists declare that "we are breaking Versailles and ensuring the honor and liberty of the nation". But that which they have in fact broken and destroyed up to now, and which they wish to destroy in the future, are only the bounds to the exploitation and suppression of the German toilers by the native exploiters. Thyssen can now exploit the Saar miners as well as those in the Ruhr, and can make use of millions of German toilers as cannon fodder. It is quite natural and understandable that he is satisfied with this. But what use is this to his victims? Where is the famous freedom of the German people who are bound hand and foot by Hitler's yellow bands? And can we imagine a greater shame for a great and cultured nation than the torture dens of the secret police, the bonfires made of books, race trials, etc., to say nothing of the wild things being done, day in and day out. The honor of the German people is now being saved by those tens of thousands of people who are carrying on the heroic struggle underground in most difficult conditions. The path to the liberation of the German people is clearly being hindered now, not by Versailles, but by the fascist hangman's dictatorship which has forced on the German people its "kinsmen" exploiters.

The brown assassins loudly proclaim "the civilizing mission of our northern honorable race". Wherein lies their historic bulwark, whom do they consider their age-long enemy? It appears that it is the ability which not only the German landowners but also the French, Slav, Italian and other landowners have so often demonstrated to exploit the peasants and to compel them to pay feudal dues. It is on their ability to exploit serf labor that the German fascists (and all the other exploiters, who, it is clear, belong as one man to the "honorable race"), at the same time base their "right" to exploit the sections of the *German* population who belong to the lower races. The exploiters of German origin who lay claim to such an alleged inherent right to domination have on more than one occasion for this reason executed or shot down the toilers in France and in Russia. This is pictured in Nazi theory as the "revolt of the lower races". As regards the civilizing mission of the German people, it clearly consists at the present time

first and foremost in ridding themselves and other peoples of the worst enemies of all civilization and culture whatsoever.

The brown barbarians are calling for a holy war "against Bolshevik barbarism". This "barbarism" consists in the fact that the peoples of the U.S.S.R. have shown the people of Germany and other countries how indeed to rid themselves of the barbarous yoke of the exploiters, and have rooted out this oppression by building socialism and have won for themselves an existence worthy of men. It is therefore quite logical that the representatives of such barbarous capitalist oppression call for assistance to be rendered to the "hungry Germans of the Volga Region", at the very time when hundreds of thousands of people in Germany are perishing from starvation. The U.S.S.R. from their point of view is a danger which must be wiped out as soon as possible. They do this so that in case such propaganda leads to the required result, *i.e.*, to war, the German exploiters may be able to doom still more millions of people (including very likely the Germans of the Volga Region) to starvation. It is *our* task to show and to analyze in detail *where* culture exists, and *where* barbarism holds sway.

Hitler asserts that he has allegedly established "a free and mighty Germany". We have already spoken about the "freedom" that exists under Hitler, Thyssen and Schacht. The spread of this "freedom" to other sections of the German people would mean that, badly as they live now, their lot would be not liberation but still worse enslavement. The Prussian Junkers, whose "best" traditions are being carried on by Hitler, have always and invariably shown in practice that what concerns them most is the maximum quantity and the maximum profitability of the objects they exploit, and by no means the nationality to which these objects belong. The German landowners have always been ready to hand over large sections of the German people to be robbed by the Hapsburgs or by others, if only this has been advantageous as far as concerns the robbery of the Polish, Turkish, African and other peasants by the exploiters, and if only it has been advantageous to their policy of conquest, which it is clear does not correspond to the language map (which they alter according to necessity) but to imperialist needs and possibilities, and German imperialism will always be compelled to hand over a section of the German people to the whims of one or other of its imperialist allies whom it requires for the conduct of its robber wars.

According to the fascists, "territory for our people" must be won through imperialist war. However, what the German people are in need of is by no means a certain number of square miles of territory. What they are in need of is the part of the product of their labor which the exploiters wring out of the workers under the protection of Hitler's brown gangs. And if the German peasant is in need of land, there is no point in his seeking it on the other side of the borders of Germany. He will have enough if he takes it from the Junker agrarian in possession of the land. Hitler's dream about seizing land in the East can of course be of advantage to thousands of landlords, capitalists, and kulaks, and mainly to the war industrialists. But as far as the millions of German toilers are concerned, the seizure of land in the East only means blood-letting on a mass scale, and a further intensification of the exploitation and the yoke under the weight of which they are now sinking.

"The advance of Germany will provide a better standard of living for everyone"—for every exploiter, we add, and then the fascist slogan would be correct. The advance of Germany also provides jobs for all kinds of foremen, executioners and other murderers of the working class.

But as far as concerns the wide masses of the toiling population, the imperialist advance of Germany means decay. For the masses the path to a real advance lies through the abolition of the domination of the exploiters.

"If we do not defend ourselves, we will be overwhelmed by gas attacks." This thesis is to a certain extent justified; but it must be correctly understood in the following way, namely, if we do not defend ourselves, the Hitler dictatorship, then many of us really will perish as a result of gas attacks. By the "defensive measures" of imperialist armaments, we only render it easier for Hitler to let loose his robber war from the evil effects of which perhaps only a handful of people will be saved, but by no means the toiling masses.

"Armaments provide bread and work, young workers who join the army release places in the factories for the old workers"—this was the thesis which Hess advanced not so long ago as a slogan for the confidence council elections. The bread, however, which one section of the working class receives from the preparation of war, is only a crumb as compared with what the Hitler dictatorship squeezes out of the working class. The temporary privileges and concessions which certain sections of the workers in the war industries receive will have to be paid for with their lives by themselves and their children. As regards the foul attempt made by Herr Hess to play off the interests of the older generation against those of the younger workers, by telling them to be glad at the "good jobs" they have in the war industries, and in the meantime let their children go to face machine-gun fire, we think that from the majority of the workers of the older generation this foul call will only rouse contempt. But we can use this argument to show the younger generation, which to some extent swallows Hitler's bait, the complete foulness of the game being played by Hitler with the youth. Hitherto all and every kind of methods have been used to drive the young workers out of the production process into the war camps, and the older generation have received no benefits from this. Herr Hess' slogan shows that the process of driving the youth out of production is to be developed on a still bigger scale, and the workers' labor opens the way not at all to the factory, but to the field of battle.

Herr Hess introduced a special note into this foul call to the workers of the older generation, when he proposed that they should be glad that henceforth their children "are being educated as befits German manhood". (He is quite well aware that all parents would prefer their children to receive anything but the Prussian barracks.) There is no doubt that Herr Hess is trying to play on a certain cord in the heart of the German petty bourgeoisie. And there can be no doubt that the Nazis will meet with a certain response when they speak of "our army of the people". But every class-conscious worker will without a doubt be in favor of his son learning how to *shoot*. For the time will come when the art of shooting will prove to be very important as far as concerns the liberation of the German people from their enemy who is in their own country. The class-conscious worker, however, is by *no means* in favor of his son learning to shoot in an organization which orders him about as a helpless slave, and teaches him to "shoot at his own father and mother" in case of necessity. The thinking workers will never agree to give the title of people's army to an army whose task it is to shoot at the toiling population of Germany and at the real allies of the German people, namely, the Red Army of the U.S.S.R., and to carry through imperialist wars.

We must first and foremost select two basic categories from among our basic tasks in the struggle against chauvinism. *First*, to obtain the practical experience by means of which to convince the masses that imperialist war and the preparations for it not only do not provide them with bread, but tear the last crust of it out of their mouths. The path towards the achievement of this experience clearly lies through united action by the proletariat in the struggle against all wage deductions made for the building of armaments, against the high cost of living and the supply of low quality goods (which latter is the result of the fact that the best products and raw materials are being used for war purposes), and for the unemployed being adequately supplied out of the stores accumulated for war purposes. The existence of these supplies creates certain possibilities of material success for our struggle against hunger. And on the contrary, success of this kind implies a straight, direct blow against the preparation of imperialist war. *Second*, it is important to penetrate the apparatus spreading chauvinist calumny, to develop revolutionary work in all the fascist mass organizations, and above all in the "Labor Front", and then in the forced labor camps, and in general in the "militarist sector" of labor. It is clear that we must adapt ourselves to the concrete and occasionally quite complicated conditions that exist within the various organizations. Thus, for instance, if we deal here with only the purely military organizations in anti-aircraft defense, it will be insufficient to simply carry on agitation and propaganda along the above-mentioned lines. We must convince the masses in practice that it is impossible to provide really all-round anti-aircraft defense for the rank and file in case of imperialist war. For this purpose we must frequently put forward concrete demands in respect to anti-aircraft defense (the provision, for instance, of gas masks for all workers). In the forced labor camps, etc., there is now apparently a danger that partial demands will be one-sidedly put forward (and, of course, in our agitation and propaganda we must *seize hold* of these, but these demands must not be the *main content* of this agitation and propaganda) while the struggle in principle against chauvinistic calumny is shifted into the background.

The weight of our activity in the forced labor camps, and what is more, among the new mass army, must be the making use of its traditions of anti-military struggle, enriched by the experiences of the Bolsheviks, and of becoming the main bearer of the struggle against the chauvinistic poisoning of the youth of Germany.

When discussing our concrete slogans as regards universal military service we must make our starting point the present sentiments existing among the masses (and among the masses close to us) and select those points which *today* are the decisive links in the chain. There can hardly be any doubt but that wide masses of workers now understand the necessity of acquainting themselves with the use of arms. But it is far from being generally understood that it is not sufficient to join the army with a view to learning how to use arms, for to join the army only from this point of view weakens the resistance of the individual worker to the chauvinistic pressure of the military machine. In the period of the preparation of imperialist war, the bourgeoisie have at their disposal tremendous possibilities and means of exerting chauvinistic pressure on the toiling masses, especially on the masses embraced by the military apparatus.

What is important for us is to explain to the workers, how and in what capacities they should join the army. We have to explain that

they join not simply to learn the military trade, but as organizers and agitators among the soldiers, consciously undermining the German army which is the weapon of the exploiters. We must explain to the masses (who have occasionally a very unclear and schematic idea of what is meant by transforming the army as a weapon of the exploiters into a weapon of the revolution) that the decisive question is not that of arms, but of the organization of the army. The task of the German workers is not to worry about the military training of the masses of the workers in the bourgeois-class army. The bourgeoisie as they advance to their death struggle take good care of that. The task is to undermine and destroy the organization and the ideology with the aid of which the capitalists through the medium of the military barracks, transform the toilers into weapons directed against the toilers, *i.e.*, against their own class. It has to be explained to the workers that the question of their armament is not a question of building up, but one of the destruction of the bourgeois-class army.

And in the struggle against Hitler's militarism, with its universal conscription, our basic task is to establish concretely *unity of action with the Social-Democratic workers*. We must develop this struggle against Hitler's militarism with its universal conscription, and make use of every single fact showing the influence of militarism on the conditions of the toiling masses. It is just in the sphere of the anti-war struggle that there are exceptionally rich traditions of the pre-war period, and we can seize hold of these traditions of the pre-war period, and develop our struggle in sharp contradiction to the Magdsburg war program. Fundamental differences in the line are primarily disclosed here, as in other spheres, in the question of the concrete development of the revolution, of the destruction of the old army, and of the building up of the Red Army, etc. It will undoubtedly be of decisive importance to overcome these unclear views of the Social-Democratic workers at a higher stage of the struggle. But they can only be overcome on the basis of the experience of the concrete joint struggle carried on for the questions immediately on the order of the day. We must jointly carry on mass explanatory work among the recruits joining the army, and also among those who have passed through the forced labor camps and are assigned to the army. We must also use all our energy to organize demonstrations of recruits, action in the barracks, demonstrations of members of the soldiers' families, carry on joint work among the workers in the war industries, especially among the qualified workers, and overcome the slogan advanced by Hess, carrying on the struggle against chauvinism, whoever is the bearer of it and spreads it among the working class. Such are the tasks which can now be solved, without a doubt, and regarding which we will undoubtedly be able to come to an agreement with all the Social-Democratic workers and organizations who are really inclined against fascism. The solution of these tasks by united working-class action will raise our struggle against chauvinism onto a higher plane.

Struggles of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America

THE RESULTS OF THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF SOUTH AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

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

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

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

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

Foreign imperialism in the countries of South and Caribbean America bases itself on the "national" bourgeois landlord ruling parties and groups, subjects the toiling masses of these countries to barbarous exploitation, combining "advanced" capitalist forms of exploitation with the relics of pre-capitalist (semi-feudal and semi-slave) forms.

Imperialist rivalry in South and Caribbean America sharpens the war danger. In their struggle against each other, the various groups of imperialists utilize and deepen the historical contradictions existing between the various countries dependent upon them, to bring about military conflicts between these countries. For example, the war that broke out in the middle of 1932 between Bolivia and Paraguay was primarily the results of the Anglo-American struggle; the war between Peru and

Colombia, which began in 1932 and ended in 1933, was the consequence not only of Anglo-American but also of Japanese-American contradictions (the influence of the U.S.A. is stronger in Colombia, while that of Great Britain and of Japan is greater in Peru).

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

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

The transition of the economic crisis into a depression of a special type caused some increase in the demand for raw materials, war orders, etc. In a number of countries (especially in Chile and Mexico, partly in the Argentine) this led to a partial and very unstable increase in output and some revival in foreign trade. But at the same time, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the prolonged agrarian crisis, the absence of a real improvement and development of industry in the leading capitalist countries, the increased exploitation, in connection with the crisis and depression, of the colonies and semi-colonies by imperialism, proves the impossibility of securing any considerable improvement in the economic situation of the countries of South and Caribbean America and the continuation of the ruination and impoverishment of the toiling masses. The standard of living of large sections of the working class and of the peasantry is lower than the starvation existence minimum.

INCREASING RADICALIZATION OF THE MASSES

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

The growth of the discontent of the broad masses of the toilers caused a number of new phenomena to appear in the political life of

South and Caribbean America. In particular it should be emphasized, that in recent years the overthrow of governments in many of the countries of South and Caribbean America (due to the group struggles within the camp of the ruling classes) was partly the result of mass revolutionary actions, and was almost everywhere accompanied by such actions (especially the overthrow of the Ibanez government in 1931, Montero in 1932, the events in Chile and the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship in Cuba in 1933).

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

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

Simultaneously there was a strengthening of reaction, which made ever wider use of the experience and methods of European fascism and frequently formed semi-fascist organizations or organizations similar to fascist organizations, such as subsidiary organizations of the reactionary landlords, the church and the compradore (middlemen) bourgeoisie in the struggle which, with the aid of imperialism, they carried on against the proletariat and the peasantry. With the aid of a nationalist

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

"anti-capitalist" demagogy, they try to win the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie ("Integralists" and the "National Evolutionary" party in Brazil, the "National Socialists" in Chile, the "Civil Legion" in the Argentine, the blocs of the Catholic "Revolutionary Youth" in Mexico, etc.). These organizations, as the agents of foreign monopolist capital, directly connected with the reactionary section of the landlords, the bourgeoisie and the church, have not yet been able to establish any significant mass base for themselves. In a number of countries of South and Caribbean America intensified attempts are made to turn the trade unions into government apparatus, *e.g.*, the government trade unions as the sole trade-union organizations in Brazil, the formation of the so-called labor chambers in Mexico, etc. Moreover, some of the trade unions entering into these trade-union amalgamations come out against the government in a united front with the revolutionary trade unions (Brazil).

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

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

During the last few years, the general crisis in the Second International found its reflection also in the increasing confusion in the ranks of the biggest and most influential Socialist Party in South and Caribbean America, the Socialist Party of the Argentine (*e.g.*, the fierce struggle which took place primarily around the demand advanced by the membership masses of the party for the organization of the united front with the Communists, the rise of groupings in opposition to the party leadership, the actual expulsion of the entire Socialist Youth League and various party groups from the Socialist Party under the pretense of "reorganization", etc.). In the process of this internal struggle, in the Socialist Party of the Argentine as well as in other Socialist Parties, groups have arisen, the leaders of which, hiding behind "Left", opposition phrases, have often, and not without some success, held back the workers from joint revolutionary struggle with the Communist workers, as for instance, the group of Marianetti in the Argentine. At the same time, in connection with the accelerated breakdown of the Socialist Parties and the revolutionizing of the masses, Left Socialist groups and organizations spring up, which, on the basis of the united front, are developing in the direction of Communism. At the same time, there has been an increase in the urge towards direct entrance into the revolutionary trade unions and into the Communist Parties (especially in Cuba, Brazil and Paraguay).

In connection with the growing radicalization of the working class, the Pan-American Federation of Labor (an open agent of American

imperialism), which had tremendous influence in Caribbean America, has lost almost all of its influence in these countries (in South America it never had any influence).

THE CONDITIONS AND WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

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

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

The first conference of the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America in Montevideo in 1929 was of great significance for the

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

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

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

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

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

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

The anti-war work of the Communist Parties, with a few exceptions, has not yet taken on a systematic character (in Paraguay the Party was in actuality created in the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the war; the Communists in Peru conducted a heroic struggle against war).

Not a single Communist Party has yet adapted itself sufficiently to illegal conditions and at the same time has not been able to make full use of legal possibilities,

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

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

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

THE THIRD PARTY CONFERENCE

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

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

The intensified imperialist offensive, which is further deepening the semi-colonial dependence of the South American and Caribbean countries, is, under the conditions of the world economic crisis, further transforming these countries into appendages of the imperialist metropolises to serve as sources of agricultural products and raw materials, inflicting a serious blow at the relatively weak national industries. Simultaneously, this imperialist offensive has drawn the South American and Caribbean countries into a number of prolonged sanguinary wars (the war between Bolivia and Paraguay which is still going on, the war between Colombia and Peru which has been interrupted, at present the direct instigation of a war between Colombia and Venezuela, the threatening war between Chile and Bolivia, the severely tense relations between Brazil and Argentine); it has chained the South American

and Caribbean countries to a number of predatory treaties (the so-called "treaties of reciprocity" between the U.S.A. and Cuba, the trade agreement between the U.S.A. and Brazil, the Rocca Pact between England and the Argentine, etc.), which further enslave the South American and Caribbean countries and expose the broad toiling masses to unlimited exploitation.

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

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

The uprisings of the Indians, the regional movement of the peasant masses in several countries, are developing unevenly, and, in most cases, are not yet leading toward the expropriation and distribution of the landlords' lands and of the imperialist latifundia. Often these activities do not take place simultaneously with the rise in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and therefore end in defeat. The Communist Parties have not yet learned sufficiently well to follow up the revolutionary movement in the countryside with the great attention that it demands. They have not yet thoroughly understood this prime duty—to give conscious revolutionary direction to this movement from its very start, to link it up with the general struggle of the people for national liberation.

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

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

The national liberation struggle against imperialism has brought forward quite sharply the necessity of organizing the national revolution by systematically drawing the broadest national masses into the struggle against imperialism and its agents at home, and thus to form the widest national anti-imperialist front. In this connection, special attention must be paid to the task of drawing into the national liberation, anti-imperialist front the widest Indian and Negro peasant masses; *i.e.*, to decisively overcome the backwardness that has existed in this respect. Only by drawing the peasantry into the struggle for the liberation of the South American and Caribbean countries from the imperialist yoke, by leading the struggle against imperialist exploitation and enslavement, against the latifundia of the imperialists and of the native landlords who betray the interests of the struggle for national independence, can the struggle for national liberation truly become the cause

of the masses. The agrarian peasant revolution against feudalism, for the confiscation without compensation of the landlords' lands and the turning of this land over to its tillers, can develop to its full strength only by widening the struggle for national liberation. Only in the fire of this struggle can the proletariat of the South American and Caribbean countries definitely develop into the leading forces, can its vanguard—the Communist Parties of South and Caribbean America—become mass Communist Parties capable of fighting, not in words but in deeds, for the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois democratic revolution.

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

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

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

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

On the question of national reformism the Conference took for its basis the decision of the Sixth Congress of the C.I. which, as regards the national reformist opposition, as it is well known, does not exclude "temporary agreements" and the coordination of certain actions in connection with definite moves against imperialism, if the activity of bourgeois opposition can be utilized to develop the mass movement, and

if such agreements do not in any way limit the freedom of the Communist Parties in the agitational work among the masses and their organizations.

For the Parties of South and Caribbean America such a way of dealing with the question represented a serious tactical turn. The inability of these Parties to correctly distinguish and differentiate the roles of the various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in the growing anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution led occasionally to the revolutionary perspectives being toned down, and to an overestimation of the forces of the counter-revolution. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, which differed in the political role they played, in their class character and social composition, were regarded as a single reactionary front which would inevitably take action against the anti-imperialist revolution. The national revolutionary, petty-bourgeois parties, which had not yet outlived their illusion regarding the independent leading role of the petty bourgeoisie in the bourgeois democratic revolution, were characterized either as counter-revolutionary, national reformist parties, or else as outright reactionary fascist parties (the so-called Officers' Party in Brazil, the Guiteristas in Cuba, etc.). The national reformist parties, which at the moment when the mass movement was on the upsurge, issued radical anti-imperialist, and "socialist" slogans (the "Left" liberals in Brazil, the "Left" radicals in the Argentine, the A.P.R.A. in Peru, the Grovists in Chile, etc.), in order to divert the masses from the revolution, and to come to an agreement with imperialism at the expense of the interests of the masses, were regarded by the Communist Parties in South and Caribbean America as an inseparable part of the feudal imperialist camp. The Communist Parties underestimated the special importance of bourgeois national reformism, which has great influence over the petty bourgeoisie, peasantry and partly even over the working class in the countries in South and Caribbean America. As a result of this, they frequently adopted a "neutral" position when big mass struggles took place, fell into a passive attitude, and isolated themselves from the masses of the toilers at times when big political events took place (as for instance in the Argentine during the Uriburu coup d'etat in 1930; in Brazil during the coup d'etat brought about by the Liberal Alliance during the war between the state of Sao Paulo and the federal government; in Uruguay, during the coup d'etat in Terra in 1933, etc.).

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

The Conference was very clear in stressing the fact that basing their orientation on the revolution, and on the active role of the Com-

munist Party in the growing mass struggle, demands an unceasing struggle for the consolidation of the allies of the workers' and peasants' revolution around the proletariat, and for the establishment of a national liberation front of the people. What is more, there must be no exclusion of agreements with those national reformist elements, which, while they have influence over wide masses, are compelled, under the pressure of these masses at the beginning of the struggle to declare their agreement with the slogans of the national revolutionary liberation front. Only such a tactic can really draw in the many millions of the masses of the people. The Conference took into account the fact that this tactic is bound up with serious dangers. At the Conference, the delegation of the Communist Party of Brazil devoted serious attention to the dangers which threaten the mass revolutionary movement, in connection with the treachery of the national reformist elements of the bourgeoisie and of the generals and liberal governors (Interventos), who assume the colors of the people, which is inevitable with the development of the mass revolutionary struggles. These elements will undoubtedly attempt to split the national liberation alliance and capitulate to imperialism; they will attempt to draw the masses of peasants away from the proletariat, and split the ranks of the proletariat by the aid of provocative counter-revolutionary, Trotskyist and renegade groupings. These elements will undoubtedly pass over to the side of imperialism and of the landowners, and will attempt to stand at the head of the counter-revolution, especially when under the leadership of the proletariat the plebian agrarian revolution develops. The Communist Party of Brazil was especially sharp in stressing the task of consolidating the ranks of the proletariat as a class, the task of systematically defending their interests, of mustering their allies in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution around the Communist Party, and especially the task of transforming the Communist Party of Brazil into a consolidated mass Party, linked up by a thousand threads with the broadest sections of the oppressed and exploited masses.

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

* * *

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

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

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

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

After the Conference, certain successes were also achieved by the Communist Party of Cuba, which supported the revolutionary peasants of Realengo-18 in their fight against the efforts of the landowners and the foreign capitalists to drive them off the land. The peasants in Realengo formed a revolutionary committee taking over the local power. The mobilization of the widest masses of working peasants compelled the reactionary Mendieta government to give up the armed offensive against Realengo, to make concessions, and to conclude a non-aggression pact with the revolutionary peasants for a period of a year.

In Peru the Party succeeded in linking itself up with the wide masses

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

The Eve of Revolution in Brazil*

By KEIROS

THE National Conference of the Communist Party of Brazil took place in July, 1934, with 45 comrades participating. After hearing the reports of the Party leadership, the Conference recognized that Brazil is rapidly moving towards a deep revolutionary crisis. The next few months may be decisive for the unfolding of great events in Brazil.

These conclusions were drawn, not merely on the basis of the analysis made by the Thirteenth E.C.C.I. Plenum, but chiefly on the basis of the analyses of the struggles organized by us, as well as the spontaneous activities which have broken out and which the Communists are not leading as yet.

At the present time so many strikes are taking place in Brazil, that it is impossible to give accurate figures. It is even difficult to count the strikes which take place in the course of one week. These strikes are extremely stormy. But the trouble is that we very often lag at the tail end of the movement. The transition to the depression of a special kind is felt very little in Brazil; unemployment is growing in almost all branches of industry.

The consequences of the crisis in Brazil are horrible. When we read of the poverty of the Chinese, it seems to us that we are reading about the population of Brazil, because the same situation exists here. A large number of the workers eat meat only once a week. The peasants who have made annual contracts for work on the coffee plantations receive such low wages, that they are unable to exist on them. The plantation owners keep special overseers who force the peasants to work. But the poverty of the masses is so great that they are prepared to work on the plantations for any wage, for the alternative is starvation.

There can be no question of any mitigation of the crisis in Brazil. Armed struggle of the proletariat, of the peasantry, of the soldiers, is developing. The movement against imperialism and the central federal government is developing; in all parts of the country the struggle is increasing.**

The government, realizing only too well this militant mood of the masses, has prohibited strikes and made the trade unions illegal. But by prohibiting strikes and trade unions, the government only discredits itself in the eyes of the working masses.

How did the proletariat reply to this prohibition?

In less than a month 56 strikes in the chief enterprises and on the railways took place. Simultaneously, in spite of the restrictions, the workers called a congress for trade-union unity at the initiative of our Party.

The nature of these strikes has changed as well. Now, if the struggle once begins, it does not stop until the workers have won some concessions.

* Speech at the Third Conference of the Communist Parties of the countries of South and Caribbean America, held in the fall of 1934 in Uruguay.

** The number of strikers in Brazil in 1934 reached close to a million.

After several strikes in the winter and spring of 1934, in which we took part, the Plenum of the C.C. of the Communist Party was convened.

At the Plenum 37 workers participated—representatives of shop nuclei. The delegates were filled with enthusiasm. Having summed up our work and made an analysis of the conditions of the masses, we came to the conclusion that on May 1 a broad mass strike could be organized. And this was done. In the second half of April, the sailors, of whom there are 140,000 in Brazil, carried out the decision of the Plenum. They launched a powerful strike, putting forth demands for "naval assistance" and for pensions. We also organized a struggle of the doctors on the ships.

We prepared for struggle in other branches of industry as well. We launched the struggle in Nitcheray,* where a thousand railway workers appealed to the workers of a large railway company, Leopoldina, to call a strike. Eleven thousand railwaymen responded to the call and declared a strike. The strike spread to other branches of industry. Twenty-five thousand workers participated, and strained every effort to keep the struggle going. But the strike was betrayed, and one member of our Party took part in the negotiations with the government. We expelled him from the Party as an enemy and traitor to the masses.

On May 1 we called upon the broad masses of Rio de Janeiro to put up a fight. A conflict occurred between them and the government forces, 6 persons were killed and over 20 wounded. The authority of the Party is very great. In Rio de Janeiro we are leading a mass struggle.

In Santos a mass strike was developed for the release of one of our comrades.

After the events of August 23,** the Party appealed to the workers to declare a strike in defense of the Party and on behalf of its legal existence. Over 40,000 workers took part in the strike. The bourgeoisie mobilized not only rifles and machine guns, but heavy artillery as well.

Sixteen mass trade unions are demanding that the government recognize the legality of the Communist Party—the leader of the mass movement. One can judge how great is the role that the Party is playing, by the enthusiasm created in parliament by the speech of the Communist deputy, when he put forward our demands. Nothing of the kind has been heard for many years. It was met with colossal enthusiasm, and considerably raised the authority of our Party.

However, our cadres are still very weak; they do not yet know how to develop the struggle and cannot raise it to a higher level. Many of our comrades are in prison (true, during strikes we are able to get some of them released).

We are paying more attention to the raising of the political level of the Party. In spite of all difficulties, we have been successful in organizing political schools. Still, we do not have as yet comrades who are capable of making good reports on the crisis, on current topics, etc. Our strength consists in the contacts which our leaders have with the masses, in the fact that they are really the leaders of the mass movement.

We are fighting under very difficult conditions, but in this struggle the workers are displaying great organizational capabilities, and new cadres of leaders are forged in the course of the struggle. For example,

* Main railroad center near Rio de Janeiro.

** An Anti-War Congress opened on August 23. Demonstrations of many thousands of workers took place, demanding legality for the C.P., during which demonstrations many were killed and wounded.

we explained to one worker how Communist groups should be created in the army, how workers' detachments should be organized. And this absolutely illiterate worker, in a short space of time, organized an armed detachment of over 100 men.

At the national conference of the Party, we made an analysis of the situation and worked out a resolution and program of action for different parts of the country. This program we fulfilled to a considerable extent, and certain parts of it were even fulfilled entirely.

At the same time we turned to the offensive, so to speak, on the trade-union question and gained big successes. The S.G.T.B.*, which previously did not even have sufficient funds to publish a manifesto, in a few days had 100 reis in the treasury and was able to give support to the masses, and henceforth felt no financial difficulties. We are fighting for a truly mass S.G.T.B. In the autumn of 1934, more than 50,000 workers were already organized in the S.G.T.B. In Rio Grande du Sul 75 trade unions are turning in their membership cards to the Ministry of Labor**, and are joining the S.G.T.B. The same is the case in Minas Jerapa and other provinces. The Trade Union Congress in Rio Grande du Sul sent greetings and declared itself in support of our Party program and sent greetings to the Soviet Union. We are fighting for a united trade-union movement, and we think that we shall fulfill our task, because the Communists are connected with the masses which are within the government trade unions. We prepared the Party platform for the October elections. This platform was made public not only in the form of leaflets, but it was read at meetings of the workers and supported by the masses with great enthusiasm, especially in the trade union of the railwaymen of the Central Railway of Brazil.

We must bring about a united revolutionary front in the trade-union movement. The reformist V.K.T. can create many difficulties for us, but at present we have favorable opportunities of establishing a united trade-union movement.

The struggle that the revolutionary trade-union movement will wage in convening regional congresses, unity congresses, etc., will play a revolutionizing role. There are big possibilities of organizing the proletariat in Brazil. The railwaymen, under our leadership, are preparing a national congress of railwaymen and a national strike. We have formed a seamen's union on a national scale, which for three years the Ministry of Labor has been trying to smash without success. We must win over the textile workers' organization, with its 35,000 members and great fighting traditions. In Rio Grande du Sul a "Proletarian Congress" is being convened. The replies concerning the convening of the congress, sent to us from all workers' organizations in the state, shows that there we can certainly realize our task of uniting the trade-union movement. Already all the workers of Brazil, all the trade-union members, know that there exists a central trade-union leadership in Brazil. Correct tactics on our part to bring about a united front with all the workers—reformist, anarchist, travailist,*** etc.—can give good results. But we must extend considerably the struggle for the partial demands of the workers, and imbue it with a truly mass character. Only then shall we

* General Confederation of Labor, affiliated to the Profintern.

** Trade unions of the Ministry of Labor. The Ministry of Labor was set up for the purpose of creating government trade unions and subordinating them to the reactionary government.

*** Travailist—workers' party affiliated to the Second Internationalist. It does not have wide mass influence, and supports the policies of the Ministry of Labor.

win over the majority of the working class of Brazil, and shall we be able to create a central trade-union organization, embracing not 50-100,000 members, as is the case today, but hundreds of thousands of members.

We know that there are activities among the peasants in other countries in South and Caribbean America: in Mexico, Peru and Colombia, and that an ever-increasing number of the masses are involved in these activities. But in Brazil these activities are of a special character. For a revolutionist who understands anything at all about revolution, it is not difficult to convince himself, not on the basis of words, but of deeds, that great perspectives are opening up before us.

What is new in the peasant movement of Brazil? The agrarian crisis is rapidly sharpening. The peasant masses are taking up the armed struggle. These struggles in the village meet with response in the towns, link up with the movement of the proletariat, and, in its turn, the urban movement is meeting with response in the villages of the Northeast.

Not so long ago a strike of agricultural laborers, which was linked up with strikes of textile workers and paper workers, took place. On two plantations workers won satisfaction of their demands. As the result of a strike under our leadership, their example was followed at 19 other plantations. These strikes, called forth by the struggle of the peasantry, had the support of 7,000 workers in the towns.

We are all from the Northeast of Brazil, and although we are town-folk, we feel very keenly the consequences of drought. We know the situation in the Northeast, we know what insufficient activity of the Party in this respect can lead to, and we know how great is the responsibility of the Party at such a moment.

We know that the peasants live far away from each other, but the drought has united the village, united millions of the peasant masses. The Government has organized a concentration camp in order to prevent the influx of masses of the peasants into the towns. In the Northeast, 70-90,000 peasants are confined in these camps.

The peasants, hard hit by the drought, are beginning to utilize the armed struggle. Had the Party in 1929, when the drought began, understood its tasks and really taken measures to head the struggle of the peasantry suffering from the drought, we would have been able to record big successes. Because they have no means of paying their taxes, very many peasants are forced to go into hiding in the forests from soldiers or representatives of the State. This causes sharp conflicts between the government representatives and the masses of the peasantry. If the newspapers were willing to publish information concerning all these conflicts, there would be insufficient space in their columns to do so.

Our task is to make contact with these masses, to organize them and lead their struggles. You cannot imagine the poverty in Northeastern Brazil. People go a distance of 20-30 kilometers in order to get water. The population is actually dying out. Previously the peasant did not protest, made no effort to fight. Now, not only do they raid warehouses where food is stored, but State construction jobs as well, demanding that the engineers give them food. The population of the Northeast is 16,000,000. Very strong illusions still exist among them. For example, they nourish the hope that a priest, Ciceru, a mystic, a fanatic, a humbug, who speculates upon the backwardness of the masses, will bring them salvation. Just as in Rio de Janeiro, so in the Northeast, formerly the masses fell victim to the demagogy of the priests and liberal landlords; but now they are beginning to refuse to believe in them. These

priests and landlords promised that truckloads of food would be brought to the peasants, but instead, truckloads of soldiers arrived.

However, four years of drought have passed, and we have not made use of it to organize the struggle of the masses.

In the Amazon, as well, poverty is on the increase. Feudal exploitation is extraordinarily strong there. People tramp along the banks of the Amazon, in search of any kind of work on the plantations of the landlords. Previously in years of drought there was a way out for the peasants: they could go to San Paulo, to the coffee plantations or to gather rubber—now there is no way out for them. They are faced with one road only: to arm and to seize the land. And the broad masses are being set into motion.

The partisan movement is also growing, but here also new methods are employed in the struggle. Now the partisans are not alone in their struggle. The struggle has the support of the toilers in the villages. The Partisan Kangaseiros are calling to struggle, are uniting the poor peasants in their battle for bread and for life. The government can no longer successfully deal with this movement. It is no longer a small peasant uprising against which it was enough to dispatch a hundred soldiers. In the Bahia province alone, the partisans represent a detachment of approximately 1,500 men, armed with machine guns, equipped with motor trucks, etc. Tales about the Lampeoni,* those defenders of freedom, defenders of the peasants, are carried from mouth to mouth.

The struggle of the peasantry is spreading, embracing one province after another. For example, in the state of Rio de Janeiro, the peasants, armed with weapons, are coming out for the right to set up their own local authorities. In Bara du Pirahy, the peasantry fought under the guidance of our Party for their own partial demands, and won satisfaction. The peasants are fighting against being driven off the land. There are cases when the peasantry travel over 2-3,000 kilometers in order to get in touch with the Communist Party and be given leaders for their struggle. But we are unable to serve them to a sufficient degree.

We are very backward in developing our work in the villages. However, it cannot be said that we have accomplished nothing in the villages. We have a few nuclei, there are district organizations, there are bases which we can use as a starting point. It is the same in San Paulo and in other states. At our conference, we recorded that in all districts we already have a base in the village—true, as yet not a large one. We must do our utmost to develop work in the village. Actually, we began this work only some 7-8 months ago, when for the first time the question of the tasks of our work in the village was raised seriously.

Nevertheless, the peasants are already seeking to make contact with the Communist Party. The authority of the Party in the village is growing. We no longer hear our rank-and-file comrades say that the masses understand nothing and want nothing; on the contrary, they now say that the masses have really entered the path of revolution. We have heard declarations of this kind both in the factories and in the villages. A comrade from San Paulo informs us that he has been successful in creating three peasant nuclei per week.

We see that parallel with the struggle that we are developing in the towns, a struggle is also developing in the village. And, vice versa, the struggle in the village calls forth a response in the town. Our lower

* Lampeoni, leader of peasant partisan detachment, who became a popular leader in Northeastern Brazil.

Party organizations are already beginning to understand the role of the Party. Our lower organizations are beginning to understand the basic points upon which we must touch in our work. The comrades understand how important it is to establish and strengthen our organizations at the Rio de Janeiro electrical power station, because it is the main strategic point in winning over the workers in Rio de Janeiro. And this in itself means a lot, when the comrades begin to understand the role of our strategic points.

The railwaymen propose that a conference of railwaymen be called jointly with the peasants, in order to link up the movement of the railwaymen with that of the peasantry.

Let us call to mind the past. The peasantry expected much from the heroic campaigns of the Prestes* detachments. The peasantry took part in the uprisings of 1924 and 1928. This campaign was unable to satisfy the demands of the peasant masses. I think that our Party is capable of, and should utilize the revolutionary traditions in the village connected with the Prestes movement as a real force, since the peasant masses up to the present have expected that their liberation is to come at the hands of Prestes.

During the coup d'etat in 1930, the Alliance Liberale** actually succeeded in mobilizing the masses with promises of a distribution of the cattle and a distribution of the land. The peasants also heard that after the "revolution" they would get land. In the capital of Sergipe state it was said that the 1930 revolution would at least give the land to the peasants. The authorities of the state, fighting against the workers, were unable, despite the fact that they had greater forces at their disposal, to check the movement of the peasants who were seizing the land. But the peasantry was deceived by the Alliance Liberale, which in place of the old bourgeois landlord government, set up a new one of the same type.

In 1932, when peasant masses both in San Paulo and in the Northeast were being mobilized during the war between the Paolists*** and the Central Government, they were once more promised land and again deceived. The peasants began to turn to the Communist Party because when tens of thousands of peasants went to fight against the Paolists, only the Party told the truth to these peasants, and many of them began to fight against the bourgeois landlord regime and against war.

But today the masses of workers and peasants are already disillusioned; they understood that neither the advent to power of the Alliance Liberale in 1930, nor other attempts of the same kind, can improve their position. The disillusionment that the masses feel in the government is extremely great. Now the masses know that these people will give them nothing whatsoever.

I want to refer to one fact which occurred during the coup d'etat of the Alliance Liberale in 1930, when the masses of the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie came out on the streets.

* The Prestes detachments developed in 1924 as revolutionary organizations, consisting mainly of military elements. It embraced about 2,000 people and carried on a revolutionary war against the government with the support of the peasantry. The Prestes detachments carried on their campaign over an area of 25,000 square kilometers, but in the end were forced to go to Bolivian territory.

** Alliance Liberale—Party of the bourgeoisie and landlords, linked up primarily with U.S.A. imperialism. In 1930 it came to power during a government coup d'etat.

*** Paolists—the Party of large coffee plantation owners. In 1932 led the war in San Pablo against the feudal government.

How did the masses of the people interpret this action?

In the majority of cases they began to fight against imperialism. It was absolutely in vain that we tried to get the Party to enter the struggle at the time, when the masses in Bahia set fire to the street cars. It is important to bear in mind that Bahia is populated by Negroes, the most oppressed of the population. The broad masses of the towns took part in this struggle, and the government was absolutely unable to do anything against this force. On that day I participated in the demonstrations. I saw the town in darkness, saw the crowds running from place to place, setting fire to street cars. The entire town was enveloped in flames, and no force—neither the government nor the troops—could beat back the rebels. The masses shouted: "Long live the Communist Party. Long live Communism." But after the masses had smashed the police and army units, the workers asked themselves the question: what should they do next? Had there, at that moment, existed a Party, linked up with the masses, enormous perspectives would have been opened up before us.

* * *

And now on the situation in the army. The army in Brazil is demoralized from the top to the bottom. It is not an army like that in the Argentine. In no other army is there such bad discipline as in the Brazilian army. This army does not resemble the German, the French nor the army of any other country. This army has behind it traditions of revolutionary struggle. Military schools were always strongholds of the revolutionary struggle for democratic liberty. In 1922 I myself was a soldier. At that time our discipline was such that we had only to be given a few cartridges, and we would immediately ask for a light from the officers. The soldiers took part in the uprisings.

The majority of the officers are from the petty bourgeoisie. They are young people who were unsuccessful in becoming officials, unsuccessful in winning their bachelor degrees, and who entered the army, because officers are paid salaries.

What has been happening in the army recently? There has been a strike in the military school, organized by our youth nucleus. The young men protested against compulsory drill, for better food, etc.

Now we have Communist organizations in the majority of the corps. The army is sympathetic towards strikers. The soldiers came to a textile factory and said: "We are not against the workers and will support you, have no fear".

A constant struggle is going on in the barracks. In the North the soldiers are reading the Party manifesto calling upon them to organize soviets and telling them about the Soviet Union.

In Pernambuco in 1931 the soldiers organized, arrested their officers and took the government into their own hands. They seized the palaces and banks, took control of the tax apparatus, the post and the telegraph. And then they did not know what to do next. They then appealed to the officers who claimed to be in solidarity with the soldiers, and released some of these officers. But the officers organized the forces of counter-revolution and despite their strong resistance the soldiers were crushed. Many of them were arrested and shot. The government, realizing the sympathy felt towards these units, disbanded them and the arrested men were transferred to the south, into other units. However, they continued to struggle even there and the struggle came to an end only when all the arrested men had been crushed. Information

came to us that they had all perished. In Recife, when the struggle broke out on the streets, the masses had become so accustomed to the fact that the soldiers would be solid, that they immediately set out for the barracks to get weapons. In 1931 the soldiers themselves distributed weapons among the people, going from street to street and from house to house. But all of them were defeated, although many workers took part in the fighting.

In San Paulo of late the soldiers have been struggling for better food, better uniforms, and against the abuse of military drill. The recent uprising (in the beginning of 1934) was conducted under our leadership. Seventy per cent of the army consists of people who join the ranks to avoid death by starvation, and peasants who have been thrown off the land by the landlords or have sought refuge from the drought. This is the situation in the army of Brazil—the largest army in any of the countries of South and Caribbean America.

The same situation exists in the police force of Brazil. The Communists have their sympathy. There are cases when policemen go out of their way to shake the hand of a Communist.

On whom, then, does the government rely? Who defends the government? It is defended by the "special police", a specially selected, well-paid corps, the Integralist* forces.

To characterize the existing situation, I will give no less significant examples from the struggle of the petty-bourgeois masses. The petty merchants of Brazil participate in the strikes against taxes, this struggle being led by petty-bourgeois leaders. Another fact. In Blumenau the population is German, and constitutes a national minority. The government wanted them to learn the Portuguese language, wanted to prohibit the German language in the schools. But the masses of workers, petty bourgeoisie and peasantry, rose up against this, organized big demonstrations and made preparations for a fight. We see the same thing in San Paulo, where the peasantry fought for local self-government in order not to pay taxes. In Rio de Janeiro bank clerks participated in a strike led by our trade-union center, and came out victorious. In the same way the court employees also went on strike.

The petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia are in a terrible situation. The wages of the dockers of Rio de Janeiro are higher than the earnings of the majority of the doctors. Journalists earn incomparably less than workers employed on government construction jobs. Bank clerks are referred to as "gilded paupers". They are forced to go to work in silk shirts, but in actual point of fact they are paupers, who are unable to pay for their apartments or to support their families.

All this causes great dissatisfaction among all strata of the population. The workers are anxious to fight.

The Communist Party of Brazil does not as yet understand how to use united front tactics in order to win over the majority of the proletariat and to bring broad masses of the people into the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Some activities were conducted successfully, but we made several mistakes. We launched the strike in Rio de Janeiro and other districts of Brazil, but strikes alone do not decide the problem as a whole. Our task is to mobilize wider masses.

With this as the starting point—and this should be clear to every Communist—we must create an independent class-conscious Party, a truly mass party of the proletariat. We must stand at the head of the

* Integralists—Brazilian fascists.

movement of the workers and peasants as a whole and of the movement of the petty bourgeoisie. And this compels us to approach the question of the united front seriously.

In our united front tactics we cannot offer a recipe that can be applied in all cases. In each concrete case we should put forward concrete demands. In the struggle against imperialism, in the struggle against reaction and against the fascist bands, it is necessary to put forth demands which will serve to mobilize the broadest masses in the towns and villages.

We are beginning to understand better how to apply the united front tactics, and this gives us important results. These results are the big meetings and demonstrations which have taken place in Rio de Janeiro, Rio Grande du Sul, and San Paolo. In Rio Grande du Sul, we have mobilized not only our own trade unions, but have made a proposal for a united front to the government trade unions, as well as to the small trade unions of the bank clerks. This gave us an opportunity to organize a big mass demonstration on August 3. The police answered the demonstrations of the workers with machine guns. Many were killed and wounded. But in spite of the terror, the masses boldly joined in the demonstration. According to our calculations, as many as 20,000 participated in this demonstration. Representatives of the peasantry from Barra du Pirahi also participated. An anti-war committee was set up composed of representatives of the trade unions, including also doctors and representatives of the petty bourgeoisie. All this is a result of the adoption of the united front tactics. The fact that the proletariat responded by developing strikes and extending the revolutionary movement only confirms the fact that the united front tactics were successful. These are all only small examples demonstrating our mistakes and successes.

In analyzing the question of the united proletarian front in Brazil, it is essential to underline the fact that contrary to the position in the Argentine, there is no centralized Socialist Party in Brazil nor any other party of that kind. Neither is there any centralized, reformist confederation of labor. We have no agrarian federation (as in the Argentine), or any organization resembling it. The only party on a national scale which united all the provinces, embracing 17 district committees, is the Communist Party. We can say that there is fertile soil in Brazil for our work. We can make our proposals for the united front, to such parties as, for example, the labor (Travailiste) party, and the "Tenientists"* But until only recently the question has not arisen in Brazil of unity of action on a national scale. Proposals for unity of action were of a casual kind, while, as a matter of fact, there are extensive possibilities in Brazil for launching the united front. We have nothing to be afraid of in the united front with the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the kangaseirus (partisans) and even with certain national reformist elements from the bourgeois parties.

At the present moment, the main question in Brazil is the struggle against imperialism, against the latifundia owners, against imperialist intervention in the Northeast. It is necessary to create a broad people's front, for the task confronts us of struggling against imperialism, of fighting against fascist bands, against integralism, against reaction, on behalf of democratic liberties, for the confiscation of the lands of foreign latifundia owners, and national traitors, for the distribution of land

* Party of middle officers, composed mainly of petty-bourgeois revolutionary elements,

among the peasants, for the eight-hour working day, for national independence and the unity of Brazil, for the overthrow of the Vargas government—the agency of imperialism—and for the creation of a national revolutionary government.

* * *

This is the situation in Brazil. The Communist Party has grown up side by side with the growth of the mass movement.

We have no rank-and-file Party members, and no members of the Central Committee, who do not carry on daily work in nuclei. Every week we control the work of every comrade, and discuss all that he has done for the nucleus. We are not impressed by, neither do we fall victims to, the influence of those red speeches which he may have uttered in the Central Committee, but we check up on his local work, look into what results he has achieved in the nucleus.

The present position is very different from that of a year ago, when we had leaders who were not seen in their nucleus for six months at a time. Now the Party controls and puts to the test the work of every one of its members.

We are reconstructing the Party. Previously 90 per cent of our organizations was composed of street nuclei. Now we are conducting a big campaign to convert these street nuclei into shop nuclei.

We no longer have small nuclei in the factories consisting of only five or six persons. In the factories our nuclei rely upon committees of struggle. We have nuclei with over 100 members, which have already won for themselves a definite position in the trade-union movement, and especially in the railwaymen's union of the Central Brazilian Railway, which is composed of 15,000 members.

How do we recruit new members into the Party? The entire organization as a whole, as well as responsible comrades especially attached to the nuclei, is responsible for this work. They are responsible to us also for the organization of conferences of sympathizers, for the mass organizations under the leadership of the nuclei.

In this respect we are very backward in San Paolo. In San Paolo we have used up more forces than elsewhere; provocation has taken from us our best cadres. But we have taken determined steps and have begun to form our cadres in the heat of the struggle, during the strikes which have been taking place there recently.

How did we begin to make contacts with the masses? We explained to our Party membership that if the nuclei are not linked up with the masses, if they do not guide the work of the strike committees, then they will be mere groups of monks, of sophists—anything you like, but not Communist nuclei. In the nucleus we also discuss the demands of the workers, discuss the work of those mass organs which work under the guidance of the nuclei. We interested sympathetic workers in the work of the nuclei and began to overcome the colossal fluctuation of members which previously existed in our organizations. We did all this in the heat of a severe ideological struggle, in a struggle against Right opportunism, which was particularly strong in our Party, against the survivals of the renegade group of Ostrajild. For example, we gave the nucleus of the big Lloyd factory, where the leadership was very weak, an opportunity to lead a strike. The strike was carried through, and—what is most important—the workers elected a broad shop committee consisting of 90 persons.

What is the composition of the Party leadership today? All of us have behind us years, decades of revolutionary struggle, true, many years outside the ranks of the Party.

There are many hostile influences in our Party, the level of ideological development is not high enough; we have too few comrades among the leaders who have read more than five Marxist-Leninist books, and many of us cannot read at all. But we have all had experience in the struggle, and we are all in contact with the masses.

We still have many chatterboxes, honest chatterboxes. We don't want to listen to them "hailing" the political line in their empty reports. We want to see people who can put the line of the Party into actual practice. We want to know people who are capable of creating nuclei, who are able to convert these nuclei into truly mass organizations; we want to know leaders who are able to organize and lead the struggle.

Recently, as the results of the struggles we have led, new cadres have been acquired. These are really leaders, leaders whom the masses know.

* * *

What must we say in summing up? The landlords and the bourgeoisie feel the acuteness of the situation. They say that a cruel fate awaits them, that Brazil is facing a national revolution, a revolution of the Russian type. It is impossible to hold back the struggle of the peasants and workers of Brazil any longer: the troops cannot be relied on, the police are weak. It is said that the police sometimes even sympathize with the workers and peasants. For this reason, the bourgeoisie are seeking a strong government. They are training special police, which are already concentrated in the key positions. The bourgeoisie are compelled to admit that the constitution and the constituent assembly were compromised in the eyes of the masses with the very day they were created.

A great responsibility lies upon us. We must go into the villages with slogans that the masses will be able to utilize properly. We must change our methods of agitation and propaganda in the village. Our manifestoes go into the villages, and the peasants, reading them, say: "Let us seize the land!" They come together and say that they no longer want to pay taxes. They say, "In your manifesto we read about exactly that which we already intended doing ourselves." And the peasantry are beginning to make the transition to actually carrying out our call to struggle.

What will happen if we link up with the broad masses of the Northeast? We must not fear that we shall be called golpists*, putschists. The peasants want to fight with arms in hand. The soldiers want to fight for a better life. The broad masses of the people are joining the struggle. We shall fight, arms in hand, for the improvement of their material conditions, against imperialism, against the reactionary government of Vargas, against the latifundia owners. Enough of this trailing at the tail end of the movement! The movement must be properly organized!

We know our weaknesses, but we must nevertheless state that the revolution will come in Brazil. And if the Party does not win positions for itself in Brazil, it will be discredited in the eyes of the mass of workers and peasants, who are waiting for their leader to arise in the form of the Communist Party.

* Golpists—groupings which prepare coup d'etat.

Jose Americu* threw in our faces the statement that the Northeast is a force, which, if thrown into battle, no other force will be able to check. This is exactly what Getulio Vargas** said, when he drew therefrom the conclusion that preparations must be made for violent reaction. Getulio and the ruling clique are preparing for reaction, for terror. Do you not agree that in the face of these prospects it would be gross irresponsibility on our part not to take proper measures? We must head the struggle of the people. And in the course of this struggle, we shall grow into a mighty force capable of leading millions in the struggle for national liberation, for land, for bread, for freedom.

* Jose Americu—the secretary of state of Parahiba who made use of demagogic slogans to draw the peasants of Parahiba into the government coup d'etat in 1930.

** Getulio Vargas—the President of the Brazilian Republic, who came to power through the government coup d'etat in 1930. He was the leader of the Alliance Libérale and pursues a reactionary policy. Vargas is connected with American imperialism, but frequently makes concessions to the supporters of the English orientation.

The Victory of the Socialist Ownership and the Development of Soviet Democracy

By E. PASHUKANIS

THE Seventh Congress of Soviets* adopted a resolution to introduce certain amendments into the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These amendments to the Constitution are to give a more precise definition to its social and economic basis, and to reflect the grandiose changes that have taken place in the economics, and in the relation of class forces, inside the country. The transformation of the U.S.S.R. into a socialist country, the victory of the collective farming system, the liquidation in the main of the capitalist elements, the consolidation of public, socialist, ownership in both town and country—all this has to be reflected in the text of the new Soviet Constitution.

For the first time in the history of mankind, changes are being made in the Constitution of a State to correspond with changes in the social structure which have come about, not as the result of blind, spontaneous development, but have been achieved consciously and on a planned basis, according to a pre-conceived program.

Indeed, the abolition of capitalist exploitation, the abolition of classes was declared to be the basic aim of the Soviet State. It was so stated in the first Constitution of 1918. Now, in 1935, this aim has been accomplished in the main. Three-quarters of the citizens of the Soviet Union are manual and other workers employed in socialist enterprises, and collective farmers.

In his report to the Congress, Comrade Molotov gave figures to show the grandiose changes that have taken place in the class composition of the population of the Soviet Union, not only as compared with the year 1913, but also with 1928.

Workers and office employees, of whom there were 23,000,000 in 1913, and 26,343,000 in 1928, numbered 47,118,000 in 1934. In 1918 there were no collective farmers at all, and in 1928 they numbered a total of 4,406,000, while in 1934 there were 77,037,000 collective farmers throughout the U.S.S.R.

In 1913 and 1928, individual peasant farmers constituted the main mass of the population numbering 90,700,000 and 111,131,000 respectively. In 1934, there remained 37,902,000 individual peasant farmers. The bourgeoisie, large and small, including kulaks, who numbered 22,100,000 in 1913 and 6,801,000 in 1928, fell in number to 174,000 in 1934 (one-tenth of one per cent of the total population).

We get the same picture from the figures for the distribution of funds invested in production. Between 1925 and 1934, the funds invested in the socialist sector rose from 48 per cent of the total, to 95.8 per cent of the total funds invested in production.

The funds invested in the capitalist sector, on the contrary, fell from

* The Seventh Congress of Soviets took place in Moscow from January 23 to February 6, 1935.

6.5 per cent to 0.09 per cent and of the small private enterprises—from 44.7 per cent to 4.1 per cent of the total funds invested in production.

During these years there has also taken place an enormous increase in the absolute figures of the funds invested in socialist production, *viz.*, between 1925 and 1934 they have increased from 22 billion to 90 billion rubles.

About 96 per cent of the total funds invested in production are concentrated in the socialist sector. New mighty means of production have been set up on the socialist foundation, of which old Russia could never dream. All that was expropriated from the capitalists and landlords represents but an insignificant part of what has been created by the labor of the working class who have become masters of the state and of production. About 80 per cent of the peasants in agriculture have been brought into the collective farms. The most difficult task of reorganizing the millions of small, dwarfed peasant farms into large collective farms has been solved. Socialism has become the predominant economic form in town and country, and is on the eve of becoming the only order in being in the U.S.S.R.

The might of the land of socialism is clearly reflected in the annual budget which amounts to 65 billion rubles, a budget which knows no deficits, at a time when all the wealthiest capitalist countries are unable to extricate themselves from serious budget difficulties and colossal deficits.

The growing importance of public, socialist, ownership is also to be seen in the fact that the income of the State budget of the U.S.S.R. is being more and more derived from the profits received from socialist enterprises.

Credit and banking business are entirely in the hands of the State. The lion's share of trade turnover is State and cooperative trade; the remainder falls to collective farm trading. The private trader, the intermediary, and speculator have been driven out of trade. Developed Soviet trade is trade without private intermediaries, is trade from which all motives of gain and profit have been removed.

Public, socialist, ownership has become the basis of the Soviet system not only in the town, but also in the village.

The text of the new Constitution has to reflect and consolidate these achievements. The principle of public, socialist, ownership must be introduced into the Constitution as its fundamental and all-determining basis, so that this Constitution becomes an extremely keen weapon in the struggle for the final liquidation of the survivals of capitalism in the economics and the consciousness of the people of the U.S.S.R.

The decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets, adopted following the proposals made by the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, also provide for changes in the Soviet electoral system, in the direction of its further democratization by way of the introduction of equal suffrage and direct elections, and the secret ballot.

In this case also we are dealing with decisions which do not constitute anything unexpected, any departure from the prospects of the development of the Soviet State, as dealt with in the works of Lenin and Stalin.

The attempts of certain bourgeois newspapers to declare that the changes in the electoral system are almost "a retreat from the ideological foundations of the Soviet government" can only be put down to complete ignorance or conscious lack of scruples.

Actually, the further democratization of the Soviet electoral system constitutes the conservative, straightforward development of the fundamental bases of the Soviet system, which were laid down in October, and which together with the progressive trend of development of socialist construction will be applied ever more extensively and planfully.

The prospects of the gradual abolition of suffrage restrictions have been repeatedly pointed out by *Lenin* and *Stalin*. As far back as 1918, in the theses on Soviet Power presented to the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin foresaw the "extension of the Soviet Constitution to cover the whole of the population *in proportion as* the resistance of the exploiters is broken".*

In his reply to questions put by students of the "Sverdlov" Communist University in the year 1925, and when talking about livening up the Soviets, Comrade Stalin emphasized the point that the bounds to the extension of Soviet democracy indicated at that time in the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Conference and the Third Congress of Soviets of the U.S.S.R., would not "remain unchanged forever. On the contrary. As our national economy develops, as the economic and political power of the proletariat becomes ever more consolidated, as the revolutionary movement in the West and in the East progresses, as the international situation of the Soviet State improves, so proportionally, will our concessions undoubtedly assume wider scope."**

After quoting the words of Lenin above mentioned, Comrade Stalin continues:

"What is referred to here is the extension of the Constitution to the whole of the population, including the bourgeoisie. This was said in March 1918. From that date till the day of Lenin's death there was an interval of more than five years, but Lenin never once during that period even hinted that it was opportune to apply this postulate. Why? Because the time had not yet come for it. But the time will come when the internal and international position of the Soviet State will have become finally consolidated, of that there can be no doubt."***

Now the position of the Soviet State has been consolidated to such an extent, that it can grant the suffrage to a certain section of the kulaks who have ceased their resistance to the collective farms and have taken up a life of honest toil.

The transition to equal suffrage in just the same way is nothing at all unexpected. The Party program of the C.P.S.U. clearly and precisely refers to the temporary character of the advantages established by the Constitution for the industrial proletariat. The program links up the institution of these advantages with "the difficulties of the socialist organization of the village".

It is clear that now that the collective farming system has achieved victory, now that the kulaks have in the main been liquidated, now that there is the collective farmer in the Soviet village—and he is a stable bulwark of the Soviet government—there is every reason for the transition to equal suffrage.

The fact that the workers and peasants are now to have equal suffrage is the best proof of the colossal successes achieved in the reconstruction of agriculture on socialist lines. It signifies the further con-

* *Lenin*, Vol. 22, page 372. Russ. Ed.

** *Stalin*: *Leninism*, Vol. 1, p. 219. English Ed.

*** *Ibid.*

solidation of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. It goes without saying that leadership by the working class is, as hitherto, the main condition for the successful struggle for the final liquidation of the survivals of capitalism in the village. But the chief difficulties connected with the reconstruction of the village on socialist lines have already been overcome. There was a time when Trotsky prophesied that the proletariat, when bringing socialism about, would inevitably come into conflict with the basic masses of the peasantry. These Menshevik prophesies have failed ignominiously. The process of development is going in the entirely opposite direction of a closer and closer rapprochement between town and village in the sphere of economics, culture and politics, an ever increasing growth of proletarian influence over the peasantry, and an increase in the authority of the Communist Party. Some bourgeois newspapers, even, have been compelled to admit this fact, when making efforts to give an objective appraisal of the full meaning of the changes to be made in the Soviet suffrage. Trotsky, the counter-revolutionary slanderer, has nothing left to do but to raise a howl, in common with the foulest fascist scribes, to the effect that there is actually no Constitution and no suffrage in the U.S.S.R., and that it is a "party bureaucracy" that holds the reins of power in the U.S.S.R. The food for the soul that Mr. Trotsky brings to his few adherents differs in no way from that which they can get from the "unified press" of Hitler Germany.

It is characteristic that in commenting on the amendments to the Soviet Constitution fully, a newspaper, published in the land where the hangmen of the Hungarian proletarian revolution hold the reins of power, agrees with the foul attacks made by Trotsky upon the C.P.S.U. and its leadership, and pays compliment after compliment to the betrayers of the working class, the counter-revolutionaries, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev.

The bankrupt leaders of Social-Democracy are trying to utilize the decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets in order to rouse bourgeois-democratic illusions among the masses once more. These gentlemen find nothing so tempting as to make it appear that the Soviet system, with its unequal, open and indirect elections, was in some degree behind the "more perfected" parliamentary democracy, and that now, apparently, the Bolshevik Party has itself admitted this and is hastening to catch up to the "advanced" countries. It is in this spirit that the *Neue Vorwaerts* of February 24, 1935, commented on the amendments in the Soviet Constitution.

This new edition of an old lie must be thoroughly unmasked and ridiculed. The Soviet political system, the Soviet political order is the most advanced, most progressive, and most democratic, and has been so ever since it was first established, since the October Revolution.

"Even during the first period, when the forces of the working class were still small and certain limitations in the election system were inevitable, the Soviet system represented an embodiment of the highest type of democracy, signifying the attraction to government administration of the great masses of toilers on an unheard-of scale." (Molotov, Speech at the Seventh Congress of Soviets on the "Revision of the Constitution".)

The Soviet system is an unheard-of extension of democracy for the toilers, and it has become possible because power, the land, capital and political rights were wrested from the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

This is the historic achievement still to be attained by the countries where universal, direct, equal and secret franchise ensure the domination of the capitalists, thanks to the link between the government and the stock exchange, thanks to bribery, and the pressure exerted by capital upon public opinion, and thanks to the fact that the press, the schools, the church, science, and the whole machinery of State, are in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The entire history of the class struggle has proved that "formal equality cannot be the form of struggle for material equality against actual inequality".*

The changes in the electoral system, in the direction of a transition to equal and direct elections with the secret ballot, is taking place on a Soviet basis, *i.e.*, on the basis arrived at by class struggle and civil war against the capitalists; on the basis of the destruction of the yoke of capital, of private ownership; on the basis of the destruction of the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie during the course of the proletarian revolution.

Among Lenin's works there remained the plan of a pamphlet on proletarian dictatorship, which contains an excellent formulation of the difference in principle between bourgeois and proletarian democracy.

"Bourgeois democracy is decision by voting, *i.e.*, by the formal manifestation of will while preserving the capitalist determinants (motivations) of the will. Proletarian democracy is decision by the class struggle and civil war against the exploiter. In its struggle, in its revolutionary struggle, the proletariat *destroys* capitalist property relations, and therefore the capitalist determinants (motivations) of the will and decision for the waverers." **

The liquidation of the kulaks as a class, on the basis of mass collectivization, and the consolidation of the collective farms, organizationally and economically constituted the final decisive blow at the "capitalist determinants of will", and have created a stable basis for the further democratization of the Soviet electoral system.

In this same draft, Lenin underlines the fact that the condition for decision by the majority is honest subordination. To presuppose that the capitalists possess this honesty implies to gloss over capitalism and deceive the toilers. This is what the reformists do. They lull the masses with the empty illusion of the honest subordination of the capitalists to the vote of the majority.

The Communists solve the problem otherwise: "First overthrow the yoke of money, the power of capital, and private ownership, and then the prolonged development of 'honesty' on this basis." ***

As Marx and Engels taught us, universal suffrage on the basis of bourgeois parliamentarism only provides an opportunity for calculating forces, for carrying on extensive agitation, for taking hold of the parliamentary tribune and using it to organize the masses.

Universal suffrage under capitalism can give no more. It remains the form of the domination of capital in circumstances where the bourgeoisie stands firmly on its feet, and where it can reduce non-economic compulsion to a minimum.

"The democratization of the electoral system was an expression of the confidence of the bourgeoisie in the growth of its

* Lenin: *Miscellany*, Vol. III, p. 495, Russ. Ed.

** *Ibid.*, p. 496.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 545.

power, of its confidence in the ability of the bourgeois power to subdue the masses in accordance, as it were, with their own will." (Molotov—Speech at the Seventh Congress of Soviets on the "Revision of the Soviet Constitution".)

In the imperialist epoch, when monopolist capital comes on the scene, the bourgeoisie resorts first and foremost to means of non-economic compulsion. It turns from parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, it turns to "strong government", to open dictatorship. Now, in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, one bourgeois power after another is turning to terrorist methods of government, laying naked the direct dependence of the apparatus of state compulsion upon the mighty organizations of monopolist capitalism.

Fascism is the regular product of bourgeois democracy at that stage when the threat is levelled at what is fundamental, namely, capitalist private ownership; when there is no other way of saving it but through unrestricted violence and terror directed against the working class.

And on the contrary, every step taken to unfold Soviet democracy is the regular result of the destruction of the oppressive, bourgeois, State machinery and of the economic power of capital.

The profound democratic character of the Soviet system, which differs in principle from the democracy of the most enlightened capitalist countries, is to be seen at every step in all spheres of State and social life.

It seems to be an absolutely natural thing in the U.S.S.R. that political and social life is free from the influence of the church.

But is it not true that this mighty weapon of the political domination of capital over the exploited, these fetters which bind the will and reason of the toilers, make themselves felt in all the other countries of the world?

And equal rights for women, which have released half the toiling population of the U.S.S.R. from the position of humiliation and semi-slavery in which they formerly existed—equal rights in the family, in daily life, in industry, in the factory, in the collective farm; is this not a sign of the broadest democracy, which is only possible where the dictatorship of the proletariat has broken down the fetters of private ownership?

And is not the Red Army the most democratic army in the world? Its profound proletarian democratic character is felt both in the comrades feeling which exists between the Red Army men and their commanders, in the relationship which exists between the army and the population, and in the fact that the Red Army is a school which brings closer together the toilers of different nations, a school of international education and of the struggle against Great-Russian chauvinism and local nationalism.

Every Red Army unit today is the bearer of the most advanced, most democratic culture, not only as compared with the armies of capitalist countries, but as compared with their universities, where bestial theories of race alienation and race hatred are propounded.

And the conditions of the trade-union organizations, their rights, the part they play in industry and in the State, do not all these point to a democracy which is only possible where the proletariat have seized the reins of power, and where production is subordinated to the interests of the toilers, and not the interests of private profit?

In operating its dictatorship, the working class of the Soviet Union aroused the intermediary sections of the toilers, and first and foremost the huge masses of peasants, to political life and political activity, educating them politically and drawing them into the management of the

State, into the organization of production. Mass collectivization, moreover, which called new strata of men and women peasants to conscious, social activity, produced a colossal increase in the political activity of the rural masses.

After all that has been said, it is clear that the amendments to the Soviet Constitution, as outlined by the Seventh Congress, must be evaluated from the viewpoint of the *consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat*, from the viewpoint of the extension of Soviet democracy, and on no account from the viewpoint of the advantages of some sort of abstract democracy.

As we know, it was in the name of this abstract democracy, in the name of the formal rights of the Constituent Assembly, that international Menshevism declaimed; it was under this banner that the renegade Kautsky fought against the Soviets.

It would seem that there is no longer any need to discuss questions to which history has already given the answers. The Russian Constituent Assembly prepared the ground for Kolchak, while the victory of the Weimar "National Constituent Assembly" in Germany paved the way for Hitler's bloody dictatorship.

And the Soviets have been the bodies around which the masses of the toilers have been concentrated; they have been the bodies guided by the proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist Party, which have converted the backward, impoverished land of the Soviets into the citadel of victorious socialism.

The Congresses of Soviets, though not elected by direct and equal elections, expressed the real will of the working class and the advanced peasants, while the bourgeois parliaments, elected by direct and equal voting, reflected the pressure exerted by capital, the power of private ownership, the influence of the church upon the backward strata of the population, and were the result of a whole system of bribery, violence and deception.

Bourgeois and Social-Democratic critics of the Soviet system have spilled quite an amount of ink in attacking the indirect elections which have existed up to now in the U.S.S.R., depicting them as a cunning device on the part of the Bolsheviks to ensure a Party majority in the various Soviet bodies.

One might have thought that they would be delighted at the news of the introduction of direct elections.

But nothing of the kind. These gentlemen have now become the most arrant defenders of the old system, and are discovering that it contains unparalleled positive features.

Take, for example, the Polish *Ilustrowani Kurjer Podzenni* of February 12, 1935, which vented its spleen about the amendments to the Soviet Constitution in an article full of spiteful rubbish. This paper is not in the least disturbed at offering its readers the absolutely unfounded news to the effect that the Soviet system is allegedly being entirely abolished, to be replaced by a bourgeois-parliamentary system, "according to which elective institutions of all kinds will be elected once in four years".

Further on, the paper makes false hints to the effect that the right to recall deputies will no longer be enforced, and ends up with the following tirade:

"Whereas under the previous system, at least in the lowest links of the chain, in the district Soviets, a citizen had some opportunity of expressing his will and carrying it out to a

modest degree, now, on the contrary, under the universal ballot on the territorial basis, this opportunity vanishes entirely."

Is it not a farce, when the lackeys of landlord-militarist Poland, which even hesitates to call itself a republic, play the role of defenders of Soviet democracy?

However, we were not forced to wait long for the explanation of these unexpected sympathies shown towards the "ideological foundations of the Soviet system". The author of the article considers that the democratic character of the local Soviets lies in the fact that:

"... the rural district Soviets were the only elected institutions where the Communists almost never had, nor could have, a majority; what is more, they were institutions into which representatives of the condemned classes, such as rich peasants, or the so-called representatives of the old world, the local clergy, sometimes found access."

These gentlemen do not like direct elections, in fact they cannot like anything in the Soviet Union, because the capitalist elements are being eliminated there, and because all hopes of restoring the capitalist system are being radically destroyed. They do not like direct elections, because they foresee an enormously new increase in the influence of the Communist Party.

Well, you can never please these people. The more abusive they are, the more useful the given measure must be for the workers and peasants.

When speaking of the references made by the bourgeois and Social-Democratic press to the decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets, we must not pass over what Otto Bauer has had to say in *Der Kampf*, No. 3. The underlying tone of his article is foul hypocrisy and a desire to cover up the traces at all costs. Otto Bauer admits that the proposed amendments to the Constitution "undoubtedly signify great progress", and "are of great historical importance". He even declares that this is "the first (!) step towards the gradual and real self-determination of the toiling masses working in socialist industry and collectivized agriculture". The question arises then, how, in that case, does Mr. Bauer estimate the October Revolution which he is never tired of greeting in words? If the decisions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets constitute the "first" step in the direction of real self-determination by the toiling masses, then what was the October Revolution? Obviously Mr. Bauer cannot make things fit in. But this is still not all. It appears that the amendments to the Constitution add nothing new, for in the U.S.S.R. there is no real freedom to elect whom you please, since there is no freedom given to all parties to put forward their candidates.

Here Mr. Bauer is singing in chorus with all the others, from the fascists to the Social-Democrats. True, he tries to occupy a "special" position. He "does not defend" the White Guards; he "admits" that dictatorship of the proletariat should suppress parties which seek to restore capitalism and overthrow the Soviet Government. But he sheds crocodile tears because the same fate awaits even "political and ideological currents which recognize the Soviet Constitution and want to continue the construction of industry and agriculture".

Where does he see these nice "political and ideological currents"? It is clear from what follows that he is referring to the remnants of the Zinoviev opposition, whom he warmly recommends as people devoted to socialism. Bauer declares that they were only dissatisfied with the abolition of the bread cards and with the foreign policy of the Soviet

Government. We do not take it upon ourselves to make a judgement as to what are the sources from which Mr. Bauer obtained such precise information as to the precise cause of the "dissatisfaction" of the counter-revolutionary double-dealers, and how far this information coincides with the truth; but it is useless for Mr. Bauer to pass by the fact that these people "merely" organized terrorist acts with the assistance of foreign consuls, and dreamed about intervention and the overthrow of the Soviet Government.

Mr. Bauer pretends that he is wholly and solely in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the suppression of the capitalists. He takes it upon himself to teach the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. how they should carry out their dictatorship, so as to win the approval of such noble personalities as Otto Bauer, to which we can give the following reply: you, Messrs. Bauer and Co., led the Western-European working class beneath the fascist executioner's axe. If the workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R. had followed your advice, capitalist reaction would long ago have washed its hands in their blood. You come forward as the defenders of the foul assassins of Comrade Kirov, at the same time assuming the hypocritical mask of people delighted with the building of socialism. The Soviet proletariat does not need either your advice or your hypocritical sympathy.

The malicious attacks of Mr. Dan, published in the Belgian *Peuple* of February 9, are just as revolting, and leave just the same farcical impression.

Dan is not satisfied with the decisions passed by the Seventh Congress of Soviets. This is quite understandable. He wants the kind of democracy where the Mensheviks will be free to carry on their undermining work in favor of the capitalist interventionists. Dan is hurt at the treatment of Zinoviev and his followers. Birds of a feather flock together. Dan would like the Nikolaevs* to be given freedom to plot terrorist acts on Soviet territory with the help of foreign consuls. He cannot imagine democracy in any other light. And finally, and best of all, Dan refuses to believe in the democratic character of the Soviet system, since the Congress of Soviets unanimously and without offering any objections, accepted the proposal of the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Dan does not like the kind of democracy where the Communist Party is the ruling party, and where it enjoys unparalleled and undivided influence and authority among the toilers. The sort of democracy that brings greater joy to Dan is that where the Communists sit behind prison bars. We know this full well. But nothing can be done about it. Neither the hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, Mr. Dan, who has found himself a place in their backyards, nor the bourgeois throughout the whole world, has the power to change historic facts.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party trained by Lenin and by the great Stalin who continues his work, has led the working class and peasantry of the Soviet Union through all difficulties and dangers, and over all hidden rocks in their path, to the promised goal, the victory of socialism. It is just this that has created for the Communist Party the enormous authority that it enjoys among the toilers. And side by side with the growth and development of Soviet democracy, the influence of the Party over the masses, and the confidence of the masses in the Party leadership will continue to grow ever greater.

* Nikolaev—the assassin of Com. Kirov, Ed.

The Memoirs of a Social Opportunist

(Loose Leaves from a Busy Life. MORRIS HILLQUIT)

Reviewed by F. I. MINGULIN

HILLQUIT'S book is of considerable interest. Hillquit was one of the most shameful figures in the camp of social opportunism. Hillquit appeared in the role of defender of the Russian White Guards, and supported their claims for the factories and the lands taken from them by the proletarian revolution! Hillquit, the "Socialist" lawyer, was the defender of capitalism against Socialism.

Hillquit's memoirs were published in 1934 after his death. The aim of the book was to picture Hillquit as a good Socialist, a friend of the poor, always ready to come out against any injustice, a passionate opponent of war, and a loyal sympathizer of the proletarian revolution and of the Soviet government.

Morris Hillquit was always the standard bearer of the Right Wing of the Socialist Party. Morris Hillquit is not merely a name, it is a banner; it represents, so to say, a whole platform of the most disgusting and cynical opportunism not only in the American working class movement, but in the international working class movement as well. If the reader wants to make sure of this he has only to read the *New Leader* of October 6, 1934, devoted specially to the anniversary of his death.

On the pages of this publication, which is controlled by the Right wing of the Socialist Party, the leaders of both American and international Social-Democracy—from Norman Thomas and William Green, and from the well-known German Social-Democratic leader, Wels, to the old traitor, Abramovich—are loud in proclaiming their praise of Hillquit, classing him as one of the great Socialists of America, and even calling him "the great philosopher of the American Socialist movement". In this issue they characterize his book as being a collection of "enamoured recollections". Behind the praise in the *New Leader* it is very difficult to disclose the *real* figure of Hillquit.

Even such Socialists as Hillquit, *i.e.*, open servants of the bourgeoisie, a champion of the White Guards, do not present themselves before the masses openly in their role of traitors. This is further proved at this time by the "old guard"—the Waldmans, the Oneals, etc. In their writings the "old guard", to which Hillquit in his time belonged, try to parade as true Socialists, almost Marxists. Hillquit's book is a sample of how such "Socialists" skilfully camouflage themselves before the masses and fool them.

Hillquit's book is divided into three sections: the pre-war period, the World War, and the post-war period. Hillquit's philosophy, his ideas on the mission of socialism, are outlined by him in his book, *The History of Socialism in the United States*. These ideas come to the fore in the very first stages of his book, notwithstanding the attempts of its author to present himself at least before the inexperienced workers, as a good Socialist.

In his book, *The History of Socialism in the United States*, Hillquit, referring to Marx, wrote that Socialism "advances the realistic theory of

gradual social progress". What formerly was dared only by individual "Socialist" adventurers of the type of Millerand, later became the platform of a whole international.

"The socialist movement in those days [end of 19th century —I. M.] was in its formative stages. It had not attained to political power and influence in any country, and nobody imagined that within a generation it would furnish prime ministers and cabinet members to the governments of the nations." (p. 3).

So this, it appears, is the mission of Socialism, this is its ideal! Hillquit, however, supplies a theoretical basis for these dreams for ministerial posts in bourgeois cabinets. The Socialists of those days, it appears, were not "practical politicians". They were rather "idealists and propagandists". Why? Because you see they did not believe in "peaceful methods". Thus the belief in "peaceful methods"—this is the theory of ministerialism and "practical" Socialism. (About himself Hillquit writes that he "always had a certain sense of realism" (p. 10).

The international working class has seen on the experience of Germany, Austria, etc., that these so-called "peaceful methods" and "practical politics" of the politicians of the type of Hillquit clear the way for fascism.

Hillquit, by means of the most brazen falsification, attributes the Bolshevik program to the anarchists and this he does in order to eventually perform the reverse operation.

"Their program was revolution, one big smashing revolution that would wipe out the forces of capitalism and establish the rule of the proletariat", writes Hillquit about the anarchists.

The reader will notice here the methods of Hillquit the lawyer; these methods are today being used by all the Hamilton Fishes and by the Hearst press. The essence of this method is to confuse anarchism and Bolshevism, to mix them together in order to fool the inexperienced reader and show him that the Socialists are "peaceful socialists", whereas the Bolsheviks are mad anarchists.

These White Guard tactics are certainly a little out of date and lack in originality.

* * *

Morris Hillquit was born in Riga in 1869 in a petty-bourgeois family and, at the age of 17, emigrated to the United States. Hillquit gives a vivid picture, of course not for the sake of drawing revolutionary conclusions, of the exploitation of immigrant workers in America, of the poverty of the immigrant quarters in New York at the end of the last century. Here Socialist agitators found a ready audience. These agitators were mostly also immigrants, very often from the intelligentsia, or from the proletarianized, sometimes only temporarily, petty-bourgeoisie. Here craft trade unions of immigrants were established, some were even built along national lines. Sam Gompers also came from these slums, from this midst, where Socialism, although accepting Marx's teachings as its platform, had nothing in common with scientific Socialism of the great teacher of the working class, that was to destroy the old world and establish a new Communist society. The Socialism of Hillquit, Gompers and Co., was a mixture of petty-bourgeois humanitarianism, narrow trade unionism with a liberal-lawyer brand of parliamentarism and ministerialism. Their "Socialism" was entirely subordinated to bourgeois politics and bourgeois ideology.

Hillquit immediately joined the Socialist movement. "It was the

unanimous decision of the family that I resume my interrupted studies and prepare myself for a professional career" (p. 31). Hillquit, however, was unable to immediately fulfill this desire for lack of money. He went to work in a shirt shop. But the position of a poor worker could not satisfy our hero. At the age of 18, Hillquit became a member of the Socialist Labor Party. He rapidly found his way into the headquarters of the central committee of the Socialist Labor Party where he was employed as a part-time clerk at four dollars a week, continuing to work in the shirt shop. At that time the party had only some 2,000 to 3,000 members of whom only about 10 per cent were native Americans (p. 41). The party was characterized by its immigrant narrowness; it suffered from craft limitations and theoretical impotency. The situation changed in 1890 when Daniel De Leon joined the party, and soon became its leader. De Leon brought into the party a revolutionary spirit and the irreconcilability of a Left radical in the labor movement.

"'He who is not with me is against me,' was De Leon's motto", writes Hillquit. ". . . Daniel De Leon was a fanatic. . . . He was not a Social-Democrat. . . . He was strongly influenced by the Blanquist conception. . . . He was the perfect American prototype of Russian Bolshevism" (p. 46).

This is how Hillquit confuses everything. Bolshevism is confused with Blanquism, and Blanquism with De Leonism. Certainly for Hillquit, who by means of Socialist organization was striving to find his way to bourgeois politics, the framework of the Socialist Party of those days seemed too narrow. This typical professional bourgeois politician could look upon the Socialist movement only through his plans of making a career for himself. He rapidly became the leader of the open opportunist opposition against De Leon.

In 1900 Hillquit's group came into contact with the organization "Social-Democracy of America", established in 1897 and headed by Victor Berger and Eugene V. Debs. In 1901 the present Socialist Party was established. It is worth while to mention in this connection one incident which illustrates the bourgeois parliamentary cretinism of Hillquit. This incident is cited by Morris Hillquit supposedly in order to characterize Debs, and is looked upon by the author as "a humorous incident" (p. 50). Debs was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. After two and one-half years he was pardoned by President Harding, but was not restored to the rights of citizenship. Debs, as a proletarian fighter, immediately hastened to New York, to the party center, in order to utilize his case for the organization of a mass struggle, for the restoration of the rights of citizenship, for the thousands who were in a similar position. However, Hillquit did not share his plans. After examining the numerous laws on the question, he was convinced that the popular notion that a conviction of felony entails loss of citizenship was not supported by the law. Therefore, he concluded there was no need of any mass campaign. At the time when Debs was preparing his plans for a mass campaign, Hillquit was preparing a long legal memorandum. Debs, writes Hillquit, was keenly disappointed. One must suppose not so much by Hillquit's memorandum as by the reception of the leadership of the Socialist Party to his proposal of mass struggle in general and by the bourgeois degeneration which was rampant in the leadership. Thus embracing Debs with the dirty hands of a traitor, Hillquit writes that in future years he and Debs became close friends. Unfortunately, there is some truth in this. The great proletarian fighter during the last years of his life allowed himself to be drawn into the treacherous swamp of opportunism which rules the leadership of the Socialist Party.

The Socialist Party of the United States, as well as all the Social-Democratic Parties of the Second International, represented a bloc of inconsistent revolutionary Lefts with opportunistic elements. Side by side with Eugene Debs there were Victor Berger and Morris Hillquit. In its first years the party grew rapidly; in the course of five years its membership increased from 5,000 to 10,000, the new recruits being mostly native Americans. The party conducted quite a broad propaganda activity and was active in the election campaigns. In 1910, Victor Berger was the first "Socialist" to be elected to Congress. In 1912 the party had 118,000 dues-paying members with its organization in all of the 48 states, with 150 periodical publications (newspapers and magazines), and received about one million votes in the presidential elections.

If this party later on, during the war became totally bankrupt, then the reason for this is the same as that which led to the bankruptcy of the entire Second International, *i.e.*, the victory of opportunism in the parties of the Second International. Hillquit cites the *New York Times* of April 2, 1908, which gives a laudatory report of Hillquit's speech at a meeting of bankers: "Mr. Hillquit had abundant opportunity to preach Socialism to a gathering which represented wealth and financial interests" (p. 81). One can judge the character of Hillquit's "socialism" by his attitude towards Gompers. It appears that the latter, although flatly refusing to accept Marxism, was nevertheless "inherently class conscious to the point of religious fervor" (p. 95). Notwithstanding his entire parliamentary cretinism, Hillquit on more than one occasion is compelled to expose bourgeois parliamentarism, the machinations during elections, etc., citing facts that show how absurd it would be for the working class to stake its struggle for power on the ballot box.

The most important part of Hillquit's book is the second part dedicated to the war period. "The world war lasted only (!) a little over four years". ". . . The war affected my course of life and modified my whole outlook more deeply than any other event." (p. 145). Hillquit changed from a social opportunist to a cynical social chauvinist, who, it is true, attempted to occupy a position halfway between social chauvinism and centralism. According to Hillquit, it appears "the time is not yet ripe for a dispassionate analysis of the astounding phenomenon". Hillquit cannot as "yet" say whether this war was an imperialistic one, for he too carries responsibility for it.

This section of his book Hillquit begins with a shameless distortion of Marx. According to him, the teachings of Marx were largely influenced by Darwin's theory of the struggle for existence. Socialism, although it should have been, was not pacifist from the very beginning. Marx supported in wars the stronger side and was not against war as such. Only a lawyer can so artfully distort Marxism.

Then begins the distortion of the history of the World War. It appears that only the Belgian and French Socialists supported the war (p. 150): In his attempt to justify himself Hillquit tries to attribute to the Socialist Party and to himself everything which in his opinion can do so. For example, it appears the Socialist Party "anticipated by two years the terse slogan of the Russian Council of Workers and Soldiers: 'No annexations or contributions and the right of peoples to dispose of themselves' and anticipated by three years some of the Fourteen Points of President Wilson" (p. 161). In the same spirit Hillquit relates his own activities and the work of the Socialist Party. But one has only to look a little closer and discover that in the best days of the Socialist Party, its opposition to war did not go any further than harmless pacifism and attempts to convince the government. Hillquit is compelled to

acknowledge that they fooled the masses with their pacifist promises and speeches. But later the Socialist Party went over to open social chauvinism and even the 1917 St. Louis resolution, which was a reflection of the Leftward movement of the masses of the Socialist Party, still carried a distinct stamp of pacifism. In speaking about this resolution, Hillquit now declares that if it had been written under more normal conditions it would have been formulated in "less irritating language". (For whom? Apparently for the bourgeoisie!—I.M.).

A very instructive chapter in this section of the book is the chapter entitled "The Odyssey of the Peace Council" which uncovers the hypocrisy and bankruptcy of democratic, legalist methods of struggle against imperialist war, especially after the outbreak of war. Even a rank-and-file worker after reading this chapter cannot help but feel a hatred towards these mean petty bourgeois politicians who called themselves "socialists" and whose whole activity consisted of helplessly searching the country for a hall where they could meet for a harmless protest against the raging war. After a prolonged search these "fighters" for peace decided to gather in Minneapolis, because the mayor of this city, Thomas Van Lear, was a Socialist and a member of the "people's council for democracy and peace", the organization that was planning the meeting. But when there is a danger of even a minor innocent offense to the interests of capital, then even the mayor is not master of his own city. At the beginning the owners of the Minneapolis auditorium cancelled the contract. Then the governor of Minnesota (who was not a Socialist) declared that in his State "anti-American meetings" could not take place.

However, let us see to what conclusions Hillquit comes. This bitter experience, it appears, "convincingly demonstrated the impossibility of organizing an extensive peace propaganda during the war" (p. 179). In other words, during the war "socialism" must remain silent and the generals must be left to command. Every more or less class conscious worker will understand that in this book which is so highly praised by the *New Leader* it is already clearly outlined that the leaders of the Socialist Party in the next war will occupy the same social imperialist position as it did in the last war.

We will not deal with other problems raised in this section of the book. They go to show how gradually with the entrance of the U.S.A. into the war the social imperialist essence of the Socialist Party and of Hillquit came to the fore (pp. 195-220, etc.). The White Guard lawyer does not stop from attempting to play with the name of Karl Liebknecht. "German is the language not only of the Kaiser, but also of Karl Liebknecht!" with false sympathy declares Hillquit, the social chauvinist, the comrade of the murderers of Liebknecht, and the defender of the White Guards. This phrase alone is sufficient to show how far the baseness of "socialists" of Hillquit's type can go!

It is worthwhile to consider Chapter VII, "A Lynching of the Constitution", in which Hillquit relates how the American bourgeoisie oppressed all expressions of dissatisfaction during the war by appealing to America's best revolutionary traditions (p. 255). It is clear for us that the party of the revolutionary proletariat must undoubtedly utilize these revolutionary traditions, must explain to the masses the concrete historical and class content of these revolutionary events which are being perverted by the bourgeoisie.

The third part of Hillquit's book is devoted to the post-war period. Here of course there is the false expression of sympathy with the

"Russian Revolution" (the February Revolution), in order to make it easier to cast slander on the October Revolution, the "Bolshevik revolution, accomplished by a comparatively small group of radical and determined Socialists without the support of an organized and trained labor movement", etc., etc. But with all this, even Hillquit is compelled to make the following acknowledgement in comparing fascist Germany with the Soviet Union: "*On the face of it the methods of Russian Bolshevism have to date scored a clear victory over those of the German Social-Democracy*" (p. 283). This only shows that the bankruptcy of the policy of Social-Democracy, which cleared the path for fascism, and the successes of the U.S.S.R. strengthen the urge for the united front with the Communists. Hillquit is forced to an extent to submit to these feelings of the masses.

The last chapter of the book is entitled "Has It Been Worth While?" *i.e.*, was not Hillquit "fighting" in vain. It is necessary to cite only one passage in order to see for what Hillquit "fought" and whether it was "worth while", and what aims are pursued by his surviving followers.

"The spirit of Socialism," writes Hillquit, "which places the welfare of society above the selfish interests of the individual clearly characterizes the whole modern trend of American government policy and much of it is directly traceable to the work of Socialist propaganda. It is interesting to note how many reform measures first formulated as political planks by the Socialists have been enacted into law by the old parties [Republican and Democratic parties—I.M.] under pressure of economic necessity and public clamor" (p. 328).

Well, what can one say about the "Socialist" Hillquit after this? The entire policy of the Right Wing of the Socialist Party, at the tail of which, followed by some "Lefts", Norman Thomas drags along, is expressed in this phrase. The Right Wing is now conducting a furious struggle against the united front with the Communists.

Hillquit's book, notwithstanding the tricks of its author, shows that the leaders of the Socialist Party are pursuing the policy of class collaboration. Moreover, the Right Wing of this party has even gone to the extent of presenting the policy of the agents of Wall Street as "Socialist" policy. The book is an additional proof that the honest Socialist workers must break away from this policy and establish with the Communists a united front of class struggle.

Hillquit's book shows the correctness of the position presented in the resolutions of the historical January (1935) Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States on the struggle against social reformism and particularly against the Right Wing of the Socialist Party. The Plenum resolution points out:

"In the approach to the various groupings in the S.P., the Party must direct particularly strong and intensive fire against the Right Wing of the Socialist Party, exposing its cynically conciliatory policy towards the bourgeoisie and the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, appealing to the indignation of the proletarian rank and file of the Socialist Party against the leaders."

Workers still under the influence of leaders of the type of Hillquit are beginning to realize that their roads lead apart and the work of the Communists and the experiences of the class struggle are further strengthening this tendency.

A New Series

IN A SOVIET AMERICA

A series of pamphlets portraying the life of various sections of the working class and its allies under a dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States. By describing also the oppression and exploitation which workers suffer today under capitalism, this series sets up in sharp contrast the happiness and well-being of workers in a socialist society.

The first four in the series, which are now ready, are listed below. Others will be on steel, railroad, and auto workers, farmers, youth, women, professionals, white collar workers, unemployed, small businessmen, etc.

Seamen and Longshoremen Under the Red Flag

By *HAYS JONES*

Five cents

The Negroes in a Soviet America

By *JAMES W. FORD and JAMES S. ALLEN*

Five cents

The Farmers' Way Out—Life Under a Workers' and Farmers' Government

By *JOHN BARNETT*

Five cents

The Way Out for Coal Miners

By *PAT TOOHEY and A. ROCHESTER*

Five Cents



Order now from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF COMMUNISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Akron: 365 South Main St.

Baltimore: 509 North Eutaw St.

Boston: 216 Broadway

Buffalo: 75½ W. Chippewa, R. 7

Butte: 106 West Granite St.

Camden: 501 Market St., Rm. 6

Chicago: 505 South State St.
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.

Cincinnati: 117 E. 12th St., 2 fl.

Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.

Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.

Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.

Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.

Duluth: 110 West First St.

Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.

Hartford: 88 Church St.

Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.

Milwaukee: 419 West State St.

Minneapolis: 241 Marquette St.

Newark: 1264 Raymond Blvd.

New Haven: 280 Park St.

New York: 50 East 13th St.
699 Prospect Ave., Bronx
369 Sutter Ave., B'klyn
25 Chauncey St., B'klyn

Oakland: 567 12th St.

Omaha: 2404 Parker St.

Paterson: 201 Market St.

Philadelphia: 46 N. 8th St., 2d fl.
118 W. Allegheny Ave.
4023 Gerard Ave.
2404 Ridge Ave.

Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.

Providence: 335 Westminster St.,
Rm. 43

Reading: 224 North Ninth

Sacramento: 523 California St.

St. Louis: 3528 Franklin Ave.

Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.

San Diego: 852 Eighth Ave.

San Francisco: 37 Grove St.
1168 Golden Gate Ave.
542 Valencia St.

Santa Barbara: 208 W. Canon
Perdido

Seattle: 614½ First Av., Rm. 15

Sioux Falls, S. D.: 223 E. 8th St.

Superior: 601 Tower Ave.

Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.

Toledo: 214 Michigan

Washington, D. C.: 513 F. St.,
N. W.

Youngstown: 310 W. Federal St.
3rd fl.

*Write for a complete catalog to the nearest of the
above addresses or to*

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City