

THE



ommunist

DIMITROV ON GERMAN FASCISM

MOLOTOV ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY OF W. PIECK, ETC.

THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT

International

VOLUME XIII

1

SIXPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number I

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

1. G. Dimitrov: The Juridical System of German Fascism. (Reply to Herr Ribbentrop: interview given by Comrade G. Dimitrov to Representatives of the Press) 1
2. Molotov: The International Situation, the Growing War Menace and our Policy 4
3. The Sixtieth Birthday of the Glorious Proletarian Fighter—Wilhelm Pieck: Greetings of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. 9
4. The International Proletariat are Collecting their Forces 14
5. Teach the Masses and Learn from the Masses 18
6. Kuusinen: There are no Grounds for Self-Satisfaction 23
7. Maurice Thorez: The Congress of the Communist Party of France 32
8. Peter Viden: What Course are you Steering, Otto Bauer ? 38

THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITED FRONT

9. V.K.: Soukup and Stivin—the Blacklegs of the United Front of the International Proletariat 44

PEOPLE OF THE COMINTERN

10. Rudolph Claus 48

THE LAND OF SOCIALISM

11. Rubines: The Stakhanov Movement and Our Enemies 51

ON THE PAGES OF THE COMMUNIST PRESS

12. Rotor: The Stakhanov Movement as dealt with by the Communist Press 60

BIBLIOGRAPHY

13. Tom Bell: Lenin, Selected Works. (A Review) 66

THE JURIDICAL SYSTEM OF GERMAN FASCISM

G. DIMITROV.

(Reply to Herr Ribbentrop: interview given by Comrade G. Dimitrov to Representatives of the Press).

IN the fascist newspaper, *Volkischer Beobachter*," of December 18, 1935, Von Ribbentrop, Hitler's "special plenipotentiary" on questions of foreign policy, published a letter to Lord Allen of Hurtwood, in reply to the request of certain English lawyers, despatched through his medium to Hitler personally, that Hans Lütten, a German lawyer, be released.

In this letter Ribbentrop puts forward a number of theses: first, that the present régime in Germany constitutes a special legislative system which corresponds to the "spirit" and "natural feelings" of the German people; secondly, that the advent of the German fascists to power on January 30, 1933, was a "revolution"; thirdly, that the historic mission of German fascism is to save civilisation, and fourthly and finally, that he, Ribbentrop, helped to obtain the release of Dimitrov, a fact which he now bitterly regrets.

Ribbentrop expresses his regret that the German Government displayed "magnanimity" in releasing Dimitrov.

Citing the report delivered by Comrade Dimitrov at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, which he foully distorts, Herr Ribbentrop writes: "This carefully elaborated programme is the result of the release of Dimitrov, i.e., the result of the liberal British outlook and German good nature and magnanimity!"

Below we publish Comrade Dimitrov's reply to questions put to him by representatives of the press on this subject.

QUESTION: What is your opinion of the letter written by the Hitler diplomat, Ribbentrop, to Lord Allen of Hurtwood, published in the official organ of the German government, *Volkischer Beobachter*, on December 18, in answer to the demand for the liberation of the German lawyer, Lütten, addressed by English lawyers to Hitler personally?

DIMITROV: Herr Ribbentrop is not giving his individual opinion alone. Indeed, his personal opinions are of very little value. His letter can only be regarded as an official statement from the German Government attempting to justify the monstrous crimes which have given rise to a wave of protests throughout the civilised world. Ribbentrop writes as the mouthpiece of unbridled German fascism which is attempting to win the support of public opinion in England both in punishing its political opponents and the war adventures that it is planning. It is no chance that this letter has appeared at a time when the dastardly execution of the German Communist, Claus, has filled all

honest people throughout the world with indignation; and when, faced with the catastrophe of starvation into which fascism has driven the toiling masses of Germany, the German fascists are tremendously intensifying the terror throughout the country. In speaking openly in defence of those who wield the executioner's axe, their accomplice in the kid gloves of a diplomat, by his letter, virtually throws a challenge to the whole of world public opinion.

QUESTION: What do you think of Ribbentrop's statement that the present German régime represents a special legal system corresponding to the "spirit" and "natural feelings of the German people"?

DIMITROV: Ribbentrop's statement is a most gross insult to the great German people. What cynicism must one possess, and with what "Nietzschian" contempt must one regard the people to whom Ribbentrop's letter is directly addressed to make such a statement. Fascism and a legal system are two things which are absolutely

incompatible. Fascism is the negation of any kind of legal system. In essence fascism is arbitrary rule. It is the arbitrary rule of an armed gang of hirelings of big capital who enslave the vast majority of the people in the interests not only of the exploiting minority in general, but precisely in the interests of the most rapacious exploiters.

What kind of legal system is it, and, what is more, one that corresponds to the "spirit" and "natural feelings" of the German people, that has deprived nine-tenths of this people of elementary political rights? What kind of a legal system is it that is destroying the flower of the German people in prisons and concentration camps? What kind of a legal system is it that, as Ribbentrop himself says, keeps incarcerated people like Lütten, who are absolutely innocent, simply because they have a different "spiritual viewpoint" from that of Herr Ribbentrop?

Ribbentrop's justification for the annulment of the old legal system in Germany is, as he says, that "Adolf Hitler could also be tried under the same clauses" of the criminal code as other mortals. But a system under which no fascist murderer is held responsible for his criminal acts before any court and under any clause of the law, is an arbitrary system. It is a régime of criminals in power.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the "special legal system" of Ribbentrop stands closer to the "system" of the American gangsters who terrorise the population of the U.S.A. than to any other existing legal system. Under what legal system, for example, can we include the provocative burning of the Reichstag by the German fascists? Let the unified German Academy of Law, whose materials Herr Ribbentrop so obligingly promises to send to Lord Allen, try from the viewpoint of a legal system to justify this provocative act which served, as its initiators planned, as a pretext for a whole number of St. Bartholomew's Nights. By no "legal system" will the Ribbentrops be able to justify such a step as the arrest of people who had nothing whatever to do with the affair, and their trial on the charge of setting fire to the Reichstag, when the whole world knows that the Reichstag was set on fire at the orders and under the leadership of the fascist rulers.

Let the German Academy of Law try to give a legal justification of the assassinations so frequently practised by the fascists, or the numerous cases of murder during so-called "attempts to escape," or the death sentences passed on anti-fascists on the basis of forged documents and false witnesses. Let it try to justify the system of tortures and inquisition to which the fascist hangmen subject imprisoned Communists, Social Democrats and

other anti-fascists. Let Herr Ribbentrop explain what standards of a legal system embrace such actions as the murder by a fascist of the German Professor Lessing on Czechoslovakian territory, as the bloody slaughter of June 30th, as the murder of General Schleicher and his wife, as the shooting of scores of storm troopers. And what about the anti-Semitic pogroms and the persecution of Catholics, which recall the worst pages of the times of the Inquisition, of the times of the Huguenots? And sterilisation? Under what legal system are such vile acts permissible? And the Bacchanalia of the public burning of the immortal productions of human thought and human genius?

Yes, such a "special legal system" has had precedents in history, in the dark days of the Middle Ages. It still arouses horror among those who study the history of tortures, the stake, the burning of "heretics," the execution of Giordano Bruno, the brutal "racks" upon which unfortunate people were stretched during the days of Ivan the Terrible. At that time also there were executioners striking off heads at the place of execution, at that time also there were the Ribbentrops who lauded this "special legal system." But we know that the peoples utterly destroyed this system, and without regret drove out those who were the bearers of it. And it needed the spiritual degeneration of bourgeois society and all the rottenness of decaying capitalism to revive this system once more, and to bring shame on the country which has given the world Marx and Engels, Goethe, Schiller, Wagner and Heine. The court of history will not be gentler with those who have raised the axe and the block as the symbol of modern medievalism in an epoch when the five-pointed star with the emblem of the hammer and sickle is already blazing over one-sixth of the globe.

QUESTION: What is your estimate of Ribbentrop's statement that "revolutions are not decided in court rooms and in accordance with the ordinary legal standards"?

DIMITROV: It is quite true that revolutions are not decided in court rooms and on the basis of the ordinary legal standards. But Herr Ribbentrop, thinking that he has here found the key to the justification of the crimes of German fascism, forgot one "small thing." The whole point is that the advent of the German fascists to power on January 30, 1933, was not a revolution at all. It is well known that every genuine revolution means the passing of power from one class into the hands of another class. But in Germany, the bourgeoisie as a class were in power and have remained in power. The capitalist system has remained untouched. All that has changed is that the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic and most

imperialistic circles of finance capital have become the complete masters and have extremely intensified capitalist exploitation and oppression. Political forgery will not help Ribbentrop. He thinks that by sticking the verbal label "national socialist revolution" on to the reactionary frenzy of the fascists, he thereby justifies the fascist terror. It never occurs to the fascist diplomat that real revolutions, however harsh they may be, do not need justification, because they lift the people who bring them about and the whole of mankind as a consequence, to a higher stage of human civilisation. But the reason why the bloody orgy of the fascists cannot be justified in any way is that it reduces the great German people to the level of barbarism.

The fascist legend of a National Socialist revolution has hitherto been an article primarily for home consumption, intended to lead the masses astray and to take the place of the fats, meat and eggs that are not forthcoming. Ribbentrop, Hitler's travelling salesman, is now attempting to throw these rotten goods on to the European market. He quite seriously recommends the raging fascist frenzy as a "model of revolution" for all other nations.

It is impossible not to smile when reading such a statement by Ribbentrop as that the notorious methods of the National Socialist revolution "have nothing resembling them in history" and "are in crying contradiction to the cruel and barbarous methods by which revolutions were carried out among other peoples of the cultured world," and that, finally, they serve to "preserve the ethical and moral principles of the people." All this represents such record-making in shameless lying that it does not even need a reply. It is a truly fascist "model" of boundless insolence.

QUESTION: What is your attitude to the statement of Ribbentrop that it is the historic mission of German fascism to save civilisation?

DIMITROV: The same as it would be to a statement of American gangsters if they were to attribute to themselves the mission of saving mankind from banditry. It is well known that the German fascists direct their blows against everything which bears the imprint of human progress, free thought, independent creation, against all who are not fascists. It could not be otherwise, because fascism is the most merciless enemy of human progress and civilisation. It is the embodiment of the most savage and unbridled obscurantism. It directs its blows first and foremost against the working-class movement and particularly against Communism, because Communism represents the vanguard of the world working-class movement,

because it is the bearer of a new civilisation, because, as the famous French writer, Andre Gide, recently correctly expressed it, Communism is "the common cause of the peoples of the whole world."

And this rôle of Communism stands out with particular clearness in the light of those great achievements of Socialist construction which have been brought about in the U.S.S.R. under the wise direction of the greatest man of our era, Stalin. Millions of people—workers, peasants, intellectuals, scientists, engineers, and technicians—in the capitalist world are becoming more and more convinced that Socialism in the U.S.S.R. means a mighty growth of the productive forces, that it means the continuously growing welfare of the broadest masses of the people, that it means an unprecedented rise in their cultural level, that it means the all-round development of human personality, that it means the birth of a new man, a new life, a new psychology. Socialism is peace and fraternity between the peoples. And for this very reason all that is honest, independent and free among mankind is, despite all difficulties, rallying with the working class to the united front against fascism, this plague of modern humanity.

QUESTION: What have you to say about Ribbentrop's claim that he assisted in securing your liberation?

DIMITROV: In making such a statement, Ribbentrop, to express it mildly, exaggerates the rôle played in history by his own personality. As everybody knows, my Bulgarian comrades and I were liberated from prison because even a fascist court could not do other than acquit us. It acquitted us because it was proved up to the hilt at the Leipzig Trial that the Reichstag was fired not by the Communists but by the German fascists. We were liberated because the wave of indignation against the crimes of German fascism rose so high throughout the world, and fascism so disgraced itself and made itself such a laughing-stock at Leipzig that nothing was left for it but to expel us from the country. But where does Ribbentrop come in here? If the Ribbentrops could have torn me to pieces at Leipzig they would have done so with the greatest of pleasure, but they were powerless. The bandit who lets his victim go because his hands are held down by people who rush to the aid of his victim, can boast least of all of his own magnanimity.

Ribbentrop tries to depict the programme of the united fighting front against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war which was developed at the 7th Congress openly before the whole world, as a world terrorist plot, not only against fascist Germany, but against the whole of Europe, and especially against the British Empire. And it would seem

that this terrible calamity took place as a result of the "British liberal outlook and German complacency and magnanimity," which, as Ribbentrop assures us, led to my liberation. Ribbentrop needs all this lying balderdash to persuade British public opinion not to repeat such a "mistake" as my liberation, and in order to set the hands of German fascism free to wreak vengeance on Thaelmann and the other prisoners in German dungeons. He deliberately distorts the decisions of the 7th Congress so as to distract attention from the real plotters and terrorists who are trying to drag the world into the catastrophe of a new imperialist war. The stenographic report of my speech has been published. It has been read by the workers of all countries, and English lords can also read it. In my report, in conformity with the programme

and the tactics of the Communist International, not only did I not speak as a supporter of individual terror, but I fought with all the passion of a fighter for Communism against those who have made the weapon of political individual terror the basic method for achieving their anti-popular aims. I have in view first and foremost the German fascists.

There is no doubt that serious danger is looming more than ever before over the life of Thaelmann and tens of thousands of Communists, Social-Democrats and other anti-fascists imprisoned in German jails and concentration camps. New crimes of fascism are pending. The hand of the fascist butchers must be turned aside. It is for the millions of workers and all honest people to have their say.

III—THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION, THE GROWING WAR MENACE AND OUR POLICY*

I SHALL now pass to problems of foreign policy. During the past year the relations between the Soviet Union and other countries have, on the whole, developed normally. In the majority of cases our relations with foreign states developed in a direction favourable to the cause of peace. At any rate, everything that depended on the Soviet government was done to strengthen the cause of universal peace and, primarily, to strengthen peace in Europe and Asia. (APPLAUSE.)

There is no need just now to dwell in detail on the relations between the U.S.S.R. and individual countries. As compared with the period in which the Seventh Congress of Soviets met, no essential changes have taken place, and on certain important points I shall have occasion to dwell later.

As an example illustrating the idea behind the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, one might point to our relations with our immediate neighbours, the states on our borders.

Along the whole of our vast land frontiers in the West, South and East, a total length of about 20,000 kilometres, there are situated fairly large, middle-sized and small states which are not always as friendly towards the U.S.S.R. as, let us say, Turkey. (LOUD APPLAUSE.) Throughout all this period not a single one of these states has had any cause for anxiety as far as we are concerned. On the contrary, even the smallest states, including those whose policy is frequently dependent on the

pressure of the anti-Soviet forces of larger imperialist powers, have never had, nor have now, any reason to express anxiety with regard to the Soviet Union. However, I must deal separately with our relations on the Far Eastern frontiers, where, in connection with the occupation of Manchuria by Japan, a specific situation, as you know, has been created.

With a view to ensuring peace in Europe, the Soviet government and also the governments of France, Czechoslovakia and certain other states attached great importance to the conclusion of what is known as the East-European Mutual Aid Pact, which, on the proposal of France, was to be signed, apart from the U.S.S.R., by France and Czechoslovakia, and also by Germany, Poland, Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania. However, owing to the counter-action of Germany, and then of Poland, the East-European Mutual Aid Pact fell through.

This did not prevent the conclusion last May of a treaty of mutual aid between France and the Soviet Union. During the visit paid to Moscow by M. Laval, the present Prime Minister of France, there was re-affirmed the common desire of the U.S.S.R. and France to facilitate the conclusion of a regional East-European pact between the states already mentioned, imposing the obligations of non-aggression, consultation and non-assistance to an aggressor.

Following on this a treaty of mutual aid was signed between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia. In doing so the representatives of the Soviet Union

* From the report by V. Molotov at the January, 1935, session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R.

and Czechoslovakia declared that they regarded both the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and France and the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia merely as a partial accomplishment of the aim of ensuring peace in Eastern Europe.

In the report of the conversations which took place in Moscow with M. Benes, now President of Czechoslovakia, it was stated that the representatives of both countries at the present time attach exclusive significance "to the actual realisation of a comprehensive collective organisation of security on the basis of the indivisibility of peace." This is the policy to which the government of the Soviet Union adhered and still adheres.

I shall also mention the visit paid to Moscow by Mr. Eden, now the British Foreign Secretary. The importance of this visit will be gathered from the fact that as a result of the conversations between the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and Mr. Eden it was possible to announce that "at the present time there is no conflict of interests between the two governments on any important question of international policy." The conditions therefore favour a further development of Anglo-Soviet relations.

Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the whole developed normally, chiefly in the commercial and economic field. In this connection one cannot ignore the repeated attempts which are being made artificially to fan an anti-Soviet campaign in a certain section of the American press by circles which are definitely reactionary and inclined towards fascism, with the object of undermining the policy of closer relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. which is of tremendous importance to the preservation of universal peace.

During the past year diplomatic relations were established by the U.S.S.R. with Belgium, Luxembourg and Colombia.

On the other hand, the government of Uruguay, under the pressure of Brazilian and, it is said, also of certain European reactionaries, has broken off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

If the Uruguayan gentlemen are to be believed, one might think that the Soviet government has nothing else to occupy it than the internal affairs of Brazil and Uruguay (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE), which those gentlemen, the Brazilian and Uruguayan rulers, evidently understand very badly if they attribute all their misfortunes to others. If you have read Demyan Byedny's New Year poem, "A Political Dogberry," which gives a fairly adequate explanation of the Uruguayan incident (GENERAL LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE) and its connection with the question of Uruguayan cheese and so on, there is no need to dwell on the

Uruguayan gentlemen any longer. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE.)

However, the Soviet government cannot ignore acts, even on the part of Uruguay, which are not only absolutely unjustified in regard to our country, but are also a direct violation of the covenant of the League of Nations, to which both the U.S.S.R. and Uruguay belong. The People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs has therefore addressed a complaint to the League of Nations on the action of the Uruguayan government (LAUGHTER), as expressed in a rupture of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. without first submitting the dispute to a court of arbitration or to the Council of the League, as the covenant of the League of Nations requires. (APPLAUSE.)

I shall now pass to the relations with Germany and Japan, which, for obvious reasons, attract the particular attention of the toilers of our country.

I shall begin with Germany.

I must say quite frankly that the Soviet government would have desired the establishment of better relations with Germany than exist at present. This seems to us unquestionably expedient from the standpoint of the interests of the peoples both of the U.S.S.R. and of Germany. But the realisation of such a policy depends not only on us, but also on the German government.

And what is the foreign policy of the present German government? I spoke of the principal trend of this foreign policy at the Seventh Congress of Soviets, when I quoted from Herr Hitler's book, *My Struggle*, which is in a sense a programme, and which is being distributed in Germany in millions of copies. In this book Herr Hitler definitely speaks of the necessity of adopting "A POLICY OF TERRITORIAL CONQUEST." And in this connection, Herr Hitler makes no bones of declaring: "WHEN WE SPEAK OF NEW LANDS IN EUROPE TO-DAY WE CAN ONLY THINK IN THE FIRST INSTANCE OF RUSSIA AND HER BORDER STATES."

Since the time these statements of Herr Hitler's were read from the rostrum of the Congress of Soviets, the German government has not made any attempt to deny these plans of aggrandisement at the expense of the Soviet Union, but, on the contrary, by its silence has fully confirmed that Herr Hitler's statements referred to still retain their validity. For us, this was not unexpected. Carrying their plans to extremes, Messieurs the National-Socialists, as we all know, are driving their preparations precisely in the direction of such aggrandisement, although not in this direction alone.

This criminal propaganda for the seizure of foreign territory has now found new followers outside of Germany. All sorts of echoers of German

capital are to be found in neighbouring Poland, such as M. Studnitsky and the other hare-brained gentlemen on the Cracow newspaper *Chas*, who have gone to such lengths as to blab openly in the press of the seizure of certain territories belonging to the U.S.S.R., of which certain dotards have frequently dreamt in their drunken ravings. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE.) Such hallucinations are not unknown to certain elements in neighbouring Finland who are orienting themselves more and more on the most aggressive imperialist states.

Everybody knows that German fascism is not merely confining itself to elaborating plans of conquest, but is preparing to act in the immediate future. The German fascists have, in the sight of all, turned the country which has fallen into their hands into a military camp, which, owing to its position in the very centre of Europe, constitutes a menace not only to the Soviet Union. Even if we do not mention other countries, who does not know that over Czechoslovakia, for instance, which is not threatening any of her neighbours and is engaged in peaceful toil, the dark clouds of German fascism have gathered, bristling with soldiers' bayonets and gun muzzles, supplied with every known, and yesterday still unknown, chemical for poisoning and infecting people, and with swift and silent war-planes for the purpose of unexpected attack, and armed with everything which converts modern warfare into a mass slaughter not only of soldiers at the front, but also of simple, peaceful citizens, women and children?

All this constitutes a growing menace to the peace of Europe, and not of Europe alone.

How contradictory is the situation in present-day Germany can be seen from the following.

Side by side with the desperate anti-Soviet foreign policy of definite ruling circles in Germany, at the initiative of the German government, an agreement between Germany and the U.S.S.R. was proposed and concluded on April 9, 1935, for a credit of 200,000,000 marks for a period of five years. On the whole, this credit is being successfully utilised by us, just as is the five-year credit of 250,000,000 kroner accorded to us last year by Czechoslovakia. During the past few months representatives of the German government have offered us a new and larger credit, this time for a period of ten years. Although we are not chasing after foreign credits and, in contradistinction to past days, are now to a large extent purchasing abroad for cash, and not on credit, we have not refused, and are not now refusing, to consider also this business proposal of the German government.

The development of commercial and economic relations with other states, irrespective of the political forces that are temporarily ruling those

countries, is in conformity with the policy of the Soviet government. We think that it is also in conformity with the interests of the German people, and it is the business of the government of Germany, of course, to draw its practical conclusions.

Finally, as regards relations with Japan.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated its peaceable and accommodating spirit by concluding an agreement for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway in Manchuria. The agreement for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway was signed last March. The railway has been handed over to the Japanese-Manchurian authorities. The payments to the Soviet Union of the sums due for the Chinese Eastern Railway and the purchase of goods with these sums in Japan and Manchuria are proceeding normally. On all other practical questions the Soviet Union has also hitherto found ways of reaching agreement with Japan.

However, the principal question in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and Japan remains unsettled. Japan so far has evaded the proposal we made three years ago for the conclusion of a Soviet-Japanese treaty of non-aggression. Such conduct cannot be regarded otherwise than as suspicious.

On the other hand, there is no cessation or reduction in the number of attempts made by Japanese-Manchurian troops to violate our frontiers. I will mention one incident that took place on October 12 in the Novo-Alexeyevka district, when about 50 Japanese and Manchurian soldiers crossed the frontier line and penetrated more than two kilometres into Soviet territory, opening rifle and machine-gun fire on our frontier troops. As a result of the exchange of shots, Kotelnikov, a commander of a frontier unit, was killed and two other frontier men were wounded. Meeting with an energetic repulse and having suffered corresponding losses, the frontier violators withdrew to Manchurian territory. But the provocative nature of such incidents will be obvious without further explanation.

Here is another example of the conduct of representatives of the Japanese government, conduct which is also incompatible with normal relations.

Nearly six months have already elapsed since our ambassador to Japan, Comrade Yurenev, submitted a draft agreement for the creation of Soviet-Japanese-Manchurian frontier committees for the examination and liquidation of frontier incidents. But so far the Japanese government has not replied to our proposal.

It is said that the frontier incidents on the Soviet borders were required by certain Japanese military circles in order to divert attention from

the way they are lording it in Manchuria and from their expansionist activities in North China and on the territory of the Chinese Republic generally. It is asserted that these and similar frontier incidents were required by certain persons in Japan in order to demonstrate to the foreign world the "firmness" and "strength" of Japanese policy. One thing is clear, that this playing with fire along our Far Eastern frontiers is not ceasing, and that the Japanese militarists are drawing nearer to our frontiers both directly and through the territory of others.

A report recently appeared of the conclusion of a military agreement between Japan and Germany and of Poland's connection with this matter. There is nothing unexpected in this for us. It is not for nothing that both Japan and Germany left the League of Nations in good time, in order to leave their hands free, and, with good reasons, are regarded by the whole world as the powers with the most aggressive foreign policy.

The fascist rulers of Germany sometimes endeavour to divert the attention of naïve people from their plans of conquest with regard to the Soviet Union by referring to the absence of common frontiers between Germany and the U.S.S.R. But we know, on the other hand, that Germany, encouraged by certain foreign powers, is feverishly preparing to occupy a dominant position in the Baltic and has established special relations with Poland, which has fairly extensive common frontiers with the Soviet Union.

And therefore in respect both to our Eastern and our Western frontiers, we must place our defence on a proper footing. (APPLAUSE.)

Not a little has been done in this direction during the past few years. But when it is a question of protecting the peaceful labour of the workers and collective farmers of our country from foreign attack, when it is a question of defending our gains and the great work of socialist construction, we cannot rest content with the results achieved in the matter of defence. (APPLAUSE.)

We must find all the necessary material resources for this, without stint, and therefore we must this year considerably increase that part of our state budget which is connected with the defence of the country. (APPLAUSE. COMRADE STALIN MOVES CLOSER TO THE PRESIDUM TABLE AND IS GREETED BY PROLONGED APPLAUSE. ALL RISE. CHEERS.) We have trained a powerful Workers' and Peasants' Red Army (APPLAUSE) and we must now work still more persistently and see to it that our entire army consists of devoted fighters who have completely mastered their job—airmen, artillery men, chemical fighters, tank operators, sharpshooters and fighters of all other necessary arms. (APPLAUSE.) We

have introduced personal titles for the commanding ranks of the Red Army in order still further to strengthen and enhance the importance of the leading cadres of our army. (APPLAUSE.) Only such a Red Army can effectively serve the cause of peace, the cause of the defence of the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the cause of Socialism. (APPLAUSE.)

We must continue to strengthen our Red Army and at the same time utilise every opportunity of maintaining peace and of explaining to the toilers of all countries the special line of principle we are pursuing in the international policy of peace.

The fact that we have joined the League of Nations does not mean that there is no longer a radical difference in principle between Soviet foreign policy and the policy of the foreign powers. The Italo-Abyssinian war shows that the contrary is the case.

The Italo-Abyssinian war is a typical imperialist war for colonies. Italian fascism is openly advocating the policy of seizing Abyssinia and transforming her into an Italian colony. Regarding herself as a slighted power in the matter of the colonial spoils which the principal imperialist states divided up among themselves after the World War, Italy has launched a new war in order to extend her colonial possessions by force of arms at the expense of Abyssinia. Fascist Italy in this case is acting as the pioneer for a new partial re-division of the world, which is pregnant with great consequences and many unexpected surprises for the ruling capitalist classes in Europe. The fascist government is demanding that the other imperialists and the League of Nations as a whole should support its colonial offensive.

The true policy of the powers is revealed in their attitude towards the Italo-Abyssinian war. It is the major decisive powers that must be chiefly borne in mind here.

At a superficial glance it may appear that there are differences of principle between these powers with regard to the policy of colonial conquest. Actually of course, this is not so. The difference in the positions of the various capitalist states belonging to the League of Nations by no means consists in a difference in principle with regard to colonial conquest. This difference is to be explained primarily, by the fact that the various major powers are differently interested in the degree to which Italy's imperialist might should be strengthened. This may also be said of the powers which do not belong to the League of Nations. There is not a single capitalist power which would place the independence of any weak country above the interests of its own selfish participation in the division of colonies.

The Soviet Union alone has taken up a definite position of principle with regard to the Italo-Abyssinian war, a position hostile to imperialism, a position hostile to a policy of colonial conquest of any kind. The Soviet Union alone declared that it bases itself on the principle of the equality and independence of Abyssinia, which, in addition, is a member of the League of Nations, and that it cannot support any action of the League of Nations or of individual capitalist states which aims at violating this independence and equality. This policy of the Soviet Union, which distinguishes it in principle from the other members of the League of Nations, is one of exclusive international significance and one which will yet yield valuable fruit.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated in the League of Nations its fidelity to this principle—the principle of the political independence and national equality of all states—in the case of one of the small countries—Abyssinia. The Soviet Union has also taken advantage of its membership of the League of Nations to put into practice its policy towards an imperialist aggressor.

The first year of the Soviet Union's membership of the League of Nations has fully borne out the correctness of our decision to join the League. Despite all the shortcomings natural to the League of Nations as an organisation of capitalist states, the League has to a certain degree served as a restraining force on war-mongers and aggressors. The League of Nations can and should be criticised for not having taken adequate measures, for instance, in connection with the Italo-Abyssinian war, in respect to which the League of Nations, after all, was obliged to express its opinion as to who was the aggressor. It must also be admitted that the League did nothing to prevent this war. However, the fact cannot be ignored that in the present case the League of Nations hampered not those who served the cause of peace, but those who wanted to help the aggressor. It is in this light that we must consider the participation of the U.S.S.R. in the decisions of the League in the matter of the Italo-Abyssinian war and, in particular, in the economic sanctions against Italy, which was considered by the League to be the aggressor.

The Italo-Abyssinian war shows that the threat of a world war is growing and is steadily spreading over Europe.

This war has only just begun, and it is impossible at present to say when and how it will end. Who, however, does not see that Italian fascism is playing with big stakes?

The fact that the dominant forces in Italy regard the principal way of strengthening their

position to be not internal economic and cultural progress, but a risky war for new colonies, speaks for itself. Even now, when the capitalist countries are more or less—and, it should be said, very unevenly—emerging from the economic crisis of the past few years, they themselves no longer believe in the possibility of achieving any considerable increase of strength by the development of their internal forces. It is only in this way that one can understand the launching of new imperialist wars for colonies. And this, too, is the underlying reason for the Italo-Abyssinian war.

Countries like Japan and Germany, and now Italy, have already advanced, or are prepared any day to advance, to the foreground in new conflicts between the imperialist powers of the whole world. There is not a single capitalist state which is not in one way or another affected by the activity of the foreign policy of the three mentioned powers. In this international situation the responsibility of the Soviet Union is particularly great.

Whoever launches into a new imperialist war may succeed in breaking his neck before accomplishing his plans of aggrandisement. (APPLAUSE.) The possibility is not excluded that the calculations of the imperialist cliques on the passivity of the masses of the people may be upset at the most unexpected moment, as has been the case before. (APPLAUSE.) It is not difficult for us, Bolsheviks, to understand such strivings on the part of the masses of the people. We also know that the masses of the people in capitalist countries have no sympathy for the predatory plans of the imperialists of all shades, especially of the imperialists in the fascist camp.

But we, the toilers of the Soviet Union, must rely for the defence of our cause on our own strength, and on the defence of our fatherland—first and foremost on our Red Army. (APPLAUSE.) We shall take every measure to frustrate every possibility of an external attack on our country by the imperialists. But if they attack us notwithstanding, we have no doubt that our Red Army will inflict the repulse they deserve. (APPLAUSE.)

The working class of Russia, together with the revolutionary peasantry, has flung off the yoke of the landlords and capitalists and has helped to bring about the national emancipation of all the peoples of the former Russian empire. The toilers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are now working harmoniously to build a new life and are really advancing towards a happy life.

And yet there are imperialist gentlemen who dream of robbing the peoples of the Soviet Union of their freedom and of saddling us with

foreign landlords and capitalists. To this we reply: "Dear sirs, open your eyes, you were born too late!" (LOUD AND PROLONGED APPLAUSE.)

There was a time when we suffered the rigours of foreign military intervention, but then we were weak and hungry and had not yet really managed to breathe the fresh air. But even then the imperialist plans to destroy our state collapsed ignominiously.

Since then conditions in our country have radically changed.

The national economy is now not like what it was ten and fifteen years ago. Every important branch of industry has been technically reconstructed, and on this basis new people have already grown up who have mastered technique and are advancing the productivity of socialist labour with Stakhanovite speed.

Since that time the most backward part of our country—the village—has been reconstructed to its very foundations. The collective farms and the liquidation of the last of the capitalist classes—the kulaks—have put the finishing touches to the liquidation of classes in our country. With the destruction of the last of the capitalist class strata in the countryside, which like small par-

sites, were particularly tenacious, the whole revenue of our country now passes into the hands of the toilers and their state. Life has improved, and now as never before the doors to a happy and cultured life for all the peoples of our Union stand wide open. We are already enjoying the first fruits of our victory and we see that an unparalleled rise in the standard of living and culture of all the peoples of the Soviet Union awaits us.

And in spite of all this, we have not yet seen the last of people who in their blind hatred of the new world are planning the seizure and dismemberment of the Soviet Union. Well, what shall we say to them? It is true we appeared in the world without the permission of these gentlemen—(LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)—and undoubtedly against their wishes. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE.)

That means that the time has come when the old world must make way for the new. (LOUD APPLAUSE. THE CHAIRMAN'S BELL ONLY SERVES TO EVOKE NEW OUTBURSTS OF STORMY APPLAUSE. ALL RISE. CRIES OF: "LONG LIVE THE MARSHAL OF THE SOVIET UNION, COMRADE VOROSHILOV!" "LONG LIVE COMRADE STALIN!" FOLLOWED BY LOUD AND PROLONGED CHEERS AND APPLAUSE.)

THE SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY OF THE GLORIOUS PROLETARIAN FIGHTER, WILHELM PIECK

Greetings of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.

DEAR Comrade Wilhelm Pieck! On your sixtieth birthday we once more wish to express how close are the ties which bind us to you and to our heroic fighting German party, the vanguard of the German proletariat.

You have always been particularly closely connected with the Communist International. You are the embodiment of the best traditions of the old working class movement in Germany, in which our great teacher, Lenin, reposed such high hopes.

For forty-two years you have been working in the very heart of the German working class movement. The whole of your life has been filled with loyalty and love towards the proletariat. As a young carpenter, you took the road of class struggle. To-day, you are marching in the front ranks along this road. When reformism secured the upper hand in the German working class movement, you were one of the prominent working-class officials on whom Karl Liebknecht, Mehring and Rosa Luxembourg could always rely in their struggle against revisionism. When it

became necessary for the German working class movement to build up a strong Bolshevik party, to apply the doctrines of Lenin and Stalin in the interests of the German proletariat, you took part in the front ranks of the struggle, as one of Comrade Ernst Thaelmann's best supporters. In stubborn battles against all the enemies of the working class, against the policy of Noske and Scheidemann, against Right opportunist and anarchist currents, against the weakness and wavering of the Lefts themselves and in particular against the ultra-Left sectarian deviations, you helped, essentially, to create the necessary factors for the establishment of the Bolshevik mass party of the German proletariat. The Bolshevisation of the German party is linked up in the closest fashion with you.

To-day, the Communist Party of Germany is confronted with serious and difficult tasks. Under your chairmanship, the first conference of the illegal German Communist Party recently took place in Brussels, which, on the basis of the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, must break

through to the broad masses, mobilising them for the struggle against fascism and setting up the united front and the people's front. The heroic cadres of the German Communist Party who are fighting under conditions of the most bloody fascist dictatorship, are proof of the great inner force and determination which the growing party has acquired. The Party must and will secure the removal of all obstacles which stand in the way of the proletarian united front; it must and will lead the whole of the toiling people of Germany to the victorious struggle against bloody fascism. It must and will wrench Ernst Thaelmann and all other anti-fascist prisoners from the claws of the hangmen.

Dear Comrade Wilhelm! In the struggle against the chief instigator of war, German fascism, the German and international proletariat have before them the bright torch of your example of courageous action both prior to and during the world imperialist war. On your sixtieth birthday, you stand at the head of the illegal struggle of the German Communist Party, full of the same enthusiasm, the same courage, which distinguished you in the years of your youth. And we express the conviction that you, one of those revolutionaries, who by their struggle, overthrew the Hohenzollern monarchy, will lead the German proletariat in just the same way, overthrow in battle this cursed fascism, and live to the final victory of the German proletariat.

Dimitrov	Florin	Lozovsky
Manuilsky	Wan Min	Bronkovsky
Ercoli	Kolarov	Kon Sin
Kuusinen	Lensky	Tuominen
Gottwald	Okano	Mihail
Moskvin	Heckert	Keller

WILHELM PIECK.

It was the evening of July 25, 1935. The Hall of Columns of the Trade Union House was full to overflowing. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International was about to be opened. In the loggia at the side of the platform sat Stalin, the great and beloved leader of the workers and oppressed throughout the whole world. The stormy ovation continued unabated.

Wilhelm Pieck, the leader of the German Bolsheviks, opened the Congress. The eyes of all present in the Hall of Columns were turned with pride and joy towards him. Lenin and Stalin have brought into being an iron guard of Bolshevik leaders in the capitalist countries. Comrade Pieck is one of the best of them.

In the person of Pieck standing on the platform of the Congress we have the embodiment of the indissoluble tie which exists between world Com-

munist and the past and present of the entire working class movement of Western Europe. Pieck enjoys exceptional authority among tremendous masses of the Social-Democratic workers also. They know Pieck and believe in him.

Wilhelm Pieck is not only the leader of the detachment of the world Communist movement which is fighting in the front line against German fascism. Pieck is not only the embodiment of the entire path traversed by the glorious Communist Party of Germany, its past and present. Pieck is one of the most prominent leaders of the working class movement of the world.

The road taken by Comrade Pieck during the course of his life is that of the best, most advanced, and revolutionary section of the German working class. On January 3, 1936, Pieck was 60 years old, and for over 40 of these years he has been an active fighter in the ranks of the German working class movement. They are 40 years of incessant struggle against the class enemy, and against their reformist agents among the working class.

Comrade Pieck is a model of a Bolshevik leader of the masses. By long years of work and struggle he has displayed his profound loyalty to the working class cause. This loyalty has been proved in battles. His authority is based upon the fact that very wide masses of the working class regard him as their leader, and have been convinced by many years of experience that he is a capable leader.

Together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, Pieck founded the Communist Party of Germany. Together with the leader of the German proletariat, Thaelmann, Comrade Pieck has worked as his true comrade-in-arms to Bolshevise the Party, to transform it into a mass Bolshevik Party with hundreds of thousands of members and millions of supporters.

March, 1933. Hitler in power. Ferocious fascist bands are torturing and killing the best people of the German working class. The leader of the Party, Ernst Thaelmann, is in prison. Pieck takes his stand at the helm of the Party; he leads it into the struggle against fascist dictatorship.

For three years now the fascist dictatorship has been holding sway in Germany. These have been years of great trial. Such, until recently, powerful organisations like Social-Democracy and the free trade unions fell to pieces at the first onslaught of the enemy. The Communist Party alone remained firm as a rock. Its forces, though bleeding, are not for one moment losing their contacts with the mills and factories, not for one moment ceasing their work and their struggle. These glorious, courageous, Party forces have been

trained by Ernst Thaelmann and his close comrade-in-arms, Comrade Pieck.

* * *

When, as a young woodworker, Wilhelm Pieck began his active political life, the German working class movement was passing through the stormy heyday of its development. This was in the middle of the nineties of last century. The Social-Democratic Party and the free trade unions penetrated into the heart of the working masses, and became the largest working class organisations on the European Continent.

These years it was that saw the beginning of the degeneration of these organisations in the direction of reformism. German capitalism was becoming more and more full-blooded, and was passing on to the imperialist period of its development. The labour aristocracy was beginning to be created, and in the mass organisations the type of bureaucrat was growing who had settled down, and was now somewhat afraid of storms and battles.

On the borderline of the present century, reformism in Germany took shape as a finished ideological current, which as the years went by won over more and more of the leading cadres of the trade union and party organisations. The group of Left radicals, led by Rosa Luxembour, expressed the protest of the Social Democratic workers against this degeneration to reformism.

The Left wing in pre-war German Social Democracy had a number of centres where it enjoyed the greatest influence. The most important of these was Bremen. Between 1905 and 1910, Pieck was one of the secretaries of the Bremen Social Democratic organisation, and was already then the closest comrade-in-arms of Rosa Luxembour, Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring.

When the Communist Party put forward Pieck's candidature for Bremen in the Reichstag elections in 1932, the Bremen Communist newspaper, *Arbeiter Zeitung*, gave detailed information concerning the rôle played by Pieck in Bremen during the pre-war years, and added:

"If the pre-war Social-Democratic organisation in Bremen was Left-Radical, it won this glory chiefly in consequence of the work carried on by Pieck."

1908. The Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Nuremberg. On the order of the day was the question of the famous agreement between Bebel and Legien regarding the May Day strikes. Actually this agreement was "a noose to strangle the May Day strike" (Rosa Luxembour). Rosa was against the agreement. The whole reformist fraternity, led by Robert Schmidt, the theoretician of the General Commission of the Trade Unions, hurled themselves at Rosa. Pieck offered a sharp retort to Schmidt's

attacks against Rosa, declaring that he did not consider Schmidt a Party comrade.

"The Party has every ground for resisting those who during the last few years have been systematically endeavouring to turn the workers away from the right road. They are trying to lead the workers on to the road which does not lead to the winning of power. This road is only of use in giving certain Right Social-Democrats and Liberals the opportunity to voice their social-reformist endeavours."

On the question of the May strike, Pieck said the following:

"The trade unions have repeatedly declared that the May Day strike is of no use, but even brings harm. However, the lockouts by the employers just show what advantages the May Day strikes will bring to the working class movement. Would the employers have declared these lockouts if they had not been afraid of the tremendous agitational importance of the May strike? I do not agree with the method of sending deputations to the employers, requesting that they kindly allow the men not to turn up at their work on May 1. It must be made clear to the workers that it is not with the permission of the employers, but against their will, that they should celebrate their May Day, by not going in to work. If the May Day strike has not been so large as we wished, it is because of the attempts made to prevent it and the resistance offered to it in the trade unions . . . The main thing is not to retreat in fear before the bourgeoisie . . ."

In 1912 German Social Democracy met with a big success at the elections to the Reichstag, obtaining over four million votes. During the first round of the voting, only 43 Social Democratic deputies were elected. For the second round, the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party concluded an agreement with the Liberals, in which they promised to mitigate the strong election agitation against the Liberals. With the help of this agreement, the Social Democrats secured 110 seats in the Reichstag for their deputies.

At the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in Chemnitz, the C.C. reporter, Scheidemann, made a complaint that Pieck in Berlin had spoken against "bartering with the Liberals," and had said that "110 deputies have no more power than 43 deputies." Wels, Braun, and others all lined up against Pieck. In his speech, Pieck determinedly repulsed these gentlemen.

Between 1910 and 1915 Pieck worked in Berlin in the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party as one of the secretaries of the cultural department. During these years he became the organiser of the Berlin Lefts. In 1915 Ebert and Co. removed Pieck from his work for taking part in the struggle against war.

Then came August, 1914. German Social-Democracy capitulated before the imperialist desires of the bourgeoisie, and converted the workers' organisations into recruiting stations of the German General Staff. From the very first

day Pieck was among the vanguard of revolutionary fighters against war. The "International" group (subsequently known as the "Spartacus Group") entrusted Pieck with the leadership of anti-war agitation among the Berlin workers.

ON MAY 28, 1915, PIECK ORGANISED THE FIRST ANTI-WAR STREET DEMONSTRATION OF THE BERLIN WORKERS BEFORE THE REICHSTAG. THIS DEMONSTRATION MADE A TREMENDOUS IMPRESSION IN BERLIN AND THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY. The police cruelly hurled themselves upon the demonstrators and arrested Pieck on the spot. He was held in prison until far into the autumn of 1915, and was then despatched to the front, to the front line. Here Comrade Pieck was court-martialled, but he was successful in fleeing to Holland, where he continued his revolutionary work. He takes part in the work of the *Kampf*, which was printed in Holland and illegally transported to Germany. Several times Pieck illegally crossed the German frontier.

In October, 1918, Pieck finally returned to Berlin, where he worked in constant touch with Karl and Rosa until the last hours of their lives. Later when they were brought to the famous "Eden Hotel," Comrade Pieck was brought there together with them, but not being recognised by the whiteguard officers, he succeeded in escaping.

In October, 1918, immediately upon his arrival in Berlin, Pieck, together with Karl Liebknecht, worked on behalf of the "Spartacus Union" among the "revolutionary stewards" of the Berlin factories which, in the majority of cases, were under the influence of the "Independents," and energetically mobilised the workers for mass revolutionary action. Liebknecht and Pieck were both members of the Executive Committee of the Berlin "Revolutionary Stewards." There they made passionate appeals for the organisation of the revolution, and did everything possible to mobilise the Berlin factories.

During the revolution days of November, 1918, Pieck with Karl and Rosa, spoke at all the big meetings organised by the Spartacus League. During the battles in January, 1919, Pieck and Liebknecht fought, rifle in hand, together with the revolutionary sailors against Noske's counter-revolutionary detachments.

During the period before the formation of the Communist Party of Germany, Comrade Pieck belonged to the group of German Lefts, who committed a number of semi-Menshevik mistakes. Talking of these mistakes, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Of course, the Left wing in Germany have something else besides serious mistakes to record. They also have great and important revolutionary acts to their credit. I have in mind a whole series of services and revolutionary acts in connection with questions of internal policy and, in particular, of electoral struggle, on the questions of parliamentary and non-parliamentary struggle, on the

general strike, on war, on the revolution of 1905 in Russia, etc. That was precisely why the Bolsheviks regarded them as a Left wing, supported and urged them forward. But this does not and cannot remove the fact that the Left wing Social-Democrats in Germany did commit a whole series of very serious political and theoretical errors, that they had not yet thrown off their Menshevik burden and therefore needed very serious criticism on the part of the Bolsheviks."* (See—Stalin, Leninism, Vol. II. Letter to the Editorial Board of the "Proletarskaya Revolyutsia.")

Later, in the course of his struggle in the ranks of the Communist movement, Comrade Pieck successfully overcame these mistakes and became a true disciple of Lenin and Stalin.

From November 11, 1918, Pieck became a member of the C.C. of the "Spartacus Union," and at the foundation congress of the Communist Party of Germany in the end of 1918, Pieck was elected to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

Since then Pieck has been a regular member of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Germany, enjoying very great popularity and confidence among the German working masses.

DURING ALL THE YEARS OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY, COMRADE PIECK HAS SHOWN HIS DEEP LOYALTY TO THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

For many long years, Comrade Pieck was directly in charge of the Berlin organisation of the C.P.G. Under his leadership, the Berlin organisation grew into a mass organisation, and developed contacts with the factories and works.

During the years of crisis the fascist menace grew. Comrade Pieck drew attention to the existence of this danger, and called for joint action by the Communist and Social-Democratic workers.

In the end of 1931, the Bruening government issued the emergency decree reducing wages of all workers and clerks by 10-12 per cent. The leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions gave the decree their unreserved support. The Communist Party did not succeed in mobilising the masses against the decree. The Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany, which took place in February, 1932, discussed the lessons of this failure. Ernst Thaelmann delivered a speech which was conclusive in content and form, in which he concentrated the attention of the whole party upon the need for fighting against fascism. Comrade Pieck also spoke at this meeting, and said that the failure of the party to organise the resistance of the masses against the emergency decree was an alarming symptom.

"We have a position where fascism may come to power in Germany without the Communist Party successfully organising any serious resistance. It is extremely prob-

* Communist International, No. 20, 1931.

able that the fascists will deliver a blow at our party, and the party will be unable to lead the masses into the struggle. This is quite possible."

A year later, January 20, 1933, Hitler was at the head of the German government. Tens of thousands of Communists were arrested, and subjected to unheard-of tortures and murder. Until the very last minute, until the day when the Reichstag was set fire to, Pieck spoke openly at meetings, calling upon the working masses to set up a united front and to resist.

On February 10, 1933, the funeral of three young anti-fascists killed by fascists took place. The cemetery was surrounded by policemen and storm detachments. Comrade Pieck delivered a powerful and passionate speech. The leaders of German Social-Democracy had just rejected the proposal of the Communist Party to establish a united front. Said Pieck:

"The three comrades who have fallen into the hands of the fascists, were fighters in the ranks of the working class Red Front to free the proletariat, the toiling masses from poverty and slavery, from all the sufferings to which the working class are addicted. The bloodshed of these comrades in the struggle to free the working class must give us the strength to hammer out a united front now in the struggle against hunger, war and fascism. Class comrades, friends! Now is the last moment. The working class must find the road to unity, to joint struggle!"

Then began the period of exceptionally difficult work underground. Comrade Pieck was untiring in welding together the ranks of the Party, the ranks of the fighters against the bloody fascist dictatorship.

During all these years, Comrade Pieck has taken an active and leading part in all the work of the Comintern. At the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Pieck was elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern. At the Seventh Congress, he was the reporter on the first point of the agenda. He was elected to the Executive Committee, and made one of the secretaries of the Comintern — being one of those people, as COMRADE DIMITROV puts it, "who not out of a sense of discipline, but out of profound conviction, assimilate the new line and decisions of the Congress and are ready and capable of carrying them out in practice."

* * *

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International confronted the Communist Party of Germany with the task of creating a united proletarian front, and an anti-fascist people's front

of all toilers to fight against the fascist dictatorship. The Seventh Congress called upon the Communist Party of Germany to take the new road, to resort to new methods of work in mobilising the masses in defence of their own direct political and economic interests and for the overthrow of the hated fascist régime.

German fascism is experiencing great difficulties. For the first time, it can be laid on record that the peasant masses are beginning to fall away from fascism. The unrest in the factories is coinciding with the growth of discontent among the petty-bourgeois masses. The near future promises a further sharpening of food difficulties, and increased discontent and resistance among all toiling sections of the population.

The task of the Communist Party is to use all these difficulties to mobilise the masses, to organise the struggle. The Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Germany, which took place in Brussels in October, 1935, carefully analysed the work of the Communist Party during the years of the fascist dictatorship and concretely laid down the work for the near future.

At this conference, where Comrade Pieck was elected Chairman of the Party for the duration of Comrade Thaelmann's arrest, it was stressed that side by side with the struggle against Right opportunism, it is essential that the line of fire should be intensified against sectarianism, which does everything to hinder the rallying of the forces of the proletariat. The election of Comrade Pieck is the guarantee that the line of the Seventh Congress will be correctly carried out by the Communist Party of Germany.

The Communist Party of Germany, led by Comrade Pieck, is waging a stubborn struggle for the release of Comrade Thaelmann, who has become the symbol of the anti-fascist struggle throughout the world. Communists and workers of all countries greet Comrade Pieck, the closest comrade-in-arms of Thaelmann, on his sixtieth birthday. And the best way to celebrate this day will be to increase the struggle for the release of Comrade Thaelmann from the bloody dungeons of German fascism.

Not only the working class of Germany, but the working class throughout the whole world, are proudly and hopefully watching the heroic struggle of the German Communist Party, and send greetings to Comrade Pieck, the leader of the German Bolsheviks, on his sixtieth birthday.

THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT ARE COLLECTING THEIR FORCES

THE international proletariat met the New Year with a feeling of great hope and the consciousness of all the importance of the tasks facing them.

The international working class movement is turning one of the most difficult corners in solving the task of uniting all the forces of the proletariat for the class struggle, which alone can crush the power of barbarous fascism where it has already conquered, and successfully deal a blow at the fascist danger in other capitalist countries.

The sharpening of the contradictions of the capitalist system which has already found reflection in the robber onslaught by the Japanese and Italian imperialists against the peoples of Abyssinia and China, threatens to bring fresh, colossal misfortunes to mankind, already tortured by hunger, poverty, unemployment and long years of economic crisis. War is knocking at every door, and first and foremost counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. For purposes of war, fascism is conducting a furious campaign of lies and hatred against international Communism and the great land of socialism, the U.S.S.R. For purposes of war, fascism is striving to fan the flames of chauvinist passion among the masses of the petty-bourgeoisie. Deception, demagoguery, terror and provocation are the weapons of class enslavement which have been perfected by fascism, all for purposes of war.

But the world is split into two camps, and mankind sees the magnificent edifice of victorious socialism, close to completion, sees the hope of the future in the world historic victories of the U.S.S.R., which prove the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

The year 1935 was the third year of the second Five-Year Plan. On the threshold of the second Five-Year Plan, Comrade Stalin the great architect of socialism, called for the enthusiasm for building to be supplemented by enthusiasm to master the new technical processes and set the task of making a new and mighty spurt in the second half of the Second Five-Year plan, both in the sphere of construction and in the sphere of the additional increase in industrial production. To create the necessary preconditions for this new advance to raise socialist competition to a new and higher stage, Comrade Stalin pointed to the main link: "Cadres decide everything." Under the leadership of our great Stalin, the Bolshevik Party, in 1935, secured tremendous successes ON ALL sections of the great front of socialist construc-

tion and showed once more that there are no fortresses which the Bolsheviks cannot take.

The new man—the Stakhanov worker—is the product of VICTORIOUS SOCIALISM, who stands out in all his magnificence as the builder of the classless, socialist society, and who is conscious to the full of the public, socialist importance of his labour, on the basis of industry freed from capitalist fetters, and labour freed from capitalist slavery.

"The Stakhanov movement, which has developed during the Second Five-Year Plan on the basis of Socialist competition, when the collective farms have strengthened, when industry has been put on its legs, when even transport, which lagged behind, has steadily begun to climb the hill, the Stakhanov movement already expresses what is new in our country, expresses a prosperous socialist life, expresses the triumph of the ideas, aims, the cares and labours of the great founders of our party and the Land of Soviets—Lenin and Stalin."*

Is it long ago since the international bourgeoisie were prophesying the near, inevitable, downfall of the Soviet Government? Is it long ago since the theoretician of the Second International, Karl Kautsky, with the Russian Mensheviks, Martov and Sukhanov, were crowing about the "illegitimate birth" of the socialist revolution in Russia, the miserable land of wooden shacks, which had only just thrown off its semi-barbarian slavery under the tsars? Russia, they said, has not yet arrived at such heights of development of the productive forces as make socialism possible, is it possible to build socialism with such an uncultured proletariat? Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin, the genius and leader of the proletariat, showed that power by the working class is itself the shortest way to "civilising" the proletariat.

"If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say what exactly this definite 'level of culture' is), why can we not first begin by winning the preconditions for this definite level by revolutionary means, and THEN already, on the basis of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, move forward to catch up with the other peoples."†

This was the reply that the great revolutionary offered to the bankrupt philistines.

Miserable, impoverished, powerless Russia exists no more. There exists a mighty proletarian power, there is a highly-cultured, heroic people of Stakhanovs and Krivonosos, Kamanins and Molokovs, Demchenkos and Goldyevs, parachutists, tractorists, combine-workers, invincible fighters in the

* Report delivered by Comrade Kaganovich at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. on December 22, 1935.

† Lenin "Concerning our Revolution." Collected Works Vol. xxvii. p. 400. Russian Edition.

Far East. The remarkable historic prognosis of the leaders and organiser of socialist construction—Lenin and Stalin—has been put into life on the basis of the unswerving operation of the general line of the Party, in a relentless struggle against all deviations from Leninism, against all who sabotage the general line of the Party, in the hitherto unseen flowering of the creative initiative of the toiling masses of the socialist town and socialist village. The land of the Soviets, at which calumnies and lies have been hurled for 18 years, is surrounded by an unequalled halo of all the oppressed, exploited, destitute capitalist world, and is the generally recognised, most reliable strongest defender of the peace and liberty of the people, against fascism.

Meanwhile, contradictions are developing in the capitalist world, which the bourgeoisie are incapable of solving. The mechanism of capitalist production, in the words of Engels, "is breaking down under the weight of the productive forces it has created itself." Never before in the whole of the period of transition from the lowest point of the crisis to the special kind of depression, has the growth of capitalist economics been so driven in the direction of preparing for war as was the case in 1935. This is particularly noticeable if we take the example of fascist Germany.

At the same time, even now the production capacity of the enterprises, which has grown thanks to rationalisation, is very little utilised in all the capitalist countries. At the same time, the rate at which the number of workers engaged in industry is increasing continues to lag more and more behind the rate at which industry is growing in consequence first and foremost of the introduction of rationalisation at the expense of the working class. The increase in the total wages bill universally lags behind the increase in the number of workers engaged. The bestial physiognomy of capitalist rationalisation reveals its hungry grin to tens of millions of unemployed. In spite of the fact that a section of the unemployed in the United States, Germany and England, have found work, unemployment is still, as before, a millstone round the necks of the capitalist world.

Fascism, especially German fascism, which by deception and demagogy has attracted considerable masses of the more backward unemployed, during the period that it has been in power, is now faced with the menacing prospect that the now newly swelling army of unemployed will become the active hotbed of a mighty anti-fascist movement. If, in the more acute moments of crisis, the bourgeois stood in panic before the uncontrollable avalanche of unemployment, the feeling of comparative calm which arose with the

first hints of a good "economic situation," has now changed to new alarm at the fact that there are millions who still remain unemployed as before.

The International Labour Office of the League of Nations itself acknowledges the fact that the bourgeoisie are incapable of dealing with the problem of unemployment, when it declares that unemployment can only be eliminated "on an international scale."

All this shows the instability of the basis of the present growth of capitalist industry. In Germany, where it has become particularly obvious that the fascist policy of autarchy has broken down, where financial and food difficulties are growing, the bourgeoisie are openly sounding the alarm in spite of the fascist threats to deal severely with the "panic-mongers." Peter Kluckner, a prominent representative of the heavy industries, declared the following at a general meeting of company shareholders on November 3:

"The improvement for the iron and steel industry on the home market which began eighteen months ago is a quantitative situation. The prices on the home market have not risen. Overburdening factors have become still greater. . . Export brings losses. Financial consolidation is essential in order to meet the return blows of the situation."

Even the miserable fascist press is compelled to hide these ripening return processes, revealing thereby the disparity between the tasks which the fascist dictatorship has proudly taken upon itself in promising to liquidate the crisis, and the concrete possibilities of capitalist rule.

The bourgeoisie are seeking a way out in war. Italian fascism is conducting a bloody war against the small Abyssinian people who are heroically defending their independence, not only because Abyssinia is the direct, nearest object of its colonial longings, but also in order to create a jumping-off ground for itself for the "great" fight that is approaching between the imperialist robbers, and so as to distract the attention of the masses away from the difficulties of the fascist régime at home.

German fascism which has improved its political position abroad by playing upon the contradictions of the imperialists around the Italo-Abyssinian war, is striving to gain time and to make use of the wavering positions of the different imperialist powers. The internal position of German fascism may, however, force it to hurl itself into military adventures sooner than the fascist dictatorship itself "plans" it.

The efforts of British imperialism are directed towards securing a free hand in Europe for action in the Pacific, where Japanese aggression in China has openly placed the basic imperialist contradictions on the order of the day. The internal situation of the British Empire and the fear for the

integrity of its colonial possessions, are enhancing the aggressive nature of British imperialism.

The polarisation of the internal forces in France, which is more acute there than anywhere else in capitalist Europe, is making the line of the foreign policy of the French bourgeoisie more and more unstable.

* * *

Serious changes have taken place during 1935 in the relation of class forces on an international scale. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International pointed out that changes in the relation of forces in favour of the growth of the forces of revolution are taking place first and foremost as a result of the brilliant victories of the U.S.S.R. Moreover, account must be taken of the fact that after the heroic revolutionary battles of the Austrian and Spanish proletariat in 1934, after the successful resistance offered by the French proletariat to the onslaught of fascism this year, the working masses are becoming more and more imbued with the consciousness of the *possibility* of offering victorious resistance to fascism, and the **NEED FOR UNITED ACTION** by the working class, without which fascism cannot be conquered. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the historic speech delivered by Comrade Dimitrov have awakened the idea of the united front in the minds of tremendous masses of social-democratic workers. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International in itself, and its line of tactics, have raised a feeling of confidence in their own strength among broad masses of the proletariat. Faith in the might of the bourgeoisie, in the invincibility of the fascist dictatorship, a faith built up by the theories of the reactionary leaders of social-democracy regarding a complete historic epoch of fascism and reaction, has now been undermined. And if 1934 was the year which saw the first wave of open resistance to advancing fascism, in Austria, Spain and France—the year 1935 was the year which saw the international working class seriously beginning to bring about a great rallying of their forces against fascism.

Fascism still has quite a few reserves left for manoeuvring. But there is not the slightest doubt that for the first time since the stormy upsurge of the fascist movement in Germany in 1930, the authority of fascism is becoming overcast on the international arena. The unpopular war of Italian fascism in Abyssinia, its war difficulties, the growth of the difficulties inside the country, have lowered its authority among the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. The authority of German fascism is falling; in the face of the hungry winter through which the German people are passing, it

has been forced, through Shacht to threaten that "we are all in the same boat, after all, and nobody will be able to leap out of it." In 1935 the difficulties became greater for fascism. But precisely because the difficulties facing fascism are growing its aggressive attitude and the menace it represents are also growing. Fascism is re-grouping its forces. Its methods are becoming more severe. This is why the struggle against fascism, against fascist dictatorship must be developed on a still wider scale and why our vigilance must be increased in relation to the fascist danger in all the capitalist countries.

The advent of fascism to power in Germany has had tremendous consequences for the entire working class movement in capitalist Europe, the loss of authority by German fascism will doubtless also meet with an echo throughout the capitalist world. The toiling masses of the German regions in the various capitalist countries which surround Germany who are now compelled to send parcels of food by post, to their **BROTHERS IN NEED**, who are groaning under the fascist yoke, will hardly be delighted at the news emanating from fascist Germany. In Germany itself more and more favourable conditions are being created for bringing about a real people's anti-fascist front. The task facing the Communist Parties, facing all active anti-fascists, is by stubborn activity to make use of and accelerate this injury to the influence of fascism, but not to trust to things developing of themselves, nor to comfort themselves with illusions about the rate and degree with which the masses of the petty-bourgeoisie will be leaving fascism, but to ever widen the breaches in the fascist régime.

"It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every "fissure," however small in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries, among the various groups or types of the bourgeoisie in the various countries; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even temporary, though this ally be, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional."*

The activity of the proletariat is also growing in the sphere of economic struggle, the struggle of the working masses for **BREAD** — against the efforts of the capitalists of all countries to improve their "position" at the expense of further reducing the standard of living of the proletariat. There is as yet no broad wave of strikes, but a gigantic miners' strike is already on the order of the day in England, and in several other capitalist countries the strike activity of the masses is growing. The Communists have never given way to the

* Lenin: "Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder," p. 52. Martin Lawrence, London.

reactionary theories of the leaders of the Amsterdam trade unions about it being impossible to carry on a successful strike struggle in the conditions of the world economic crisis. But there is no doubt whatsoever that a certain increase in the number of workers employed, a revival in a number of industries, are facilitating the possibility of extending the economic struggle of the proletariat. The year 1936 should be a turning point in the work of the Communists and of all united front bodies among employed and unemployed workers on behalf of the urgent economic interests of the proletarian masses, a task that has been impermissibly neglected. Without the most active, most stubborn struggle for the daily, vital interests of the working class, as Comrade Dimitrov declared at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, there is no, nor can there be any real united front of the working class.

The year 1935, at the initiative of the Communist International, marked a great change in the struggle for the united front of the working class. Since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, there have been quite a few in connection with the united front in a number of capitalist countries. On the basis of a broad united front policy, the rôle of the Communist Parties as a POLITICAL FACTOR is beginning to grow. We see this in France, England, Czecho-Slovakia and other countries. The growth of the Communist Parties is steadily continuing in those countries where they are meeting with success in the establishment of the united working class front. Very wide masses are becoming more and more convinced of the fact that the Communist International is the centre of the struggle against imperialist war and this hated fascism. They are becoming convinced that the Soviet Union is the greatest bulwark of freedom and peace for the peoples. The new line of tactics laid down by the Communist International has already considerably helped to clear the way for the establishment of the united front. The practical application of this line is already setting in motion growing resistance by the social-democratic workers and party officials who are coming closer to the revolution, to the policy of the reactionary leaders of social-democracy. But many difficulties still lie on the road to the united front. The leaders of the Second International have hidden themselves behind the most reactionary leaders of five of its sections, and have rejected the proposals of the

Communist International for the united fighting front against the war being conducted by Italian fascism in Abyssinia. The resistance of the Second International to the united front still continues. Comrade Dimitrov's warning at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International concerning the difficulties and possible dangers to be met with in launching the united front has been fully justified in practice. Practical experience has shown that the extent to which the forces of the proletariat are really mustered and how far the united front meets with success depend both upon the extent to which sectarianism is overcome and also upon the extent to which Right opportunist distortions of the line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International are averted. The Communist Parties must, particularly now, remember Comrade Dimitrov's words at the Congress, that

"joint action with the Social-Democratic parties and organisations requires that the Communists exercise serious and substantial criticisms of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and untiringly explain to the Social Democratic workers in a comradely way the programme and slogans of Communism."

The process of differentiation between the social-democratic workers and Party officials who are moving towards revolution, on the one hand, and reactionary leaders on the other, is increasing in all the social-democratic parties, true, not at an even rate. While doing their utmost to advance every positive form of action on the part of social-democracy in favour of the united front, the Communists are obliged with no less force, in the interests of the united front, in the interests of assisting ALL SUPPORTERS OF THE UNITED FRONT IN THE RANKS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY, to reveal to the masses the meaning of all actions performed by reactionary leaders of social-democracy, which are hostile to the united front.

The international proletariat greeted the appeal made by Comrade Dimitrov with tremendous enthusiasm. Operating the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International with all Bolshevik firmness and consistency, fighting determinedly against sectarianism, and rooting out all attempts at opportunist distortion of these decisions, the Communists are entering upon a new year of revolutionary struggle firmly convinced that the success of the united working class front is near at hand, and the victory of the working class throughout the world is not far distant.

TEACH THE MASSES AND LEARN FROM THE MASSES

ON the anniversary of the death of our great leader and teacher, Lenin, the world proletariat, in its struggle to abolish all forms of exploitation of man by man, in the struggle for the victory of Communism, reviews its gains and losses in carrying out the great legacy of Lenin. And every year, turning to the great teachings of Lenin, the masses of the workers assimilate with exceptional vitality all those aspects of his teaching which stand out particularly clearly in their own experiences at the given stage of struggle. On the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of his death, one of these aspects is Lenin's appeal not only to teach the masses, but to learn from the masses, by carefully studying the practical experience of their struggle.

"... I do not know another revolutionary," writes Comrade Stalin, "with such a profound belief in the creative forces of the proletariat and in the revolutionary expediency of their class instinct, as Lenin... Hence the offhand attitude displayed by Lenin to all those who tried to look down upon the masses from above and to learn about them from books. Hence also Lenin's constant advice: to learn from the masses, to ponder over their actions, and to carefully study the practical experience of the struggle of the masses.*"

Lenin built up a NEW TYPE OF PARTY, different from all the parties in the Second International, a party armed with the only really scientific theory, a party which is the vanguard of the working class. But precisely because this party is called upon to lead all other forms of proletarian organisations, it must be closely bound up with them.

When speaking of the development of the European sections of the Comintern, after the Third Congress, Lenin drew attention to the fact that the most difficult and most important thing in the daily life of the party was to see that it becomes the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat, in ever closer union with them, raising them to revolutionary consciousness and the revolutionary struggle.

The greatest historical achievement in this heritage left to the world proletariat by Lenin is the NEW TYPE OF STATE—the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Soviet state. And one of the most important distinguishing features of the Soviet state is precisely this, that it gives unlimited opportunities to the masses for the development of their initiative and creative energy. Lenin pointed out on more than one occasion that only in the Soviets do the exploited masses really begin to learn, not out of books but out of their own practical experience, the

work of socialist construction, and the building up of new social discipline.

On the twelfth anniversary of the death of Lenin, the creative energy of the masses of the people of the Soviet Union has already risen to such a level of culture and technical efficiency, that out of the heart of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., a new and special kind of people have grown up, the Stakhanov movement has come into being.

At the same time the sharpening class struggle in the capitalist world makes the extremely imperative demand on the Communist vanguard of these countries that they "pursue an active Bolshevik mass policy, to draw ever wider masses into the revolutionary class struggle and to lead them forward to the proletarian revolution. TAKING AS THEIR STARTING POINT THEIR VITAL INTERESTS AND NEEDS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR OWN EXPERIENCE... The establishment of united working class action is the decisive stage along this road." (Dimitrov).

Spring, 1918. The young land of proletarian dictatorship is forced to accept the extremely burdensome Brest peace. Inside the country there is painful disorder, unemployment, hunger—the heritage of the imperialist war and the rule of the bourgeoisie, supported by Menshevism and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries. The bourgeoisie, overthrown but not yet crushed, do their utmost to secure the restoration of their power to exploit; speculation undermines revolutionary order throughout the land. The broad masses of the toilers are extremely weary and even exhausted. The country is in a state of economic breakdown, and the productivity of labour is extremely low. The bourgeoisie and its Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary agents try to undermine the Soviet Government by plots and uprisings, and shower down a flood of jeering, insults, and poisonous calumnies upon it.

It was in a situation like this, in March-April, 1918, that Lenin, in an article entitled "Current Tasks of the Soviet Government," raised in their full scope questions of the need to raise the productivity of labour in the land of proletarian dictatorship, and of socialist competition. Lenin stressed the point that in every socialist revolution, after the task of the proletariat winning power has been solved, and to the degree that the expropriators are expropriated, the task comes to the forefront of raising the productivity of labour and of organising it in the highest degree; he goes on to emphasise the fact that such a revolution can only be successfully accomplished "if there is

* Stalin, "On Lenin."

the independent, historic, creative work of the majority of the population, and first and foremost of the majority of the toilers."

Lenin uttered a warning that the raising of the productivity of labour, at that time in the Soviet Republic, especially after a tortuous and devastating war, required continuous work. One of the essential conditions for solving this task is that there should be a rise in the educational and cultural level of the masses, and an increase in the labour discipline of the toilers, and an ability to work and to organise labour better. What prospects were there for achieving the second condition? In the Spring of 1918, Lenin then wrote that "This (educational and cultural—Ed.) advance of the masses is going forward with tremendous rapidity now, and this is something that people blinded with the bourgeois routine fail to see, since they are incapable of understanding the impulsive striving after light and initiative that is now developing among the 'rank and file' of the people, thanks to Soviet organisation. The task of the party is precisely this: to base itself on this impulsive striving and initiative of the masses who have only just shaken off the incredibly savage yoke, and to advance from among them new organisers of the labour of the people."

"There is a mass of organising talent among the 'people,' i.e., among the workers and the peasants who do not exploit the labour of others; they were crushed, ruined and cast away in thousands by capital, we do not yet know how to find them, how to encourage them, to stand them on their legs, to advance them. But we shall learn this, if we settle down to learn this with all the revolutionary enthusiasm, without which there are no victorious revolutions."

That of which Lenin wrote as of the future, for the achievement of which "long months and years" were necessary, has now become the present, the wonderful present of the great land of the Soviets. The Party of Lenin and Stalin has successfully directed the creative energy of the toilers among all the peoples of the Soviet Union towards the construction of socialist society. The weak young land of the Soviets, which was regarded as easy prey by all who hate socialism, by all capitalists hunting for plunder, has become the mightiest and most stable of world Powers, the inaccessible fortress of the world proletariat. The backward agrarian country which was reduced to severe economic ruin by the imperialist war, counter-revolutionary intervention, bourgeois sabotage, and speculation by the kulaks, has now become a steadily flourishing, industrialist country. It has brought about the socialist reconstruction of the entire economic life of the country, and to-day has at its disposal technique of such a high order as is not inferior to the technique of the most advanced capitalist countries.

And at the same time as the material basis for a high productivity of labour was created, organising talent was advanced from the heart of the masses of the people, and new cadres, new heroes of the labour of the people were trained and hammered out. Bolshevism, headed by Lenin and Stalin, carried the faith in the socialist victory of the working class, in the creative power of the masses, through all the trials of economic ruin, through all the difficulties of the restoration period. At the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin was able to point to the following fact as the most important achievement of industry during the period under review, namely that "it succeeded in this period in training and hammering out thousands of new men and women, new leaders of industry, a whole stratum of new engineers and technicians, hundreds of thousands of young skilled workers who have mastered the new technique, and who have advanced our socialist industry."

On the basis of these achievements, Comrade Stalin made his historic statement on May 4, 1935, that now everything depends upon people who have mastered technique, and appealed to these people to squeeze the maximum possible out of technique. Can we doubt that the words of our leader so rapidly called forth a mighty burst of impulse on the part of workers and collective farmers, that these words fell upon the soil saturated with the creative power and enthusiasm of the masses.

"What strikes one first of all is the fact that this movement began of itself, as it were, almost spontaneously, from below, without any kind of pressure on the part of the managing boards of our enterprises. Moreover, the movement originated and began to develop in certain measure against the will of the managing boards of our enterprises, even in a struggle against them . . . And it is precisely because it originated spontaneously, precisely because it comes from below, that it is the most vital and most irresistible movement of modern times." (Stalin).

In order to raise the working class to enthusiasm for labour, in order to bring broad masses of the peasantry into socialist construction, the party of Lenin and Stalin had to crush Trotskyism, Zinovievism, and the Right kulak deviation. And the bourgeois theory of the impossibility of building socialism in one single country, of the counter-revolutionary nature of the peasantry, of the inability of the proletariat to draw the basic masses of the peasantry into the work of socialist construction, had to be buried. The Trotskyist lack of faith in the masses, the superior aristocratic attitude towards them, had to be exterminated.

In an article printed in the "Pravda" on December 19, 1935, Comrade Krupskaya recalls how during the initial steps of the organisation of indus-

trial propaganda in the U.S.S.R. (1920-21), "Vladimir Ilyich upbraided Trotsky for his unwillingness to approach the solution of the question of industrial propaganda in a businesslike manner, for his attempt to substitute 'theses of principle' for live work, for his under-estimation of concrete conditions, and for his inability to approach the masses." In his speech on December 30, 1920, Lenin said:

"... I am convinced that Trotsky has fallen into a number of mistakes connected with the very essence of the question of dictatorship of the proletariat... But if this is left aside, then we must ask ourselves, why indeed is it that we cannot secure the good collective work we need? Because of differences on the question of methods of approaching the masses, of winning the masses, and of maintaining contacts with the masses. Herein lies the essence." (Vol. XXVI, p. 66, Russ. Ed.)

Only by successfully waging a relentless struggle, as Lenin taught us, against our class enemy and its agents—counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, the Zinoviev bands, the Right deviation and the Kulak offspring, has the Party of Lenin and Stalin secured the complete triumph of emancipated labour in the Soviet Union.

It was not Lenin's lot to live until the final and irrevocable victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, but in the Communist *subbotniks* he already saw the first green shoots of Communism. He pointed out at that time that "with the support of the proletarian government, the green shoots of Communism will not wither, but will spring up and mature into full-blown Communism."

By the twelfth anniversary of Lenin's death, this dream has already become a reality. The Stakhanov movement not only makes the further consolidation of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the latter's conversion into the most wealthy country in the world possible in practice, but is also preparing the conditions already for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

* * *

The Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, as we know, re-examined the tactical line of the Communist International in the spirit, and with the help of the method, of the living Marxism-Leninism, to correspond to the changed situation, and on the basis of the extremely wealthy and instructive experiences of recent years. The Congress was able to lay the foundation for an unprecedented, broad mobilisation of all the toilers against capitalism, precisely because it correctly adopted the tactical principles of Leninism, in the new situation where there is a new alignment of class forces. What are these principles, which, without taking into account, as Comrade Stalin emphatically points out, it is impossible to correctly lead the revolution? These are, firstly, the

absolute necessity of reckoning with the national peculiarities and specific features of each individual country. Secondly, the absolute need for the Communist Party of each country to use every opportunity that arises to secure a mass ally for the proletariat, even if only a temporary and unstable one. Thirdly, the absolute need of taking into account the fact that for the political education of millions, propaganda and agitation are not sufficient. The masses require their own political experience. The Communist Party must therefore, by the policy it pursues, by its actions, by the timely substitution of one slogan by another, help the broad masses to discover, on the basis of their own experience, that the party line is a correct one, and lead them forward to revolutionary positions.

In his report at the Seventh Congress, Comrade Dimitrov reminded us that Lenin called upon us fifteen years ago to concentrate our attention "upon seeking forms through which the masses will go over to or approach the proletarian revolution." Under what conditions has the proletarian vanguard to solve this task at the present time. One of the characteristic features of the present situation is that the overwhelming masses of the toilers who, in "normal" times, stand aside from politics, are now being drawn into political life, and are becoming active because of the course events have taken. The fascists are approaching these masses not only by appealing to their prejudices but by appealing to their sharply increasing needs and growing anxieties. It is precisely because fascism is bringing masses under its influence by the most monstrous, brazen deceit, that the mass base upon which it stands, and which it tramples upon, is its most vulnerable spot. It is therefore impossible to mobilise the broad masses and to set them in motion against advancing fascism, except on the basis of their direct economic and political demands. In the fascist countries it is even more impossible to lead the masses to the decisive struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, except by drawing the toilers, who are members of the mass fascist organisations, into the most elementary movement in defence of their economic, political and cultural interests.

Lenin pointed out that

"It is much more difficult—and much more useful—to be a revolutionary when the conditions for direct, open, really mass and really revolutionary struggle have not yet matured, to be able to defend the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organisation) in non-revolutionary bodies and even in reactionary bodies, in non-revolutionary circumstances, among the masses who are incapable of immediately appreciating the necessity for revolutionary methods of action."*

* Left-Wing Communism, p. 76.

Just then it is important to be able to find and operate a concrete plan of measures which are not yet fully revolutionary, of methods and means which lead the masses up to the real, decisive, revolutionary struggle. Basing itself on this, the Seventh Congress concretely determined the starting point and content of the working class united front at the given stage of struggle, and adopted a decision on work inside the mass fascist organisations and the non-party class organisations as the best form for conducting and consolidating the united front among the rank and file and that the proletariat must support the demands of the toiling masses that correspond to its basic interests.

Lenin taught us to get our directions not from historical analogies and parallels, but from the study of surrounding conditions. The Bolsheviks must base their activities not upon quotations and sayings, but upon practical experience, testing every step on the basis of experience and learning from their own mistakes, and teaching others. Correspondingly the Seventh Congress demanded that the sections of the Comintern in their approach to the masses should consider the process taking place among these masses, as well as all the lessons of their own experiences, when applying the united front tactics. This means to take account of the changes which have taken place or are taking place in a number of countries in the position of social-democracy in the bourgeois state and its attitude to the bourgeoisie, of the process of differentiation in the ranks of social-democracy, of the reactionary rôle of its Right wing and the uneven process inside its Left wing of advance towards revolution, etc. The more rapidly the experience of the social-democratic masses is enriched by the practice of the class struggle, the more effectively will the Communists be successful in undermining the influence of the reactionary camp of social-democracy and in accelerating the process of revolutionisation inside its left camp, and the more they base this political educational work upon the experiences of the social-democratic masses themselves, the more convincing will the Communists be able to explain the principles and programme of Communism and to make their criticism of Social Democracy.

Lenin taught the point that Marxism recognises different forms of struggle, that "far from having any pretensions about teaching the masses forms of struggle elaborated by office 'systematizers,'" it generalises, organises, gives conscious shape to those forms of struggle of the revolutionary classes which originated in the course of the movement. Guided by these tactical rules, the Congress stressed the point that the united front will

be concretely established in different ways in different countries, will take on different forms according to the corresponding situation.

In preparing the proletariat for rapid changes in the forms and methods of struggle to suit the changing circumstances, the Communists must find the central issues, in each country, and at each stage of the struggle, around which to unite the forces of the proletariat, to consolidate the toilers around the working class in a broad people's front, as the main tasks confronting the international proletariat to-day which can be realised. "We did not invent this task," said Comrade Dimitrov, "the experience of the international working class movement itself, and first and foremost the experiences of the proletariat of France, put forward this task."

Lenin showed how the content and forms of the work of Communists must change with the transition from the ideological conquest of the vanguard of the proletariat to the next task, namely, practical mass political action. Whereas in the first case, propaganda is of decisive importance, in the second case, propagandist habits and the mere repetition of the truths of "pure" Communism will achieve nothing. "Here we must ask ourselves not only whether we have convinced the vanguard of the revolutionary class, but also whether the historically acting forces of ALL classes, of all classes without exception of the given society, have been distributed in such a manner as to ensure that the time for a decisive battle has matured . . ." Making this task its starting point, the Seventh Congress demanded of its sections that they must not be satisfied with mere propaganda of general slogans about the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet Power, but that they conduct a concrete active, Bolshevik policy on all the home and foreign problems of the given country, and on all essential problems which concern the lives and interests of the working class of the given people and of the international movement.

True to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the leading rôle of the Communist Party which, in its work, must combine the highest degree of principle with the maximum of connections and contact with the masses, the Congress called on the parties to "safeguard the Bolshevik unity of the party as the apple of the eye." Comrade Dimitrov emphasised that the consolidation of the Communist parties does not constitute a narrow party interest, but represents the interests of the whole of the working class.

Lenin uttered the warning that the task of leading the masses forward to new positions cannot be solved without eliminating left doctrinaire

methods, without completely overcoming the mistakes arising out of them. In the changed situation, left doctrinaire methods are now frequently being transformed from the "infantile disorder" of which Lenin wrote, into deep-rooted vice, into self-satisfied sectarianism. Only by eradicating the remains of self-satisfied sectarianism and in every way increasing vigilance and the struggle against right opportunists, the danger of which is growing as the broad united front develops, will the Communist Parties render themselves safe from becoming isolated from the masses and from dragging in the tail of events.

* * *

An enormous abyss lies between the attitude of Bolshevism and reformism towards the masses. Reformism, the ideology and policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, not only adopts a high-handed bourgeois attitude towards the masses, but is not capable nor desirous of drawing lessons from the experiences of mass struggle.

We are witnessing to-day how the Right wing of Social-Democracy is doing its utmost to hinder the masses under its influence from understanding the causes of the advent of fascism to power, from recognising the forces which, having been brought into motion on the basis of the united front, have already shown that they are capable of offering resistance to the advance of fascism or of preventing the consolidation of the fascist power. A similar mockery of the urge for unity of the suffering working mass is the haggling by some "left" leaders who, at one moment, under the pressure of the masses, take one step towards the united front, and at another, deceive the masses once more by taking two steps backwards.

In the capitalist countries the reformists who have led the masses to defeat and are displaying tremendous adaptability, ignore and disregard the experiences of the masses in the class struggle. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the leader of the international proletariat, Comrade Stalin, on behalf of the Soviet Government and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union thanks the

representatives of the Stakhanov movement which is advancing from below, from the rank and file, for what he has learned from them. Calling to mind Lenin's advice, not only to teach the workers and peasants, but also to learn from them, Comrade Stalin said at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, that:

"I will not try to deny that the members of this conference have learned a thing or two at the conference from the leaders of our Government. But neither can it be denied that we, the leaders of the Government, have also learned from you Stakhanov workers, from the members of this conference. So then we thank you, comrades, for the lesson, many thanks!"

All Comrade Dimitrov's speeches at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and his speech at the opening of the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International were saturated with appeals to study constantly at every step in the struggle, to learn from one's own experience, as well as from the experiences of the masses, to study so as to learn how to swim as fast as possible in the turbulent waters of the class struggle, Comrade Dimitrov, by his personality, by his struggle, confronts the international proletariat as a living example of "how to unite tremendous passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the greatest coolness and sober calculation of the infuriated writhings of the bourgeoisie." (Lenin).

By the twelfth anniversary of the death of Lenin, the mobilisation of all the forces of the toilers against capitalism is taking place on such a wide scale as never before in the history of the struggle of the working class. These forces are being mobilised around the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, which is held high on the international arena by Comrade Dimitrov, the standard-bearer of the Comintern. The sections of the Comintern in capitalist countries are also being transformed into parties of Leninism, capable of giving the correct line of advance to millions of the proletariat, and of preparing, organising and leading them forward to the decisive struggle against capitalism, for the victory of the revolution.

AN ADDITION TO THE

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY SERIES

**LENIN'S ROAD TO THE OCTOBER
REVOLUTION - - 6d.**

MODERN BOOKS, LTD.

THERE ARE NO GROUNDS FOR SELF-SATISFACTION*

By O. KUUSINEN.

COMRADES! There is no doubt that the Seventh Congress of the Communist International has called forth great changes in the work of the Communist Parties. We notice everywhere serious efforts on the part of our Parties to carry through the united front tactics. These changes, however, must not cover up the fact of the existence of mistakes and shortcomings. The Secretariat, after establishing a number of such mistakes and shortcomings in the practical activity of our Parties, came to the conclusion that there is basis enough for this question to be discussed with the representatives of the Parties.

When the Seventh Congress of the Communist International demanded that all Communist Parties concretely conduct the united front policy, the Congress realised that in practice, this would be no light task that could be solved without effort. Now we see that, in practice, the greater part of the Communist Parties are taking the line of least resistance. Instead of conducting a concrete united front POLICY, what is being done in the majority of cases is general PROPAGANDA of the united front. It is clear that with such an approach the decisions of the Seventh Congress will not achieve their aims. The point is to apply the decisions concretely in practice, but it is especially in this regard that the position is still very weak.

Our Parties have made quite a few united front proposals to the Social Democratic Parties, but where these proposals have been rejected—that is in the majority of cases — our Parties have not taken sufficient steps independently to develop mass action.

The schematic approach to their work by the Communist Parties was subjected to very sharp criticism in the resolution of the World Congress, and particularly in the speeches of Comrade Dimitrov. The demand was also made that the tactics of the united front be applied “in a new manner.” But examples are now to be observed which show that in practice, in some cases, it is merely these same schematic methods which are being applied in a new manner.

1.—Insufficient Activity in the Sphere of Economic Struggles.

So as to give a striking example of this here, I wish to mention the fact that many of our Parties

* Report delivered on November 20, 1935, at a meeting of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. together with the representatives of the Communist Parties, on the shortcomings and mistakes in the carrying out of the united front policy laid down by the 7th World Congress of the Comintern.

are satisfied with the most general political slogans and underestimate the necessity of putting forward demands which DEAL WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE MASSES.

Slogans such as “Peace and Freedom and Democratic Rights” are now in use everywhere, but the slogans of the STRUGGLE FOR BREAD are often forgotten. Comrade Marty has given us examples of this from France, but it is not in France alone that many Communists, when raising the struggle for peace and freedom, leave the question of bread in the background. Peace and freedom, of course, are undoubtedly irreplaceable benefits, but every worker knows and feels that freedom without bread is not enough. In the same way, peace without bread is but little better for the workers in the capitalist world than the quiet of the graveyard. The scourge of hunger is the chief weapon in the hands of the capitalist slavedrivers.

You, probably, still remember that the central thought of the resolutions of the Seventh Congress and of every remark made by Comrade Dimitrov was that the defence of the DIRECT ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASS MUST comprise the starting point and the main content of the policy of the united front. It is especially in the struggle for the defence of the ECONOMIC interests of the working class that the activity of the majority of our Parties is particularly weak at the present time. But we cannot say that this weakness is based on OBJECTIVE conditions. On the contrary, it can rather be said that the objective conditions for the development of the economic struggle have become more favourable in a number of countries. But our Parties made far from sufficient use of them.

Though it is absolutely incorrect to say that the economic struggle is IMPOSSIBLE during the crisis, as the reformists claimed at one time, it is nevertheless a fact that economic struggles were hampered to a considerable degree during the crisis. What was it that hampered them? Primarily the PRESSURE OF WIDESPREAD UNEMPLOYMENT. It is from THIS point of view that we must examine whether the objective conditions for the economic struggle have become better or not.

On the basis of the information that I have received from Comrade Varga, the state of affairs on the labour market is as follows.

In general, the pressure of mass unemployment has grown less in most capitalist countries in this last period. In Great Britain, for instance, the number of insured unemployed fell from the peak of almost three millions in January, 1933, to some-

what under two millions in September, 1935. In the U.S.A., the number of workers who have found employment in the last two years is estimated at from 2,700,000 to 4,000,000. In Germany also, according to the statistics of the sick benefit societies, the number of employed workers increased from 12,700,000 to 16,000,000 between August, 1932, and September, 1935. No matter how unreliable these general figures may be, they show, in any case, that the demand for labour power has somewhat grown.

There are, of course, countries where unemployment in 1935 is higher than before—France, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and some others. It must also be borne in mind that the number of the unemployed varies from time to time. During the last few months, for example, a certain growth of unemployment has begun once more in the U.S.A. and in Germany. This is connected partly with seasonal and other fluctuations in production and partly with an increased intensity of labour. The size of the tremendous army of the unemployed is affected in particular by the ever-growing influx from the ranks of the young people who were born in the post-war years (when the number of births greatly increased) and have now reached the working age.

It is not enough, though, to consider the general unemployment figures in order to make a proper estimate of the conditions for economic struggles. It is necessary to consider unemployment in the separate industries, for there exist considerable differences between these. In Great Britain, U.S.A. and Germany, for example, there are a number of branches of industry where the proportion of chronically unemployed has fallen almost to "normal," i.e., to the level existing in capitalist industry before the crisis. In other spheres, it still keeps at a considerably higher level.

In Great Britain, the following figures show the percentage of unemployed among insured workers in various industries:—

	Maximum before crisis, 1929	Maximum during crisis	September, 1935
Manufacture of Explosives ...	3.6	16.8	5.4
Automobile In- dustry	5.2	22.7	8.7
Chemical Indus- try	6.0	18.8	10.5
Coal	13.2	41.7	24.8
Shipbuilding ...	22.5	64.2	41.7

In the United States, if we take the proportion of employed workers in 1923-1925 as 100, the num-

ber has risen from the lowest point until September, 1935, as follows:

Engineering	from 47.1 to 91.1
Automobiles	from 42.0 to 95.1
Chemical Industry ...	from 71.1 to 110.7
Footwear	from 73.1 to 89.1
Rubber	from 59.8 to 81.1

In Germany, the percentage of employed workers increased from the lowest point until September, 1935, in comparison with the busiest season in the factories, as follows:

Iron and Steel	from 42.5 to 81.8
Production of Means of Production	from 24.7 to 77.4
Manufacture of Con- sumption Goods, only	from 47.7 to 61.7

Unemployment has fallen off particularly in those industries which are connected with the manufacture of war munitions. But the fall in unemployment is also to be explained, particularly in the U.S.A., by the partial renewal of new factory equipment, etc. As a rule, relations on the labour market have changed much less in favour of the workers in those industries which directly serve the needs of the masses.

A new phenomenon has become evident lately on the labour market—THE SHORTAGE OF SKILLED LABOUR POWER. This is particularly the case in many branches of the war industry in Germany, in Great Britain (especially in the aviation industry) and partly in the U.S.A. This arises, on the one hand, from the fact that the volume of production in certain industries has risen above the pre-crisis level and, on the other hand, from the fact that the qualifications of some of the workers deteriorated during the crisis owing to prolonged unemployment, while only a very few apprentices received vocational training. In any case, it is undeniable that not only has the pressure of unemployment weakened in a number of industries, but there even is in evidence a more or less considerable demand for skilled labour.

If, then, we study the concrete situation in each country, it can be seen that the conditions for the economic struggle have become MORE FAVOURABLE in some industries, even if this is not so on the whole. This faces the workers and especially the Communists with the task of correspondingly increasing their activity. Every effort must be made to develop the economic struggles of the working masses and to achieve unity in the economic struggle. In proportion as, after long periods of want during the crisis years, there is now to be noticed a considerable increase in the demand for labour power—even though it be in

only individual branches of industry—and a slackening of the pressure of unemployment, the militant activity of the workers will grow very powerfully. We see this in Great Britain, for example, among the miners, 400,000 of whom voted for a strike while there were only less than 30,000 votes cast against it.

The majority of our Parties take an unpardonably passive attitude towards these developments.

Even in France, the country where the Communist Party on the whole has conducted the united front policy most energetically and successfully, we find a great deal of passivity in the application of the united front in relation to economic movements.

According to the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, joint co-ordinated action has to be developed not only on a national scale, but also on a local scale, even in INDIVIDUAL FACTORIES and INDUSTRIES, as well as special action for the demands of the unemployed, the youth, women, peasants, etc.

Some comrades may object that it is not always easy in practice to bring about an agreement on common action with the Social Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions. Granted, but what remains to be done in such a case? Should we stand by with folded arms and merely continue to carry on simple propaganda of the united front? This is not what the Seventh Congress thought. The Congress expressively emphasised the point that:

“WITHOUT FOR A MOMENT GIVING UP THEIR INDEPENDENT WORK IN THE SPHERE OF COMMUNIST EDUCATION, ORGANISATION AND MOBILISATION OF THE MASSES, the Communists, in order to render the road to unity of action easier for the workers, must strive to secure joint action with the Social Democratic Parties, reformist trade unions and other organisations of the toilers . . .”

Thus we must constantly strive to secure joint action, but irrespective of whether agreement is reached on joint action, Communists must not for a moment give up their independent work in the sphere of the education, organisation and mobilisation of the masses. Such was the opinion of the Congress.

2.—An Abstract, Schematic Approach not yet Eliminated from the Practical Work of our Parties.

The Congress pointed out that there are two sides to be distinguished in the tactics of the united front, both integrally connected with each other—namely, the struggle for the direct interests of the toiling masses and the struggle to establish the united front. If we leave the former of these without attention or relegate it to the background, if we merely conduct abstract propaganda for the united front, we shall sink once more into a lifeless, schematic way of doing things.

The Seventh Congress gave important directives as to the various aspects from which we can find the CORRECT SLOGANS AND FORMS OF STRUGGLE which will set the broad masses in motion, even when we fail to reach agreement on the united front.

These directives in the resolutions of the Seventh Congress could, of course, only be of a general character. The important thing is to apply them in practice. What was emphasised in this connection? It was stressed that we must launch slogans and use forms of struggle such as “arise from the vital needs of the masses and from the level of their fighting capacity to the given stage of development.”

Consequently, we must constantly, and in the most conscientious manner, adhere to these two directives, namely, to make our starting point, firstly, the vital needs of the masses, and, secondly, the level of the fighting capacity of the masses at the given stage of development. With this aim we must accurately ascertain the concrete vital needs of the masses and the level of their fighting capacity. If we do not pay attention to these circumstances, we shall not be able to tell the masses WHAT THEY CAN AND MUST DO TO-DAY to defend themselves from being robbed by the capitalists and from the fascist offensive of the bourgeoisie. In practice, this is the most important thing in giving concreteness to the policy of our Parties.

But it is just this aspect of the practical activity of our Parties that continues to be the weakest. We cannot say that the various leading bodies in our Parties have a sufficient knowledge of, and study and take into consideration the concrete vital needs of the workers, the sorest needs of the masses and the level of their fighting capacity at the given moment, and that ON THIS BASIS they weigh the advisability of slogans and forms of struggle. But as long as they do not do this, as long as they do not set aside the old bad methods, and do not put a stop to the practice of bringing forward long lists of slogans of action, even though partial slogans, but still which they have taken from the air, as long as they do not learn to work out practical slogans of action and PROGRAMMES OF ACTION based on an all-round knowledge of the existing economic and political situation and the level of the fighting capacity of the working masses at the given moment, so long then, can we not say that they have mastered the line of Bolshevik mass policy. But the very essence of the united front policy must be that it is a concrete mass policy.

In a capitalist country we are not in a position to place any questions we desire on the order of the day in the political life of the country. We

often have to seize on questions which our opponents raise. It is even more important to listen to the voice of the masses, to find out what are their demands and what urgent questions are most deeply agitating them. How often do our comrades repeat in articles and resolutions that they are fighting for the demands of the working masses, whereas in practice, the demands advanced by the Communists (good demands in themselves) do not correspond to the concrete demands for which the masses, at the given moment, want to fight. We must draw lessons from this, for there are still many cases showing that the direct interests of the working masses and of other strata of the toilers, particularly their economic demands, are expressed in too schematic a manner or are relegated to the background in the slogans of the Parties.

Of course, this is not the only form of schematic work of our Parties. There are other examples showing the same abstract approach, for example, raising the question of a GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED FRONT in such a way as may easily give rise to an incorrect interpretation. We know of such an example from the experience of France. In that country the question of the united front government was raised by some leading comrades without any connection with a corresponding situation of political crisis, and especially without any connection with the upsurge of the mass movement. The government of the people's front was spoken of in such a vague and general form that this government could be understood to be just an ordinary left bourgeois government.

This differs widely from the conception developed by Comrade Dimitrov at the Congress. First of all, he raised the government of the people's front not as an "aim in itself," but as one of the possibilities in the path towards the proletarian dictatorship and to Soviet power. Secondly, his arguments were aimed at showing that one of the chief shortcomings in the treatment of these questions at the Fourth and Fifth Congresses of the Comintern was the fact that the question of a workers' and peasants' government was raised without any connection with the situation, i.e., irrespective of a mass upsurge and a situation of political crisis. It was due to this that mistaken conclusions of a Right opportunist or Leftist nature were arrived at, and that a correct solution of the question could not be found.

This lesson, after the report of Comrade Dimitrov, should have been clear to all comrades, but this was not remembered by all. I have to admit, however, that in the last few weeks, the leaders of the C.P. of France, especially Comrade Thorez, have brought clarity into this question, so that it does not cause confusion in France. In

addition to this, Comrade Thorez has made very valuable proposals with a view to strengthening the united front in France.

The question of POLITICAL UNITY is similarly being raised so abstractly in some cases as if it had the same form and importance in various countries.

3.—Mistakes and Shortcomings in the Struggle Against War and the War Danger.

War has been in full swing for many weeks and the danger of a world war is growing with each week. But most of the Communist Parties are conducting the struggle on this question with insufficient energy.

I do not wish to assert that no struggle at all is being carried on. As you know, various demonstrations and protest meetings against war have been held in a number of countries. Even strikes were declared in some cases, and the Communist press is everywhere conducting a more or less energetic campaign against war.

But unless I am mistaken, the activity of the majority of our Parties has weakened rather than strengthened in the last few weeks, that is to say, during the period that the war has been on. At the very beginning of the war they made bigger and more successful efforts. Is this the case or is it not? Let the comrades who have a better knowledge of the situation in their own countries express their views on this question. In general, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the struggle of the Communists on this matter is mainly limited to a campaign in the press and possibly to a few speeches on the united front which give very scanty results.

Under the pressure of the reactionary leaders of five Social Democratic Parties, the Executive Committee of the Second International rejected our proposal for an international united front. But even the Executive Committee of the Second International dared not prohibit the Social Democratic Parties of individual countries from coming to an arrangement with the Communist Parties on the united front. It is therefore necessary, firstly, to continue our efforts for creating a united front in the various countries in the struggle against the war. Secondly, what have we to do in those places where, despite all our efforts, we have not yet succeeded in bringing about a united front on this question with the Social Democratic Parties, or where we are not even in a position to bring about a united front agreement with the local organisations of the Social Democratic Parties. Should we do nothing in such places? It is obvious that we Communists must appeal in such places to the working class, independently organise protest meetings, demonstrations against the war as well

as other mass actions, and in general do everything that is in our power to set the broadest masses into motion.

Thirdly, a campaign must be carried on against the reactionary leaders of the Second International who disrupted international unity of action against war. But this campaign has not yet been developed.

In connection with our united front proposals, some of the leaders of the Second International got into a difficult situation at first. Anxiety was very noticeable among the leading personages of the Second International during the first few weeks after the Communist International published its proposal. Some of them wavered, fearing the consequences of their rejection of the Comintern proposal to form the united front. The majority were even afraid to say openly at the session of the Executive Committee that they were against the united front, and they hid behind the backs of the representatives of the five parties, and the reason they gave for rejecting the Comintern proposal was that the representatives of five parties did not want it and they had to reckon with the opinion of these parties.

It can now be seen that these people have gained courage once more, since we are not conducting any campaign against the infamous decision of the Executive Committee of the Second International. Once more they are making impudent attacks on the Communist Parties in their press with a view to maintaining the split in the working class. Their hobby now is the policy of sanctions, and they are trying to foist on the masses the line of simply supporting the Anglo-French policy of the League of Nations; while our Parties have not yet succeeded in exposing the imperialist nature of this policy (for example, the plan for the partition of Abyssinia) in a manner that the people can understand.

Allow me to give a few examples.

The British Labour Party was one of the parties whose representatives directly brought about the rejection of our united front proposals by the Executive Committee of the Second International. At first, in the *Daily Worker*, the central organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the statement of the E.C.C.I. was published in which these people—Dallas, Compton and others who disrupted the international united front—were arraigned before the judgment of the international proletariat. But after publishing this statement our paper forgot about the matter. On the very next day (November 7) the *Daily Worker* published Compton's own electoral manifesto without making any criticism of his conduct on this matter in Brussels.

The Swedish Social Democrats, Lindstrom and

Höglund, also belong to the wreckers of the international united front. But the central organ of our Swedish Party did not carry on any campaign about their conduct in Brussels. Mr. Höglund spoke in Stockholm in defence of the position of the Second International and especially of his own conduct. He even repeated the old slander that the Comintern proposal for the united front was merely a "manoeuvre." Our Communist paper did not consider it worth while to criticise Höglund, and limited itself to publishing his speech for information purposes!

A situation is created when it is difficult for the Swedish workers to see any fundamental difference between the points of view of the Communist and Social Democratic Parties on the question of sanctions and on the rôle of the League of Nations, so little have our comrades succeeded in distinguishing themselves from the Social Democrats on this question. This is utilised by the followers of Kilbom, who come forward with Trotskyite arguments against sanctions in general.

Things are almost the same in Norway. The Communists content themselves with bringing pressure to bear on the Social Democratic government so as to make it insist on the necessity for the League of Nations to apply sanctions. They do not explain to the workers that the League of Nations, owing to imperialist contradictions, is incapable of using real measures to hinder the war and that the League of Nations itself can only be moved to take more serious steps if the working masses develop independent joint activity against war.

In Canada, our press at first took up a stand in opposition to sanctions, and this created the impression that the leaders of the Labour Party occupy a more correct position. Before the Party rectified this mistake, confusion was created which helped to weaken the struggle for the united front.

On this question the American *Daily Worker* gave a big advertisement to Otto Bauer by printing in heavy type, "Otto Bauer Points Way to Working Class Unity Against War." Otto Bauer had only written of the possibility that some of the Socialist Parties would exchange information and opinions with the Comintern on this question, by no means, it is true, for the purpose of concluding an agreement. This was sufficient for the *Daily Worker* to ask:

"But will the American S.P. go along with these people—whose bitter opposition to the united front is actually a fight to maintain their own united front with the capitalists—or WILL IT GO ALONG WITH OTTO BAUER, WITH THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF FRANCE, AUSTRIA, ITALY, SPAIN, SWITZERLAND, THE POLISH BUND, THE MENSHEVIKS, with the progressive forces in all Socialist Parties."

This is what is called journalism in America! Even the Mensheviks, who have long since

received their final sentence from history, who have long since existed as the living corpse of a counter-revolutionary party, even they are classed as one of the "progressive forces" of the working class movement.

I can fully understand that the editors of the *Daily Worker* wanted to demonstrate their skill in distinguishing between enemies and allies. But, when a caricature is made of this, it does not make the task for the Party easier, but on the contrary more difficult.

Thus there are big shortcomings and mistakes in the work of our Parties on this extremely important sector of the front.

4.—Criticism of the Reactionary Policy of Social Democracy is Blurred Over.

The examples which I have just quoted indicate that there are serious shortcomings and mistakes in the approach of some of our comrades to the Social Democrats.

As we know, the Seventh World Congress gave our Party new and important directives on the tactics to be adopted towards Social Democracy—that the united front tactics must be operated in a new manner, that the process of differentiation within Social Democracy must be taken into account, and a varied approach made to the various camps and tendencies within Social Democracy, and even to individual Social Democratic Party officials; that we must generally in our criticism of Social Democracy argue in a businesslike manner, etc. Yes, our World Congress demanded all of this. But our World Congress did not say that we must give up all our criticism of Social Democracy or abandon the struggle against the reactionary section of Social Democracy. In the practical activity of some of our Parties, it sometimes seems as if some of our comrades must have understood the directions of the Seventh World Congress in just such a false manner. I wish to remind you first of all of what the World Congress said on the struggle in principle against Social Democracy:

"Joint action with the Social Democratic Parties and organisations," the Congress emphasised, "not only does not preclude but, on the contrary, **RENDERS STILL MORE NECESSARY** the serious and well-based criticism of reformism, of Social Democracy, as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and the patient exposition of the principles and programme of Communism to the Social Democratic workers."

This criticism of the basic principles of Social Democracy, and the strengthening of the propaganda for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for Soviet Power was regarded by the Seventh World Congress as a necessary development of the tactics of the united front which must not be neglected when joint actions take place.

The Seventh Congress further demanded that Communists increase their struggle against the reactionary section of the Social Democrats at the same time that they establish the closest co-operation with those Left Social Democratic workers, party officials and organisations which are fighting against the reformist policy and which stand for the united front with the Communist Party:

"The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of Social Democracy which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of Social Democracy which is becoming revolutionised."

Consequently, the task of encouraging the revolutionary process inside Social Democracy presupposes an increased struggle against its reactionary section.

"And in the Left camp," says the Congress, "the self-determination of the various elements will take place the sooner, the more resolutely the Communists fight for a united front with the Social Democratic Parties."

Thus the Seventh Congress demanded that we fight for the united front and do not turn aside from the struggle. **IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE THE UNITED FRONT WITHOUT A STRUGGLE.** If there were no opponents of the united front, then we could shout "Long live the united front"! But things will not go on so swimmingly. The united front can only be achieved by a struggle, in the first place, by an increased struggle against the **OPEN** enemies of the united front; in the second place, by criticism of the concealed enemies of the united front—which is no less necessary; in the third place, by correct tactics towards those Social Democrats who willingly accept the united front in words, but do nothing in practice to bring it about. And with such Social Democratic leaders, we cannot make a step forward by adopting a complacent attitude of conciliation. What did the Congress say about the leaders?

"The attitude to the practical realisation of the united front will be the chief indication of the true position of the various groups among the Social Democrats. In the fight for the practical realisation of the united front, those Social Democratic leaders who come forward as Lefts in words will be obliged to show by deeds whether they are really ready to fight the bourgeoisie and the Right Social Democrats, or are on the side of the bourgeoisie, that is, against the cause of the working class."

As you see, the Seventh World Congress gave absolutely clear directions. But is the practical activity of our Parties equally clear? No. There are plenty of cases in which our comrades deliberately avoid criticising the reactionary steps of the Right Social Democrats, cases when they react weakly or not at all to the actions of these Rights or when they restrict themselves simply to defending themselves against the most brazen attacks of the reactionary Social Democrats. In past years, many Communists replaced businesslike criticism of Social Democracy by merely denouncing them.

Now, on the other hand, it happens that necessary and serious businesslike criticism is replaced by silence. This shows how well-founded was the warning given by the Congress that the RIGHT DANGER WILL GROW when the tactics of united front are widely applied.

In Great Britain at the beginning of the election campaign, the criticism of the Labour Party by the Communist Party was pushed into the background. The resistance of the Labour leaders to the united front was not sufficiently criticised either in the press or among the voters. It is true, that as the election campaign proceeded, the Party corrected these omissions, but this took place rather late in the day. The leading organ of the Labour Party, the *Daily Herald*, played a double-handed game towards our Party. The edition of the *Daily Herald*, circulating in South Wales where Comrade Pollitt was a candidate, was full of attacks on the Communists. But in the edition circulating in London, where our support was very valuable for the Labour Party, the *Daily Herald* refrained from attacks on us. This double game of the *Daily Herald* was not exposed by our press, and the workers were not clearly shown the difference between the Communist Party and the Labour Party.

Here is an example from Czecho-Slovakia. A few weeks ago the Social Democratic trade union leader, Hampel, spoke at the Congress of the Metal Workers' Union. He advocated the unity of the metal workers' trade unions, but in his opinion this unity must take place simply on the basis of the Social Democratic platform by uniting the members of the Red trade union to the Social Democratic union. Such was the gist of his speech. The central organ of our Party, *Rude Pravo*, welcomed Hampel's speech as a step forward and gave up all criticism of him.

The readers were left under the impression that Hampel spoke in favour of trade union unity.

A little later this same Hampel spoke at the Prague Conference of Czech Social Democracy, and there he showed still more clearly that he merely wished to cover up the old Social Democratic policy of splitting the working class and of defeating the Communist Party with his words about the "unity of the working class." Hampel's tactics fully conform with the point of view of the leading bodies of the Social Democratic Party of Czecho-Slovakia. The Social Democratic paper, *Pravo Lidu*, also comments on Hampel's speech in the following words:

"All sections of Social Democracy are advancing towards the objective of uniting the forces of the working class of Czechoslovakia on the ideological basis of constructive socialism. This presumes that the other big Socialist parties, the National Socialists as well as a large

number of the members of the Communist Party are to a considerable degree ripe already for such a decision."

In reply to this statement in *Pravo Lidu*, and the speeches by Hampel, the Communist paper, *Rude Pravo*, stated the following among other things:

"Hampel's remarks give us great satisfaction and are the result of many years of our work . . ."

The polemics of the Communist paper were not directed against Hampel and the leaders of Social Democracy, but only against the extreme Right Social Democrat, Bechyne, the Minister of Railways, who also advocates a united front, but on the basis of class co-operation with the bourgeoisie. In *Rude Pravo*, criticism even of the Benes Party and the trade unions connected with it is blurred over. Their leaders also advocate "unity," but it is unity on the basis of the "state and nation," on the platform of Czechish National Socialism. And *Rude Pravo*, in an opportunist manner, presents all this as a "step forward" towards the unification of the working class!

I have already mentioned how the *Daily Worker* in America praised Otto Bauer and the Mensheviks. But as Otto Bauer and the Mensheviks are foreigners, it may be allowed that the editors did not know these people sufficiently. But they ought to have a good knowledge of John Lewis, the miners' leader, who has been carrying on a fierce struggle for many years to throw the Communists out of the miners' union. At the last session of the A.F. of L., Lewis proposed that Matthew Woll, vice-president of the A.F. of L., should not in the future occupy the post of acting president of the National Civil Federation, an organisation of big industrial magnates in which, for the purposes of class collaboration, several of the higher functionaries of the A.F. of L. were also included. To that extent, Lewis's proposal was a correct one. But, that this was only a harmless blow at Matthew Woll, can be seen from the circumstance that Woll himself, immediately after the proposal was introduced, hastened to resign by telegraph from his position in the National Civil Federation. But just imagine how our *Daily Worker* later lauded this proposal of Lewis's! It carried a big headline: "Lewis's Resolutions Strike Blow at Class Collaboration." And it continued in an energetic style:

"Yesterday the 55th Convention of the American Federation of Labour got a glimpse—brief, but unforgettably vivid—of the parting of the ways.

"The voice of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, must have sounded like the crack of doom in the ears of Matthew Woll and the extreme Tory wing of the A.F. of L. Executive Council. The two resolutions introduced by Lewis objectively hit at the foundations of the whole traditional class collaboration policy of the A.F. of L. leaders . . .

". . . through him there spoke not only the half

million members of the U.M.W.A., but all that is best, most clear-sighted and progressive in the American trade union movement," etc., etc.

After this paean of praise, the readers of the *Daily Worker* were bound to think that the notorious Lewis had suddenly become a hero, and in reality he is playing a new rôle. He voted in the same session, not, it is true, for the immediate expulsion of Communists, but for the autonomous right for the unions to expel Communists. The papers now inform us that this same person has opened a frenzied campaign against the import of Soviet coal into America.

It is plain, comrades, that this paper gave way in this case to opportunist "backsliding," which has nothing in common with the tactics of differentiating in the approaches we make, as recommended by the Seventh Congress. It is obvious that we must take into account even small contradictions between the various reformist and Social Democratic leaders, and use them in the interests of working class unity. We have also no objection, of course, if a distinction is made between Otto Bauer and extreme reactionaries, and even between John Lewis and Matthew Woll. But this is not the point; the point is that some Communists have stopped criticising people like Otto Bauer and John Lewis altogether. Negotiations can and must be conducted with such people on unity of action, but wherever there are grounds for businesslike criticism, this criticism must not be replaced by praise. It is not our united front tactics but opportunist tactics, if the possibility of negotiating with the reformist leaders is bought at the cost of a systematic refusal to appeal directly to the masses, so as not thereby to irritate these leaders and to disturb the "unity" with them.

The Seventh Congress did not have such an idea of the tactics of the united front.

A different kind of tactical mistake was made in Denmark. The Communists there, during the election campaign, continued in the old sectarian manner to put all the Social Democrats into one category. It was just as if the directions of the Congress on the necessity for differentiating in the approaches we make had not been written for Denmark. The Seventh Congress gave special directives on how to apply the united front in countries where a Social Democratic government is in power. I do not want to repeat here all that was said in great detail about this by Comrade Dimitrov. I shall only refer to the advice he gave, namely, to take from the electoral promises and other platforms of the Social Democratic Parties individual demands which correspond to the interests of the working class, and approach the Social Democratic workers and organisations in this way: Here are the demands of your own party. We, Communists,

support these demands. We propose a united front on the basis of these demands. If our Danish Party had used this method instead of its sectarian efforts, it is possible that it would have established long-lasting contacts with part of the Social Democratic workers and organisations. But it did not take account of this advice given by Comrade Dimitrov.

In Denmark, as in the Scandinavian countries in general, and also in Holland, the struggle against the danger of TROTSKYISM is also a task demanding constant vigilance and activity.

But in Scandinavia the Communists pay practically no attention to this question at the present time. In the same way, it is necessary in other countries as well to react more energetically than hitherto to Trotskyite slander, for such slander, which is first set into motion by the Trotskyites themselves, is frequently spread by all kinds of "Left" Social Democrats and Socialists.

Thus, the despicable slander on Comrade Stalin, which only a foul individual like Souvarine could fabricate, was warmed up again by Otto Bauer, who tried by the spicy flavour of his reservations to make this disgusting dish à la Souvarine palatable for the Social Democratic readers. Firstly, such acts on the part of the "Left" Otto Bauer must be sharply condemned, and secondly, the counter-revolutionary meaning of the struggle of the Trotskyites against the personality of Comrade Stalin must be exposed to the end. We are dealing with what is at bottom nothing but a struggle against the Soviet Union and against the cause of the revolution of the whole international proletariat. Anyone who attacks the personality of the great leader of the international and Soviet proletariat is serving the interests of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

5.—Conclusions.

Although most of the examples given primarily reflect the shortcomings and mistakes of the Communist press, it would be incorrect to think that these mistakes and shortcomings are not of great importance. We well understand that it is not correct and not necessary to examine every newspaper article under a microscope in the apparatus of the E.C.C.I. so as to seek out little accidental mistakes. But, here we are dealing not with accidental mistakes, but with such that give warning to the existence of a danger. We must therefore in good time rouse the vigilance of the Sections of the Communist International to this danger.

But I may be asked, are not there any successes to be noted in the conduct of the united front policy by our Parties. Naturally many successes may be recorded. If we were to consider this side of the question there is no doubt that it would be

found that every Communist Party has achieved some successes in the last period.

But we are speaking to-day not of successes, but of omissions and aberrations which must be rectified as rapidly as possible.

There cannot be any doubt whatsoever that the idea of the united front is gaining more and more headway among the broad masses of the toilers. THE UNITED FRONT MOVEMENT is becoming more and more firmly grounded, particularly FROM BELOW, and is developing at a rapid speed. But in many cases it is developing absolutely spontaneously, without Communist leadership. There is a danger that Communists will drag at the tail of the movement. The Communists have not the necessary initiative. There are many cases where the enemies of the Communist Party have been able to seize the initiative in various campaigns. In Sweden, for example, the campaign against the increase of the war budget by the Social Democratic government was developed at the initiative of the Kilbom Party. Such examples show how profoundly justified was the emphasis laid by the Seventh Congress on the points that the mobilisation of the broad masses of toilers depends to an important degree on the development of the initiative of the Communist Parties.

The political reorganisation along the lines of concretely leading the mass movement, which the Seventh Congress demanded of the Communist Parties, is still in its initial stage and is far from having been carried to its conclusion. After prolonged privations during the crisis and the depression, a ferment is already beginning among the masses in many countries, but our Parties are mostly still very weak in giving concrete leadership to the mass movement.

What is needed is that all our comrades must fully understand in each separate case what is and what is NOT in practice the line of the Seventh Congress. If I had to sum this up in a few points, I should like to recommend our comrades at the present time to take account, above all, of the following points:

1. The line of the Seventh Congress on the carrying through of the policy of the united front requires a struggle not only for the basic political slogans of the Parties, but also for the direct interests and concrete everyday demands of the masses.

2. It is not enough to address united front proposals to the national leaders of the Social Democratic Parties, but it is necessary to constantly struggle to bring about common action on a local scale, in separate factories, and in separate industries.

3. Communists by no means take the line of ONLY making united front agreements. They must not for a moment give up the independent education, organisation and mobilisation of the masses.

4. The establishment of the united front without a struggle against its enemies and those who sabotage it, is impossible. This struggle must not weaken but must grow STRONGER in the economic and political spheres, in the anti-war movement and in the movement against fascism.

5. The line of the Seventh Congress requires a struggle NOT ONLY against Left sectarianism, but also against the Right danger in all its concrete manifestations. "Self-satisfied sectarianism" must be rooted out, but must not be replaced by self-satisfied passivity.

And so, an end must be put to every kind of opportunist passivity in carrying out the decisions of the Seventh Congress.

It is particularly important to ensure the ORGANISATIONAL CONSOLIDATION of the united front movement. The World Congress strongly emphasised the necessity for forming non-party, class united front bodies. But, we are only at the outset of solving this task in all the capitalist countries. We must not, however, forget that Bolsheviks are never satisfied with developing some campaign, but that at the same time they take care that the mass influence they obtain is consolidated organisationally.

In all capitalist countries, the Party press must be mobilised to secure that the decisions of the Seventh World Congress are properly carried out. The leading bodies of the Communist Parties are faced with the urgent task of doing everything to secure that not only individual mistakes are corrected in the practical activities of our Parties, but that a real Stakhanov scope is attained in the development of the Bolshevik policy of the united front.

This will be a reliable guarantee that tremendous successes for the united front are achieved in the struggle against war, fascism and capitalism.

THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE

By MAURICE THOREZ.

IN his speech at the close of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Dimitrov declared that:

"Our Congress has set before the international proletariat as its most important immediate task that of consolidating its forces politically and organisationally, of putting an end to the isolation to which it had been reduced by the Social Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, of rallying the toilers around the working class in a wide people's front against the offensive of capital and reaction, against fascism and the threat of war in each individual country and in the international arena."*

Comrade Dimitrov further stated that:

"We have not invented this task. It has been prompted by the experience of the world labour movement itself, above all the experience of the proletariat of France."†

Thanks to the initiative of the Communist Party, the people's front has really been set going in France in conditions of growing resistance by the toiling masses to the attacks made by reaction and fascism. The basic causes which have impelled the bourgeoisie of a number of countries to resort to bloody methods of fascist dictatorship operate in France as well. Just as in Germany and the other fascist countries, so in France also the imperialists would like to make use of fascism as a means of throwing the whole burden of the economic crisis upon the toilers, to overtake the growing forces of revolution, and ensure the preparation and conduct of an imperialist war.

The French fascists for the first time tried to make a big sally on the evening of February 6, 1934. But the toilers of France, taught a lesson from the bitter experience of the German events, and warned in time by the Communist Party—the only party which called upon them to demonstrate on February 9, 1934—successfully resisted the sally of the fascist leagues. This demonstration and the response which it met among the broad masses determined the political character and fighting spirit of the general strike of February 12—which was a big success for the anti-fascist movement.

However, ever since then, side by side with the increasing activity of the masses, there has been a constant increase in the menace from the direction of the most violent enemies of the people. The economic and social causes which have encouraged this are obvious. Towards the end of 1935, France was the only one of all the big capitalist countries where the economic crisis continued

to deepen. The index of industrial output fell to the lowest point since the beginning of the world crisis. Unemployment was increasing. The emergency decrees worsened the conditions of the toiling masses. The wages and pensions of the small clerks, retired civil servants, and ex-servicemen, which had already been subjected to considerable reduction on more than one occasion, were now reduced by an additional 10 per cent. In this connection, with this further reduction in the purchasing power of the masses, we are witnessing a still further decline in production, a slowing-down of the commodity turnover, and a decline in budget receipts. 10,000 million francs have been "economised" at the expense of the poorest sections of the population, yet the budget deficit has not been reduced. According to preliminary estimates, the deficit will reach 6,000 million francs next year, excluding the 4,000 millions arrears in respect of revenue from the railways.

The financial situation is not only not improving, but, on the contrary, is becoming more difficult. In 1935 the total amount of loans amounted to 20,000 million francs. The state coffers are empty. The money being withdrawn from the savings banks far exceeds what is being deposited. There is a colossal flow of gold out of the country, not only in consequence of the deficit in the balance of trade and payments, but also in consequence of speculation and the export of capital. The franc is menaced, and the depreciation of the franc is coming nearer and nearer. It is the toilers who will have to pay for this operation with the franc, just as they are to-day paying for the policy of deflation.

The toilers are protesting against the emergency decrees, and are resisting wage reductions. The workers have conducted several successful strikes (Saint Chamont, Rouen, Marseilles). The clerks and railwaymen have carried through demonstrations of protest on more than one occasion. The ex-servicemen arrange processions in Paris to the grave of the unknown soldier, demanding that their rights be respected and that their pensions remain untouched. All this is inspiring the bourgeoisie to intensify the line aimed at setting up a fascist dictatorship, so as to break down the resistance of the masses to the capitalist offensive. Speculating on the growing needs of the masses, the French mimics of Hitler and Mussolini are launching a broad campaign of social demagoguery.

* See "Communist International," No. 17/18, 1935, p. 827.

† *ibid.*

In the French villages the government policy of national unity is causing ever-growing discontent. The price of wheat remains at the same level, although bread is dearer. In spite of all official promises, the prices of agricultural products have not been raised to correspond with the increase in the price of the commodities which the peasants require. It is on these grounds that the fascist agitator, Dorgeres is trying to rally in the ruined peasant masses.

The international situation, which is extremely tense in connection with the attack upon Abyssinia by Italian fascism, has given the reactionary press and the fascist leagues an excuse for launching a monstrous campaign. The French people are confirming their sincere desire for peace, and are indignant at the criminal adventure being pursued by Mussolini. But at the same time, the mimics and agents of Mussolini in France endorse his policy in every possible way. Colonel de la Rocque and his supporters uphold the dual policy of Laval, who signed the Pact of Rome—and the plan to divide up Abyssinia. They insist upon France pursuing a policy of friendship with the government of Rome, i.e., adopting a position hostile towards the League of Nations and refusing to resort to sanctions.

The chauvinist leaders of the leagues, arrant supporters of war are demagogically howling: "Long live peace," "Down with war." They accuse the real friends of peace — the revolutionary workers, the democratically inclined peasants and all the real supporters of the republic—of wanting to start war. At the same time, the true friends of Laval are renewing their attacks against the U.S.S.R., against the mutual assistance pact, which the French people in May, 1935, demanded should be signed. Supported by the renegade Doriot, these chauvinist leaders are insisting upon the conclusion of an alliance with Hitler, and are encouraging Laval's manoeuvres in this direction.

The fascist danger in France exists as hitherto. The fascists are reorganising their ranks and revising their methods in order once more to take up the offensive when the requisite situation arises. But the resistance of the masses is also growing. The widest scale on which the forces of the masses have been and are being consolidated is on the basis of the defence of democratic rights, and republican liberties gained by the toiling masses as a result of long years of heroic struggle. Democratic traditions are deep-rooted among the masses of workers and peasants in France, and are the consequence of many revolutions and rebellions carried through on behalf of freedom. They are traditions inherited from their great forefathers of 1793, which, at the end of the last

century during the Dreyfus case, determined the mighty movement in defence of the republic against the onslaught of reaction. And it is these same traditions which have endowed the people's front in defence of peace and freedom, and in defence of the republic, which arose at the initiative of the Communist Party with such tremendous scope.

* * * *

The Communist Party of France has been carrying on activities on a wide scale, which have borne fruit. At our Party Conference in June, 1934, we pointed out that:

"To bar the way to fascism, united action between the Communist and Socialist workers must be set up, and trade union unity be restored, AT ALL COSTS. An alliance between the working class and the toilers of the middle sections of society must also be set up."

By acting in concert and determinedly, and ridding itself of the Barbé-Celor sectarian grouping, and of Doriot, the renegade liquidator, and splitter, our Party has successfully fulfilled the task set by the Congress. The united front set up among the rank-and-file during the process of the struggle of workers of all currents shoulder-to-shoulder, against the armed bands of big capital, against the employers or against the pro-fascist reactionary governments, ended in the agreement for common action concluded between the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in July, 1934. The fusion of the trade unions, which was considerably facilitated by the successful preparatory work carried out by the co-ordinated trade unions, is already being achieved in the localities, in trade union branches, in the inter-union county organisations and in the industrial federations. The Railwaymen's Federation which has already been united, has about 150,000 members. We have an indication of the democratic moods of the workers in the election of our comrades Midol and Semard to the leadership, although our opponents, former members of the General Confederation of Labour, declared themselves against them on the alleged grounds of the principle of the incompatibility of holding trade union offices along with membership of parliament or municipal councils.

The people's front has arisen in spite of the resistance of open and secret enemies. Thanks to the people's front, the results which we reckoned upon have now been achieved: a mighty barrier has been thrown up against the development of fascism. The broad scope of the anti-fascist movement of the people has forced the bourgeoisie to change their tactics and to try to present the character of their shock detachments to the masses in some other way.

Never before in the course of the entire history of the Third Republic has there been such a

clearly expressed move to the left on the part of the masses of the people as we have had since February, 1934. This process still continues. After the victories of the people's front and of the Communist Party which inspired it, at the municipal elections in May, 1935, and later at the District Council elections in the suburbs of Paris in June, 1935, further new successes were achieved both in the provinces and in Paris. In Maine et Loire, an agricultural region, with age-long conservative traditions, and in the other agrarian region, Oise, the candidates of the people's front, thanks to the stubborn support of the Communists, were successful in obtaining two mandates which had hitherto gone invariably to former marquises. In Paris, three Communists elected to the municipalities—Laval declared these elections invalid—were again elected in the first round of voting. And in election district No. 4 the Communist candidate who was unsuccessful in May of last year, this time gained the victory over the reactionary, and obtained a majority of 800 votes.

It is clear that the masses of the people are swinging to the Left in France. And it is precisely with a view to retarding this swing to the Left that Laval and his supporters, reactionary politicians, tried to carry out the carefully elaborated manoeuvre of "national conciliation," which has been successful, and yet not successful; it was successful in the sense that Laval is still in power, but it was unsuccessful in the sense that the Chamber of Deputies converted the slogans of the fascist leagues into a snare for the latter themselves, and under the influence of a small group of Communists, voted for legislation demanding the immediate disarmament and dissolution of armed bands. So great was the success achieved by the people's front by force of the pressure it exerted. However, only the vigilance, courage, solidarity, organised strength and activity of the rank-and-file of the people can guarantee victory for the anti-fascists.

For despite all these obvious successes, we must not close our eyes to the re-grouping and consolidation of the forces of reaction, and also to the difficulties, to the weak features which are apparent in the people's front itself, and to the fact that it is carrying on insufficient activity. It was the simplest thing, one which met with the greatest success, to mobilise the masses of the people for the struggle for freedom against the fascist leagues menacing democratic liberties. Without ignoring other forms of the onslaught of big capital, and considering joint action to be necessary in the economic sphere as well, our Party considered that special difficulties in launching this struggle should not lead to the breakdown of

the agreement, even though it was restricted merely to the defence of democratic liberties and peace. For instance, the Communist Party has always fought, and still fights against the policy of emergency decrees pursued by the notorious government of national unity. The Communist Party shows how harmful this policy is for the toiling masses, and how such a policy is totally unable to solve the economic crisis, which is undermining the economic life of France. The Socialist Party is also against the emergency decrees. But despite the signing of the agreement which provides for active struggle against the emergency decrees, they have always refused really to mobilise the masses for the struggle, to the point of giving support to the strikes prepared and launched by the trade unions against the robbery of clerks, workers, civil servants and municipal employees.

Although there was strong opposition in the Radical Party, the latter recognised the emergency decrees in principle. However, under the pressure of the masses, it has demanded that the decrees be made more "humane," where they were directed against the small clerks and war invalids. Thus, on the question of the emergency decrees, there is no agreement between the three largest parties of the people's front. And this, of course, weakens the force of the drive of the broad masses of the people. This being so, our Party adopts the attitude that each party of the people's front maintains its freedom to develop its own activity in such a way as not to cause losses or bring harm to joint action in the sphere of the anti-fascist struggle.

If we pass on further to an examination of economic problems, and the solutions offered by the different participants in the people's front, we shall see that the differences existing between them are still greater.

The Communist Party is systematically insisting upon the introduction of an emergency progressive income tax upon large fortunes so that by solving the financial difficulties in this way, the position of the toiling masses will be lightened. We have formulated our programme of immediate demands in the sphere of finance, in the slogan "The rich must pay." The Socialist Party is not in agreement with this. It talks about "structural reform," about "nationalisation." And we in reply declare that the Communist support, and fight for, proletarian nationalisation, but consider that the working class must first win power as a result of a victorious revolution and the establishment of the French Soviet Republic, in order to operate this measure. To-day, it is a question not of the programme of proletarian revolution, but

of the daily, urgent demands which already today can mobilise the broad masses for the struggle against the offensive of capital and fascism, for shifting part of the burden which at present is oppressing the most destitute sections of the people, on to the shoulders of the rich.

The Radical Party also does not consider our slogan of an emergency progressive income tax upon the capitalists to be acceptable, although this demand has long figured in its programme. The majority of the Radical group has supported the financial policy of the national unity cabinets.

And here it is clear that in searching for an essential and possible agreement for the immediate mobilisation of the masses on the basis of the most urgent and moderate economic demands, each party should fight at the same time for its own programme. Our programme is the programme of the proletariat, its revolutionary vanguard. It is the programme of struggle for Soviet Power, for real socialisation, for the development of the broadest democracy. BUT AT THE SAME TIME THE STRUGGLE FOR THE FUTURE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND OF THE WHOLE OF THE FRENCH PEOPLE DOES NOT EXCLUDE, BUT ON THE CONTRARY DEMANDS, THAT THE MOST ELEMENTARY INTERESTS AND NEEDS OF THE TOILING MASSES BE DEFENDED RIGHT NOW, TO-DAY. On this basis we can and must come together, and come to an agreement with those who, although they do not share our views as to final aims and means of struggle, nevertheless, agree to wage a joint struggle for immediate demands.

And, finally, the Communist Party of France, on the basis of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, declared itself prepared, in conditions where the anti-fascist movement develops energetically and on a broad scale, to support, if need be, and even to take part in, a government of the people's front. It is clear that on this question the opinions of the different participants in the people's front are at very great variance. For us, Communists, it is a question of the possibility of a Government coming into being in circumstances of political crisis, a government relying mainly upon the activity of the masses outside parliament, on the forces of the working class united in a single General Confederation of Labour; it will be such a government as will really proceed to disarm and dissolve the fascist leagues, place their leaders behind prison bars, and close down their newspapers; a government which will force the rich to pay, which will destroy the monopoly of the banks, and officially abolish the Council of Regents of the state bank of France, etc. But such a government can on no account be simply a parliamentary combination, something in the nature of an extended

second edition of a government so-called "left bloc." It will be a government leading the masses to the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the Soviet Republic.

The Communist Party of France considers it essential to set up rank-and-file committees of the people's front, to establish a widespread firm organisation of the people's anti-fascist movement which opens up wide vistas for the broadest initiative of the masses, since such rank-and-file committees of the people's anti-fascist movement are a guarantee that the movement will be successful, a guarantee against a new drive of the fascists.

The Socialist Party, and, presumably, the Radical Party, are not of our opinion, do not share our line. The Socialist Party understands the united front government to mean participation in bourgeois governments as has been and now continues to be the practice of social democracy in many countries. The Radical Party strictly adheres to parliamentary formulae. It would therefore be superfluous now to attempt to thrust a general programme on the question of the government upon parties which pursue such different ends. Thus, we return to the crux of the question: the people's front in present conditions will fully achieve its aim, if it bases itself upon rank-and-file committees of the masses, if it bars the way to fascism, if it makes it possible for bourgeois democracy to function normally, and allows the working class to continue the daily struggle for a better existence, and to rally their forces in preparation for the struggle for their final emancipation.

The Communist Party is trying first and foremost to formulate such slogans, and elaborate such decisions, as will help the further growth of the working class movement and the entire people's front.

Our campaign under the slogan, "The rich must pay," has met with a very wide response. The bourgeois press has commented upon our proposals in every possible way. The daily organ of the industrialists entered into a discussion with us over the signature of its chief editor, an authoritative economist.

Our Party did not limit itself to general solutions of the question. In appealing to the peasantry our Party formulated its "PROGRAMME TO SAVE FRENCH AGRICULTURE."

This programme provides for the direct demands of the toiling peasantry, then for measures against the trusts, the big middlemen, and the agrarians, with a view to restoring the prices of agricultural products without increasing prices for the consumer. The programme demands the payment of crisis benefits, the selec-

tion of seeds, and the distribution of manure; it indicates where to find funds for this purpose.

Our Party is trying to give an answer to every vital question. It is expressing its opinion on all the problems facing the working class movement and the entire French people. It is displaying tremendous initiative and at the same time the maximum determination and firmness.

Many of our prominent opponents have more than once emphasised the worth of our Party, which has successfully linked up its policy with the revolutionary Jacobin traditions of the French people. One of them has written that: "We must raise our hats to the Party which has inspired the singing of the 'Marseillaise' and the 'Internationale.'" Our Party has deprived reaction and fascism of the hymn of the revolutionaries of 1793 and 1848.

The Party is proceeding further along this road. Considering ourselves to be the best defenders of the interests of the working class and the French people, and the sole representatives of their future, we have seriously taken up the solution of these problems which are attracting the attention of the whole country. We have shown that the policy of the bourgeoisie in absolutely every sphere of life, is pushing France along the downward path. We have raised the question of the protection of mothers and children, of the protection of the family. The low birth rate which is the result of capitalist exploitation, is an awful scourge which menaces the future of the French people. The death rate in France considerably exceeds the birth rate. We have raised the alarm on this point. We have shown the deep economic and social causes for the low birth rate. Unemployment, poverty, uncertainty of the future, the fear of war—these are the causes which are leading to a reduction in the birth rate. Fathers and mothers are afraid to bring children into the world, are afraid to bring up luckless people who will only drag out a miserable existence. We have declared that children must really be protected. Big families must be guaranteed work and given higher wages. Working class families must be afforded comfortable, clean, light dwellings, and newborn children must be ensured free medical assistance and all that the newborn child requires materially. When the children grow up and are sent to school, they must be given textbooks and exercise books, as well as nourishing, abundant food in school dining rooms. The more talented, capable children must be given an opportunity of continuing their education, and they must be given work to correspond with their abilities on finishing the higher schools.

The Communist Party has taken up questions

of sport. It has noticed the fact that French sportsmen are constantly being defeated in different forms of sport, and also that first-class sportsmen, like the French runner, Ladoumergue, are prevented from competing, and forced to earn their bread by appearing on the music-halls. This is the result of the avidity of capital, which thirsts only after profits, which sees in all manifestations of human activity, only means of making profit, and which for the sake of profits, sacrifices the interests of the sports movement and the whole of the nation.

In just the same way the Communist Party has revealed the downfall of literature and art, the growth of crime and prostitution, in a word, all the horrors of the present order, of which Marx wrote that "the accumulation of riches at one pole signifies the accumulation of poverty, misery, slavery, ignorance, savagery, and moral degradation at the other"; the Party energetically exposes all the corruption and demoralisation of the ruling classes. The last few years in France are noteworthy for the big financial scandals that have occurred. The whole world of political humbugs, parliamentarians and ministers, of municipal councillors, and higher officials, retired generals, prefects and ambassadors, is bespattered with blood and filth. Robbery of the treasury, bribery, abuse of official positions, are all carried out in broad daylight. Such subjects have become the favourite theme for the demagogic utterances of fascist leaders, who try to make use of the just fury and indignation of the masses in connection with these affairs, in the interests of capital. On February 6, the fascists made their preparations under the slogan: "Down with the robbers and their accomplices—parliament."

The Communist Party has declared for all to hear that it would work to obtain the real "reconciliation of the French Nation," the real unity of the forces of the French people for the struggle against the insignificant capitalist minority which exploits the masses of the people, dooming them to starvation and ruin. The Communist Party has shown that those who make strife among the people must be sought for among "the two hundred families who hold the entire economic life and politics of the country in their hands," and that it is the financial oligarchy which organises and arms the fascist bands. We have determinedly torn away the masks from the faces of the sham patriots who lead the storm detachments and deceive the French people. We have unmasked them to the end in connection with their campaign in favour of Italian imperialism. In this particular case they acted as agents of the foreign fascist governments in Berlin and Rome,

as the hired mercenaries of Hitler and Mussolini, as the worthy offspring of their forefathers who served in the army of the Prussian King and the Coblenz emigrants.

Finally, in the face of the menace of a violent fascist coup d'état, the Communist Party struggling against the fascisation of the army, puts forward the appeal of the people's front to the republican army. This manifesto emphasises the fact that we have faith in the democratic outlook of the French soldiers—the sons of the people, and the Republican officers; we believe that, when need arises, they will reveal and undermine the plans of the royalist and fascist officers, and that they will successfully frustrate the fascist plot that is being laid against the republic.

All our most essential arguments in favour of uniting the French people for the struggle against their enemies were included in the excellent letter written by Marcel Cachin to the national volunteer, to the passive member of the "croix de Feu" organisation, which is the chief instigator of civil war, the hired vassal of capital.

This new document, issued by the Central Committee of our Party, has created a big impression. It has already been distributed in 200,000 copies. Another edition is being asked for. Our pamphlets on the same subject have enjoyed the same success. They were all sold out to organisations and active members of the rank-and-file units of the Communist Party and sympathisers.

The Communist Party of France is doing its utmost by its activity to merit the praise with which Comrade Dimitrov reported on it at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

The Communist Party is uninterruptedly strengthening its ranks. The influence and authority of the Party are growing. Every word of the Communist Party meets with the widest response, not only among the friends of the alliance, but also among enemies and opponents. The Party is growing numerically as well: by the end of 1935 it had over 70,000 members. And only two years ago there were less than 30,000 members in the Party.

The daily circulation of *L'Humanité* is 250,000, and on Sundays—350,000.

The Young Communist League now has about 30,000 members; its weekly organ, *L'Avantgarde*, has a circulation of 40,000.

The report of the Organisational Department of the Party, drawn up for presentation at the Congress, is a thick pamphlet of 140 pages. Every chapter of the report is peppered with figures and data, illustrating the successes of the Party in all spheres of its work.

Of course, we are not blinded by our successes.

We know that the menace of the offensive of the fascists has only temporarily been frustrated, and that the enemy is not crushed. We recognise the weaknesses and defects of the anti-fascist people's front. It is with the greatest alarm that we note the absence of that which could be the guarantee of the complete, decisive, and stable success of the anti-fascist people's movement, namely, a thick network of rank-and-file mass bodies of the people's front.

The task of setting up such bodies, such committees still remains most acute. It would be wise to focus the maximum efforts of all sincere and determined supporters of the people's front, and first and foremost the efforts of the Communists, to get such organisations set up. We must soberly evaluate the political importance of the inconsistency, indeterminateness, vacillations of our allies in the people's front. Behaviour of this kind on the part of our allies causes no small difficulties, and covers up not a few dangers in the way of consolidating the anti-fascist forces.

Neither must we close our eyes to the weaknesses and defects of our own Party and the dangers which menace it. In launching out upon the intensive, broad political activities, that have been conducted by our Party during recent years, and with the rapid influx of new members, the danger arises of Right opportunist mistakes and deviations. Therefore, the Central Committee of the Party (and even more so the coming Party Congress) are confronted with the necessity of keeping a vigilant watch to ensure that the line of the Party is carried out correctly and on the basis of principle, and that there is a steady rise in the ideological and political level of the Party members. The Central Committee of the Party has therefore decided to make the tasks of organisation and especially the development of new Party forces a central question in the work of the Congress. For, despite the fact that we have had considerable achievements, we are still terribly backward in the carrying out of our organisational tasks. The political influence of the Party has advanced rapidly, it has grown in extent; broad sections of the proletariat and toilers follow our Party. Our leading Party workers have grown quantitatively and qualitatively, nevertheless, they are far from being adequate. Now we require many times more cadres, forces who are far more experienced, better trained, better able to find their bearings independently and rapidly, to work on new lines, to widen and consolidate the links between the Party and the masses, and to lead all forms of the struggle of the masses on behalf of their demands.

In spite, however, of the shortcomings and weaknesses in our Party, it is a splendid healthy

organism. United and monolithic, it has rallied firmly around its Central Committee. All the work of the Party is carried out in a spirit of confidence and absolute loyalty and faith towards the Communist International, its Bolshevik general staff, and our great leader, COMRADE STALIN.

A discussion has opened on the questions included in the agenda of the Eighth Congress of the Party which will take place January 22-25. Here is the agenda of the forthcoming Congress: 1. Report of the Central Committee on political and organisation questions (Marcel Cachin). 2. The Communist Party in the people's front of work, freedom and peace (Maurice Thorez). 3. The question of saving French agriculture (Renaud Jean). 4. The future of the French youth (Jacques Duclos). 5. Election of leading bodies.

Meetings of cells and conferences of district committees are now being held. Regional conferences have been gradually taking place, between December 15 and January 12. All the meetings and conferences that have been held to date have unanimously, without any reservations, and with enthusiasm, approved the line pursued by the C.C. of the C.P. of France, aided by the Comintern. In the course of its mass work, the Party has learned to fight on two fronts: against opportunist and

liquidating deviations, and against sectarianism. The Party is extending its fighting experience to the whole of the working class movement, and especially in the sense of fighting against the demoralising influence of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. The Communist Party is conducting a struggle to establish a united Party of the working class. Seven months ago we drew up a charter of the working class unity. We formulated our draft, taking account of the experiences of the international working class movement for the last 20 years, the experiences of the victory of the toilers in the U.S.S.R. under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, and the bitter experiences of the toilers of Germany and Austria who, in the main, remained under the influence of the parties of the Second International.

We are inspired by the principles of Lenin and Stalin, which were so brilliantly developed in the reports and speeches of Comrades Dimitrov and Manuilsky at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

We hope that by following this road we shall achieve triumph for the people's front of work, freedom and peace in France, and later the victory of Soviet Power, and the establishment of a French Soviet Republic.

WHAT COURSE ARE YOU STEERING, OTTO BAUER?

By PETER VIDEN.

IN the December number of the *Kampf*, edited by Otto Bauer, Dan, the Menshevik, expressed his opinion on "the Comintern Congress, working-class unity, and the Soviet problem." Dan is an enemy of Bolshevism. Thanks to the indomitable strength of Bolshevism, thanks to Lenin and Stalin, the great leaders of the Communist Party, Dan and his party friends did not succeed in leading the Russian proletariat to defeat along the road of the Second International. For years Dan and his party friends have been foretelling that the Soviet Union would soon perish. The Mensheviks have organised plots and revolts against the dictatorship of the proletariat and thereby given their support to counter-revolution. However, their prophecies were false: it is not the Soviet Union, but the counter-revolutionary plots and revolts which have broken down. Dan and his party friends set themselves the task of always travelling against the wind. This thankless task, and the constant failures they have met upon the road, only increase their dislike of Bolshevism. Consequently, it would not be worth while entering into a discus-

sion with Dan and his party friends if there were not other forces behind them using the services of the Mensheviks to hinder the united front. Insignificant in themselves, the Mensheviks are of value to all the enemies of the united front in the Second International; they and the Trotskyites supply the arguments against Communism, against the Soviet Union.

Dan is sufficiently wise not to make a frontal attack on the united front. On the contrary, he "declares" himself a "supporter" of the united front, refers to it as "the most important problem of the working class" and demands "the rapid, successful solution of this problem." It is essential merely to do away with a few unimportant things, and there can then be no doubt at all that the problem will be solved. The little things that have to be removed are: the Communist International, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fundamental principles of the Soviet Union. If the Communists desire the united front they will obviously be willing to agree to remove these little things that hinder. Of course, if they do not agree to this,

then, according to Dan, the united front cannot be established. What truly sincere solicitation for the establishment of the united front! In order that the flag may fly freely, first saw through the mast, then cut the lanyard, and the flag can fly whither the wind carries it. This is Dan's idea of the "problem" of the united front.

But let him speak for himself. He writes:

"If we examine the discussion and resolutions of the last, Seventh, Congress of the Communist International from this point of view, we inevitably come to the conclusion that this Congress strongly assisted the establishment of the necessary pre-conditions for the restoration of proletarian unity . . . The reports and resolutions of the Congress of the Comintern indeed contain many points which demand the sharpest criticism. But if we take the essence of the practical, political decisions of the Congress, and first and foremost the basis for them contained in the numerous speeches of delegates, we cannot fail to record that essentially they signify the complete denial of the ideology of Communism as a branch of the working class movement which is something totally isolated from the whole of the rest of the class-conscious labour movement, and hostile to all its other sections. Henceforward, the parties affiliated to the Comintern stand in principle upon the same platform in the political, tactical and organisational sense, as that upon which the parties of the Socialist International also stand and fight."

We have always thought, up to now, that the Second International is against the dictatorship of the proletariat, in favour of peaceful development into socialism, against the revolutionary class struggle and for class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, against converting the imperialist war into proletarian revolution and for class peace, is against democratic centralism, and for an international debating society, which makes no demands on anyone, against the united front and in favour of coalition with bourgeois parties. Dan wants to persuade us of just the opposite. He asserts that "in the political, tactical and organisational respect" we have adopted "the same platform" as the parties of the Second International; in that case the decisions of our Congress should inspire the Second International to draw positive conclusions. Yet strange though it may seem, the Second International has turned down the united front proposals made by the Communist International. Strange though it seems, the Czech, Swedish, and Danish Social-Democratic Parties cling to governmental coalition with the bourgeois parties and adopt repressive measures against the supporters of the united front. Strange though it may seem, not only the above-mentioned parties, but the English, Dutch, Belgian and other Social-Democrats as well, condemn the dictatorship of the proletariat. Strange though it may seem, all the parties of the Second International are fighting against the principle of Soviet power, and of democratic centralism, the organisational principles

advanced and established by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. True, some Social-Democratic groupings have come closer towards the principles of revolutionary Marxism than people who a few years ago were advocating "organised capitalism" and who advanced the American "economic wonder" as against the socialist planned economy in the Soviet Union, put forward the trump card "Red Vienna" against Red Moscow, and substituted the ballot paper for the revolution, but who have learned something by bitter experience, have thrown aside their democratic illusions and mastered some of the precepts of Bolshevism. They have begun to leave the platform of the Second International, without yet finding in themselves the strength to rebel seriously against the dictatorship of the openly reformist parties. The ground upon which many of the parties of the Second International are standing to-day has collapsed or become unstable. It is Dan's custom, however, to regard realities as a deviation from the theory of Menshevism to be deplored, and therefore he continues:

"If the league of the Comintern wanted, or had the right, to ponder to the end over the new situation that has now arisen, and openly state the conclusions arising therefrom, they would be compelled to admit that henceforth, there are no reasons which force the split to be further maintained, there are no insuperable obstacles to the restoration of unity: THE IDEOLOGICAL LIQUIDATION OF THE COMINTERN SHOULD BE FOLLOWED, IN ACTUAL FACT, BY THE IMMEDIATE LIQUIDATION OF ITS SEPARATE ORGANISATIONAL EXISTENCE . . . Behind the scenes of the Comintern, the possibility of liquidating it as a separate international organisation has very likely already been discussed."

Although we fully understand this "modest" desire, we must nevertheless inform Dan, who is so interested in profound secrets, that the possibility of liquidating the Comintern has been as little discussed behind the scenes of the Comintern, as the possibility of inviting Mr. Dan to become a member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. The Communist International is stronger than ever before. It is winning the confidence of ever greater masses of workers. It has become the leading force of the world proletariat. One must be a fool to imagine that it will "liquidate" itself and migrate to the bosom of the disintegrating Second International. Dan, however, is not so stupid as to think this seriously. Behind his apparent naïveté and political slow-wittedness there is political intriguing and sabotage of the united front. In a carefully veiled form, Dan says the same as the downright enemies of the united front say openly: "If the Communists want the united front, let them join the Social-Democratic Party. For us there is no other united front."

But Dan demands more. He demands not only the liquidation of the Communist International,

but also the ABOLITION OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE SOVIET UNION.

This "Socialist" regards the united front as a business transaction. He speaks about trade union unity as a bank director might speak about the fusion of capitalist firms. As far as he is concerned, the Bolsheviks are holders of a big bundle of shares. The "big bundle of shares" is the Russian proletariat. The Bolsheviks must be prevented from securing the majority of the shares in a united trade union international. Steps must be taken to reserve shares in the Russian proletariat for the Mensheviks. Dan solves the problems affecting the destiny of the working class in the jargon of the stock exchange. The workers are concerned with freedom and life. The Mensheviks are concerned with securing a majority of political shares. The political speculation is disturbed under no circumstances. Yesterday as far as he is concerned, Moscow was a hotbed of "revolutionism"—to-day it is the embodiment of "reformism." The "banal reformism" of the Bolsheviks could infect the various royal and republican ministers of the Second International and as the bourgeoisie attribute great importance to establishing coalition governments only with genuine revolutionaries, this would be entirely unbearable. Dan probably only fought against the October Revolution because Lenin was a reformist, and his "banal reformism" was a danger to the revolutionary movement.

After Dan, the enemy of the proletarian revolution, has introduced himself as the defender of the purity of revolutionary principles, he comes forward with his real demand. How, to use his stock-exchange jargon, is the "countermine" to be placed against the proletarian united front?

In the following way:

"It will soon be discovered that it is impossible to have any serious, honest 'united front' of both internationals for any length of time, if the working class movement of the Soviet Union which constitutes nine-tenths of the force of the Communist International, and dictates 99 per cent. of its policy to them, remains outside that front. The united front 'only for the capitalist countries' will very soon turn out at best to be self-deception. It can convert the 'united' international working class movement into a blind tool of the policy of Stalin, or else into an arena of violent internal struggle, which will again destroy the newly-won unity."

This is open sabotage of the united front. The Menshevik saboteur wants to make the united fighting front against war and fascism dependent upon the creation of a "united front" in the Soviet Union, i.e., upon permission being given to all Mensheviks, Trotskyists and other counter-revolutionaries to organise anti-Soviet forces in the Soviet Union itself and to let loose against the dictatorship of the proletariat all those dark forces responsible for the murder of Kirov: it is difficult

to reply calmly to such monstrous proposals, but there, we do not intend to enter into discussion with Dan, but merely want to explain the meaning of this Menshevik demand to the Social-Democratic workers.

Suppose the Soviet Union allowed the Mensheviks to organise a Social-Democratic Party side by side with the Communist Party. Let us suppose for a moment that the people who build up such a party are not the enemies of the Soviet Government, obviously a very unlikely hypothesis. Each party is an organisation of people with the same convictions and must not only dissociate itself from other parties, but put forward its own programme against the other programme—otherwise this party would be quite superfluous. We would like to raise the question: Who would join such a new party in the Soviet Union? The masses of the proletariat and toiling peasantry, who love Stalin and stand for the dictatorship of the proletariat and who are building Socialism with such enthusiasm? No, these masses would remain true to the Communist Party, they would look on any other party with astonishment and hostility, and would reject it. Who, in that case, would join the new party? All the dark counter-revolutionary elements which have not yet been completely destroyed, all the throwbacks of the dying world, with their dreams of sabotage and murder, all the waverers, who have not yet freed themselves from the remains of petty-bourgeois ideology—these are the people who would gather together in such a new party. All the agents of counter-revolution in Hitler Germany and in other countries would heave a sigh of relief, and give their supporters instructions to support the new party in every possible way and to use it as a tool for the struggle against the Soviet Union.

What does this mean? This means that any second party would inevitably become a counter-revolutionary party, a weapon of struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against Socialist construction, a means of undermining the workers' and peasants' state. However "honest" the intentions guiding the founders of such a party, they would be unable to prevent such a development and would very soon be the bearers of the counter-revolution. Only a fool or an innocent child can refuse to understand that. But any who understands this (and every politically-thinking individual must do so), but nevertheless stubbornly repeats this demand, is an enemy of the Soviet Union. To legalise the Mensheviks, the Trotskyists and so forth in the Soviet Union would be to allow counter-revolution to penetrate into the strongest fortress of the world proletariat and to undermine it and simplify the task of fascism.

We, Communists, want to establish the united front against fascism together with all the Social-Democratic workers and parties. The Menshevik Dan, however, wants a different "united front." He wants to destroy the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, he wants to organise a party in the U.S.S.R. to fight against Stalin and the Bolsheviks, and thus actually to create a "united front" of all the counter-revolutionary elements. What is more, Dan declares that without this "united front," the international united front against fascism is impossible, that for the Second International the establishment of the united front with the Communists must be made dependent upon this other "united front." He thereby plays the game of all the enemies of the united front. Knowing full well that the dictatorship of the proletariat never can and never will allow the existence of a second party, that the working class of the Soviet Union do not intend to clear the way for counter-revolution, he really makes his evasive declarations in order to say: "The united front is impossible. We must not allow it to be organised. And we, Mensheviks, will do our utmost to prevent it."

There is nothing surprising in this. We should not have dealt with this article by Dan at all were it not for the fact that it was published in a magazine edited by Otto Bauer. Otto Bauer did not limit himself to merely printing this article, but he stressed it and supplemented it with a few phrases in the section entitled "In the Soviet Union," where he writes:

"The last Congress of Soviets promised to democratise the Soviet Constitution. Democracy is not only equal suffrage. There is equal suffrage in Hitler Germany. The basis of all democracy is freedom of all opinion and the right to fight within the framework of the constitution for the decision arrived at by the majority of the people. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International made a proposal to the Socialist Labour International to organise the united front. The Russian Social-Democrats also belong to the Labour and Socialist International. The Russian Social-Democrats in the Labour and Socialist International were boldly in favour of united action with the Communist International and of the unconditional support of the Soviet Union in case of war. But apparently the bureaucracy of the G.P.U. has not yet taken note of this fact."

Otto Bauer is not a mere private individual, but a leading politician of the Second International. All that he says and writes is of political importance, has a definite political aim, and requires a political evaluation. Therefore, we ask with all seriousness and emphasis: What does Otto Bauer want? What is his aim in making declarations of this kind? What political results does he want to achieve?

Otto Bauer has declared himself to be a supporter of the united front. He has declared that

he considers that the establishment of the united front on an international scale and joint struggle with the Soviet Union against war and fascism is a most important task. The leader of the Communist Party of Austria, Kopenig, referred to the fact at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern that Otto Bauer had adopted this position, and advocated closer contact.

Otto Bauer, however, has not only hesitated, but has retreated and changed his policy. He has written a review of Souverine's disgusting libel against Stalin,* and under the cover of being objective he has allowed himself to make attacks against the great leader of the Soviet Union and the world proletariat. He has borrowed a number of Trotskyist arguments and spoken about "police dictatorship" in the Soviet Union and about "superfluous cruelties" against the kulaks. In the December number of *Kampf* he continued to pursue this line, not only by printing Dan's article, but by giving it his support in the above-mentioned note. What was he out to achieve? What course is he steering?

THIS ROAD LEADS NOT ONLY TO COMPLETE ISOLATION, BUT TO THE CAMP OF THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITED FRONT AND OF THE SOVIET UNION.

"But," Otto Bauer will object, "I express my opinion openly. Dan equally openly expresses his. Everybody openly expresses his opinion. You can enter into a discussion with us. But how does this harm the united front?"

We are for open comradely criticism. Political discussion is also essential when we have the united front. We shall discuss all our differences in a friendly and businesslike spirit, but there are "arguments" used against us which are counter-revolutionary, which are raised merely to hinder the united front and thus to strengthen the class enemy. We shall react to such arguments and such questions in a different way than we do to businesslike political differences. Let Otto Bauer call to mind the "Doriot case." When Doriot was expelled from the Communist Party of France, Otto Bauer was most indignant: "The Communists do not recognise any freedom of opinion! They have expelled Doriot for being in favour of the united front." Will Otto Bauer assert the same to-day? Doriot was expelled because he came close to counter-revolution in his arguments and in the manner he raised political issues. To-day, even those who once befriended him, must understand that he is an agent of counter-revolution, a tool of Laval and a tool of Hitler fascism. The Communist Party of France displayed proper vigilance in unmasking him as an enemy in good time. Freedom of opinion exists for those who

* See No. 21, 1935. Communist International.

are not enemies of the Soviet Union, enemies of the united front. We do not, however, offer freedom of opinion to our enemies. We do not enter into friendly discussion with enemies. Enemies are crushed. It is a primitive trick of our enemies to find a contradiction between Stalin and the Soviet Union, our friends know this and our enemies must take note of this.

There is no contradiction between Stalin and the Soviet Union. To entertain a "positive" attitude towards the Soviet Union and at the same time to fight against Stalin is sheer hypocrisy. WITHOUT LEADERSHIP BY STALIN THERE WOULD BE NO SOVIET UNION TO-DAY, THERE WOULD BE NO SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION, THERE WOULD BE NO VICTORY OF SOCIALISM. For the proletariat of the Soviet Union and for all Communists, Stalin is not only the embodiment of victorious Socialism, but he is actually the man, who in the struggle against a world of enemies, waverers, and wreckers, did everything that was right and necessary, and achieved the greatest work that has been achieved in the history of mankind. Otto Bauer recognises that this is a magnificent thing. But at the same time he wants to persuade the world that this was all done by relentless violence, and that the brain is the "retarding organ" preventing others from achieving similar things.

How senseless to think that the world can be changed by violence alone. The gigantic *intellectual* creative work performed by Stalin, the magnificence of his conception and far-sightedness, his brain, his creative forces—without all this the Soviet system would be unthinkable. Stalin, the Bolshevik Party, and the Soviet Union constitute one indivisible whole, where the brain, the will and the energy of man constitute one whole. An attack on Stalin is an attack on the Soviet Union, the defence of which Otto Bauer declares is the most important task of the working class.

Therefore there can be no agreements between ourselves and the Trotskyists and Mensheviks. They can offer any amount of assurances to the effect that they are the friends of the Soviet Union and are only hostile to "Stalinism"—but we shall defend the working-class from these hypocrites. Organisationally, neither the Trotskyists nor the Mensheviks are a serious danger (concerning the disintegrating organisational activities of the Trotskyists, Otto Bauer can obtain information from the French Socialists), but they supply the counter-revolution with arguments against the united front. They no longer dare to cast doubts on the successes of "Stalinism," to foretell the downfall of the Soviet Union. This is why they spread legends about the "oppression of the Russian workers," about "police dictatorship,"

about "the treacherous foreign policy of the Soviet Union," about the liquidation of the world revolution through Stalin," etc. They demand that "democracy be introduced" into the Soviet Union. They demand to be allowed to return to the U.S.S.R., in order to "battle against the dictatorship of the proletariat." They demand, in a word, the overthrow of the Soviet Government, they demand freedom of action against Socialist construction for all others including counter-revolutionary elements, they are striving to undermine the mighty bulwark against war and fascism. They are in the front ranks of our deadly enemies. There can be no agreement with them.

Like the Trotskyists and Mensheviks, Otto Bauer demands the "democratisation of the Soviet Union." Apparently he cannot imagine democracy without political parties and the inanities of parliament. He does not want to recognise that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a new form of democracy, higher than bourgeois parliamentarism. With the final victory of Socialism, Soviet democracy is developing wider and wider.

"At a time when more and more bourgeois countries are abolishing the last remnants of the voting rights of their populations, the Soviet Union is steadily approaching the complete abolition of all restrictions on universal suffrage."—Speech delivered by V. N. Molotov: "Report on Constitutional Changes," at the VII Congress of Soviets of the U.S.S.R., 1935.

But Otto Bauer is renewing his old talk about the "dictatorship over the proletariat," "the personal dictatorship of Stalin," "the rule of the G.P.U. bureaucracy," and speaks of Hitler Germany, incidentally, in the same breath. We would not like to think that he intends putting the fascist dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat on the same level. This most stupid, most reactionary "argument" is now rarely used even by the most downright reformists. But how are we to understand it if Bauer declares: "Democracy is not merely equal suffrage. Equal suffrage exists also in Hitler Germany." Formerly the Social-Democrats said the words, "Swastika and Soviet Star" in one breath; does Otto Bauer want now to bring this shameful phrase to life again? Has any Communist ever declared that equal suffrage is the beginning and end of democracy? Proletarian democracy is the domination of the working class and all toilers in the state. Proletarian democracy is, further, freedom for the workers in the factories and workshops and the peasants in their collective farms. It is unlimited opportunity for all toilers to occupy key positions in the economic life and in the state, it is the complete equality of political, social, and cultural rights for all toilers (and not purely formal "equality in the eyes of the law" which exists under bourgeois democracy).

It is the creative initiative of the masses, the spontaneous upsurge which we are observing to-day in the Stakhanov movement, and much more besides. It is quite obvious, in addition, that this democracy, existing in a hostile environment, demands at the same time tremendous vigilance, that this democracy is not extended to counter-revolutionaries of all shades, that the proletarian dictatorship battles against all counter-revolutionaries, be they white guards, Trotskyists or Mensheviks. These are all essential measures to safeguard the Soviet Union. Or perhaps we shall once more be ordered to wait until another murder is committed, like the murder of Kirov, to wait until a new murderer arises out of this small handful of plotters. Thanks for the advice that we give freedom of thought and deed to counter-revolutionaries. Soviet democracy does not require Social-Democratic advice for its further development. Otto Bauer has often given his advice to the Soviet Union. He advised it to begin building up not heavy but light industry. He advised it to retard the agrarian revolution and to come to an agreement with the kulaks. He has given the Soviet Union much more advice of this kind. Otto Bauer will understand himself that it would have been a misfortune for the Soviet Union if it had followed his advice, and had used the brain as a "retarding organ." The Bolsheviks have led the working class from victory to victory. Let people LEARN from them, instead of TEACHING them.

Otto Bauer is overgrown with liberalism. Perhaps this is the cause of all his mistakes. He applies his scale of liberal conceptions of freedom and liberal democracy to Soviet freedom and Soviet democracy. But in class society, democracy is radically different from democracy in classless society. What is the use of political parties, parliamentary elections with lists of rival candidates, and parliamentary battles to form governments, in a classless society? Parliamentarism is the most developed form of democracy in class society, but the classless society will never return to this form. There can be no return to liberalism and its ideals, there can only be the march forward to new, incomparable forms of liberty, democracy and the expression of the will of the masses, as new and incomparable as Socialism and the classless society. Soviet democracy is gradually feering itself from all restrictions. It will take over some of the elements of parliamentary democracy, just as Communism will take over some of the elements of the great bourgeois culture. But these elements become combined in a new way, they become endowed with a new form and a new significance in the new social order, they constitute the succession of

all great things created in the past, without ever returning us to this past. Elements of parliamentary democracy will be introduced into a new world, but parliamentary democracy will never return.

Otto Bauer thinks like an historian. He ought to be able to accept the historic process instead of stubbornly repeating: "The Social-Democratic Party must be allowed to exist in the Soviet Union, parliamentarism must be restored in some form or another." He ought to understand that liberalism is dead, irrevocably, once and for all, that now, more than ever before, we demand from every politician in the working class movement that he adopt an unambiguous, unconditional position. The wider the world front, the front of capitalist counter-revolution, headed by Hitler fascism, and the front of the working class, of the anti-fascist masses, led by the Soviet Union, the stronger becomes the need of making an unequivocal choice between these two fronts, the more untenable is the policy based on the principle of "on the one hand, yes, and on the other hand, no." Otto Bauer has declared himself on the side of the Soviet Union. In an earlier article in the *Kampf*, he recognised the leading rôle of the Soviet Union; and then declared the most important task is to be the mobilisation of the masses in defence of the Soviet Union, but his political line is in contradiction to this statement. He sows doubts about the policy of the Soviet Union. Over and over again he discovers things he does not like. He links up with the Mensheviks and provides the enemies of the Soviet Union with arguments. His pessimistic "objective approach" will not fill a single waverer with determination to really defend the Soviet Union, and fight ardently for the united front. On the contrary, Bauer's approach to questions offers an indecisive justification of their indecision, and gives the enemies of the united front arguments, the more real, since they originate from a man who has declared himself to be a supporter of the united front. No, this is not the way to assist in revolutionising the masses or to win new forces to support the great cause of the united front, to defend the Soviet Union. This is the method of damping down the flame, of shattering the front by "buts" and "ifs," by "on the one hand," and "on the other hand." This is a refined form of the policy of the reformists.

If Otto Bauer really wants to help consolidate the united front and defend the Soviet Union, he must proceed along a different road. Let him discuss things with the Communist International, let him criticise us and offer suggestions as to how to achieve the united front more quickly. But

behind all this we must feel what we have not felt up to now; namely, that he is consistently and unreservedly joining in the united front, that he is possessed of consistent consequent friendship for the Soviet Union. Not of false "objectivity" in the interests of the reformists and Mensheviks, but of a real desire to do everything that will assist the united front and do nothing that will injure it.

Trotskyist arguments and Menshevik demands are milestones along the road to the enemies of the united front and the Soviet Union. Does Otto Bauer really want to travel along that road? Or will he take another road, the road which revolutionises the masses, the road of the united front, the road of fighting unity with the Soviet Union and the Communist International?

THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITED FRONT

SOUKUP AND STIVIN, BLACKLEGS OF THE UNITED FRONT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

By V. K.

IT is with bitterness that the international proletariat call to mind the decision taken by the Labour and Socialist International on October 12. In this decision there was rejected the proposal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International concerning joint action by both Internationals on an international scale against the armed invasion of Abyssinia by Italian imperialism, and the growing danger of a new world war. Included among the five social-democratic parties responsible for the breakdown of united anti-war action by the international proletariat is social-democracy in Czecho-Slovakia. At the session of the Executive Committee of the Second International, representatives of both social-democratic parties of Czecho-Slovakia—the German and the Czech—together with the English, Dutch, Swedish and Danish social-democratic leaders, demanded that the Executive Committee reject the proposal of the Comintern, as against the view-point of 17 representatives of the other social-democratic parties who declared themselves in favour of accepting the proposals of the Communist International. In this disgraceful list, we also find the leaders of Czech social-democracy. The names of these representatives to the Executive Committee of the Second International are Frantiscec Soukup and Josef Stivin, and they call forth the same disgust among the international proletariat as does the name of SCHEIDEMANN.

The workers of Czecho-Slovakia consider it a disgrace to themselves that the representatives of their country in particular, came forward in the Executive Committee of the Second International as opponents of international united action against war, and that the Czech social-democratic party is one of the five social-democratic parties condemned by the proletariat of the whole world.

The position of the working class of Czecho-Slovakia on the question of united working class action and in particular on the question of the united front against the warmongers, has nothing in common with the position adopted by representatives of Czech social-democracy when the vote was taken in the Executive Committee of the Second International. The manner in which Soukup and Stivin (and Shefer from the German social-democrats in Czecho-Slovakia) voted at the Brussels session has called forth tremendous indignation among the toiling masses of Czecho-Slovakia. The votes given by them also contradict the opinion of the majority of the social-democratic workers, officials, and honest leading workers in the ranks of social-democracy.

The social-democratic workers realise that their leaders are to blame for the differences which exist between the Czech social-democratic party and the social-democratic parties of the majority of other countries. The representatives of 17 social-democratic parties of other countries were in favour at Brussels of accepting the proposal of the Comintern; but the representatives of Czech social-democracy were stubbornly opposed. Czech social-democracy is guided by leaders who have made it their profession to betray the working class and split its ranks, and who in coalition with the bourgeoisie, and with places on the ministerial benches, slavishly obey the orders of the bourgeoisie, and strive to the utmost to do their will. These leaders (for example Bechyne—the chief leader of the Right wing of social-democracy) say they would sooner cut off their right hands than lose their ministerial seats.

The reactionary ministerial clique of leaders who have become thoroughly bourgeois, and who have caused tremendous harm to the working class

for several decades, brought Czech social-democracy to reject the international united front. This clique has on its conscience countless cases of acts of treachery against the interests of the working class. If the social-democratic workers wish to put an end to the treacherous activities of these leaders, they must secure their removal. Soukup and Stivin, who take their seats in the Executive Committee of the Second International, are representatives of this reactionary clique of leaders of Czech social-democracy.

FRANTISCEC SOUKUP is the traditional representative of Czech social-democracy in the Executive Committee of the Socialist International. Soukup is an example of the social-democratic leaders common in pre-war days, who in spite of their treacherous policy both before and after the war, have always made themselves out to be people who have rendered big services to the working class movement. Soukup willingly assimilates the title of "the patriarch of socialism," but only his theatrical gestures, his gray hair under his broad-brimmed hat, and his flowing tie, give him the right to do so. By profession Soukup is a lawyer. He arrived at the leadership of the social-democratic movement under the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy, in connection with the struggle of the Czech proletariat for universal suffrage in 1905. From 1907 onwards, Soukup became a deputy of social-democracy in the Austrian Council of State. As an agitator, Soukup covered himself with glory by repeating the slogans of Bebel and Jaurès in very flowery terms. There are numerous humorous sayings connected with the name of Soukup, which the bourgeoisie are always using when they want to jeer at socialism and to show the inconsistency of social-democracy. Soukup's favourite saying: "There will be neither kings nor priests" in Czecho-Slovakia was frequently recalled after the war, when Alexander, the Serbian King, bestowed the Order of Saint Saba on Soukup.

In his time, Soukup knew how to thunder against Austrian militarism in words and to demand that the Hapsburg monarchy be brought before the people's court. He knew how to proclaim "war against war," and how as one who participated in the Basle Congress (1912), to utter touching expressions of his pleasure at the triumphal scenes of the taking of the oath in Basle cathedral, when the Second International promised to fight against war. However, Soukup also knew, in the old Austria, how to combine a monarchist programme with Socialism, and when the war broke out in 1914, he forgot all about his anti-war slogans, all about his noisy utterances against the Hapsburg monarchy, and about his oath in Basle cathedral: his chief care at the beginning of the war being to assure the government of the

loyalty of Czech social-democracy to the Austrian monarchy and to persuade the workers that any action against war was madness.

In his loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Soukup went so far that when a messenger came to him in 1915 from Masaryk, carrying a secret message written on a piece of paper hidden in a button, he handed the messenger over to the Austrian police. This deed earned Soukup the humorous title of the "button hero."

During the whole of the war Soukup remained the defender of the Austrian policy of Czech social-democracy, proving that the endeavour to establish an independent Czech state was an illusion. This, however, did not prevent Soukup, when this policy proved bankrupt, from joining the other bourgeois current—the "national movement," in which he played the rôle of "the hero of October 28." In one of his books, when presenting the history of the downfall of Austria-Hungary and the rise of the Czech republic, he managed to depict himself as the grave-digger of Austria and the liberator of the Czech people. After the war, Frantisec Soukup was for some time Minister of Justice in the "national coalition," and took an active part in putting through the land reform. "The over-curious" workers were able to establish that Soukup became very wealthy after this.

However, Soukup became worthy of a prominent political post in Czecho-Slovakia only after he played the rôle in 1920 of one of the chief culprits in the split of the working-class movement in Czecho-Slovakia. It was then that he brought out the gendarmes to occupy the House of Labour and helped in the bloody suppression of the general strike, which took place in December, 1920, under Communist slogans. From that time onwards, Soukup has fought against Communism, and for many years has been concocting calumnies against the Soviet Union.

Soukup considered it a great honour to become the sponsor of various counter-revolutionary emigrant organisations of the Russian, Ukrainian and Georgian Mensheviks. At the same time, since the disgust of the workers, including the social-democratic workers, towards Soukup was growing, the latter expected the bourgeoisie to give him the honour of being a second time elected to the post of the President of the Senate.

As an orator also, Soukup became a comic figure: his oratorical gesticulations develop into acrobatics; he knows how to weep touchingly at the right moment, and is proud of his function as sworn scribe, who finds it equally easy to compose memorial statements and verses for the First of May.

This is Frantisec Soukup, whom the reactionary

clique of leaders of Czech social-democracy consider to be a worthy member of the leading bodies of the Second International.

JOSEF STIVIN is the other member of the Executive Committee of the Socialist International delegated from Czech social-democracy. Stivin was chosen representative to the Executive Committee in 1935, after the sudden death of Leo Winter, who represented the more left current of Czech social-democracy in the Executive Committee of the Socialist International. It is difficult to find an example of a more chequered career among the renegades of socialism, than the life of Josef Stivin. Already before the war Stivin was one of the leaders of Czech social-democracy, and led the young social-democratic press. He adhered to the current known as the so-called "orthodox Marxists and internationalists." The war revealed him in his true colours. We remember how, as a sergeant-major in the Austrian army, Josef Stivin, in letters from the Galician front, sang the praises of war under the banner of the Austrian Empire; he wrote: "Let us drive out the Russians," and agitated for support for the war till the final victory of the Austrian monarchy. Stivin condemned not only every idea of the possibility of resistance to war on the part of the working class but, when in 1917, Czech writers issued a manifesto against the national oppressors of the Czech people, Josef Stivin organised action against them. He was one of the chief defenders of the Austrian policy of Czech social-democracy during the war.

After the fall of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and the establishment of the Czechoslovakian Republic, a change took place in Josef Stivin: he was reincarnated as a socialist radical. Stivin led the radical current in Czech social-democracy, sang the praises of Liebknecht, and threatened the bourgeoisie with Bolshevism.

Josef Stivin played the part of a socialist radical until the first government coalition was formed in Czecho-Slovakia under the leadership of social-democracy, and the bourgeoisie began to throw big concessions to the social-democratic leaders. Josef Stivin quickly changed his coat and from simulating the revolutionary rebel, became the most passionate defender of coalition with the bourgeoisie, of ministerialism. He was finally absolved of all his old sins by the bourgeoisie when the split took place in social-democracy, and together with Soukup, Bechyne, Meisner and others, he hurled himself with fury and hatred against the followers of the Third International, and then ardently threw himself into the battle against the Communist Party, already formed in Czecho-Slovakia.

Having cringed his way up to the post of deputy-

speaker of parliament, Josef Stivin considered his chief mission as Editor-in-Chief of the Central organ of social-democracy, the "Pravo Lidu" to conduct a constant stream of calumny against the Communists and the Soviet Union, considering no means too horrible for the purpose. Stivin always opposed the united front with infinite hatred and deservedly belongs to the number of those "leaders" who are most hated by the Czech social-democratic workers and officials. When Stivin was sent to the Executive Committee of the Second International to take the place of Leo Winter, the social-democratic workers considered it an act of provocation, not only because the current represented previously by Leo Winter was left without a representative, not only because in choosing a successor to Winter, the leadership of social-democracy did not reckon with the growing desire among the social-democratic workers and officials for the united front, but also because in the person of Josef Stivin, a man was chosen, side by side with Soukup, for the Executive Committee of the Second International, who was notorious for being the most out-and-out opponent of the united front, and the most vulgar inciter to action against the Communists. To elect Stivin at a time when it was known that the Executive Committee of the Second International would be deciding the question of joint international action on the part of the toilers, was a blow in the face to all the social-democratic supporters of the united front.

The attitude of Czech social-democracy towards the Second International is also instructive. So long as there were no social-democratic parties in the Second International in favour of the united front, the Czech social-democratic leaders rejected all the proposals of the Communists for a united front, on the grounds that the Executive Committees of the Socialist and Communist Internationals must first of all come to an agreement among themselves. Thus, they showed themselves to be the most obedient members of the Socialist International. When, however, the relation of forces in the Second International changed, and the number of social-democratic parties in favour of the united front increased, the Czech social-democratic leaders began to change their arguments. Now that the representatives of 17 social-democratic parties have voted in the Executive Committee of the Second International for accepting the proposals of the Comintern for joint international action, the Czech social-democratic leaders have begun to change their tone. How many times have we read statements in the "Pravo Lidu" threatening that Czech social-democracy would not permit the Second

on the question of the united front. Whereas previously the social-democratic press in slandering the Communists, wrote about "orders from Moscow," now, in attacking the social-democratic parties who support the united front, they are beginning to write about "orders from Brussels."

It is very unpleasant for the reactionary leaders International to show them how they should act of Czech social-democracy who are trying to maintain the pleasure of the bourgeoisie by keeping wide the breach in the working class, that the majority of the other social-democratic parties have declared themselves in favour of accepting the proposals of the Comintern. The Czech social-democratic leaders now make their attacks not only on the Communists, but also on the French socialists: Ziromsky, Blum, and others, as well. They are saying that the behaviour of the French socialists is a "brainless policy," and they are infuriated when their lying assertions that the united front in France is helping to strengthen fascism, are overthrown by the results of the elections and the scope of the anti-fascist movement in France. As against the actions of the French socialists and the social-democratic parties of other countries, they point to the policy of the social-democratic parties of Denmark and Sweden where, as in Czecho-Slovakia and in Belgium, the social-democratic leaders are members of the government.

Czech social-democracy is now the most reactionary section of the Second International. The leaders of Czech social-democracy want to continue the policy which in a number of countries has led to catastrophe. The reactionary social-democratic leaders of Czecho-Slovakia want to maintain for social democracy the rôle of the weapon which splits the working class, the weapon of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The Czech social-democratic leaders are beginning to attack the social-democratic parties of other countries which have joined the united front with the Communists. They are prepared to break with the Second International and split it, if the Executive Committee of the Second International declares itself in favour of the united proletarian front, as a result of the pressure of the masses.

At the session of the Executive Committee of the Socialist International held in Brussels on October 12, Soukup and Stivin succeeded, by using threats, in preventing the Socialist International from daring to dictate to Czech social-democracy the decision of the majority of the members of the

Executive Committee on the united front with the Communists. Moreover, they made the majority of the Second International submit to the resistance of five social-democratic parties, and reject the proposal of the Communist International. This method actually worked. On October 12, the Executive Committee of the Socialist International, at the insistence of five parties, rejected the proposal of the Communist International.

If the present reactionary leadership continues to lead, and to continue the policy of smashing the united front and sabotaging international unity of action, the social-democratic workers of Czecho-Slovakia will become more and more divorced from their brothers in other countries and will be brought to national isolation.

The social-democratic workers of Czecho-Slovakia are therefore confronted with the following tremendously important task: they must not allow themselves to be isolated from the international movement for united working class action, which is meeting with more and more support in other social-democratic parties and in the Second International. They should understand that the sabotage of the blacklegs, of the opponents of the united front, must be broken down, that the reactionary ministerial clique must be eliminated from the leadership of Czech social-democracy to prevent them from continuing to be a check upon the international united front of the working class.

The social-democratic workers in Czecho-Slovakia must insist upon Soukup and Stivin being recalled from the Executive Committee of the Socialist International as arrant opponents of the united front and submissive servants of the reactionary bourgeoisie, and that representatives be sent in their place who will vote in the spirit of the wishes of the whole working class of Czecho-Slovakia, namely, for joint action between the internationals, for the united international working class front, against war and fascism. This will help the united front of the international proletariat in the future to become the force that will defend the interests of the toiling masses and the people of Czecho-Slovakia in addition, in the event of danger from German fascism. It is in this spirit that the Communists of Czecho-Slovakia will influence the social-democratic workers, who are being drawn closer to them by the joint striving for united militant action by the working class, as time goes on.

RUDOLPH CLAUS

ON December 17, 1935, the Hitler gang, the cowardly band of warmongers, hangmen and robbers, murdered Rudolph Claus, a German worker. The victim was an invalid, 90 per cent. incapacitated during the world war, one of the millions of toilers, who, as the fascist hangmen and charlatans usually describe it, have sacrificed their health "on the altar of the fatherland." Claus was not murdered in secret like the thousands of other class-conscious workers in Germany who have been tortured to death in fascist dungeons or "shot while attempting to escape." They "tried" him before the court. The fascists were unable to prove the charges of murders levelled against Claus. And so they beheaded him because he was the organiser of aid for the victims of fascist terror, because he assisted the wives and children of the workers, tortured and killed by the fascists. **FOR THE FIRST TIME THEY HAVE CARRIED OUT THE DEATH SENTENCE AGAINST A MAN WHOM THEY COULD ONLY ACCUSE OF DEFENDING HIS COMMUNIST CONVICTIONS TO THE BITTER END, TO HIS LAST BREATH.**

They have beheaded Rudolph Claus at the very time when long queues are standing in the streets of Germany outside the foodshops, when the hungry, toiling people are indignant at the rule of the fascist executioners and hangmen.

The increase in unemployment, the high cost of living, the shortage of meat and fats, are all results of the rule of the fascists. It is they who have reduced the German people to conditions of hunger blockade.

The intensification of unbridled terror is closely connected with the increase in the discontent of the masses.

"What is important is that the Communists now see that there is no leniency for them," wrote the fascist press on the occasion of the execution of Comrade Claus.

The whole world sees from these actions that the régime of the butcher dictatorship is unstable, and is quaking in the expectation of the hour of reckoning. It is precisely the knowledge of their instability which inspires the fascist government to arrange orgies of brown terror. In Wuppertal, 600 workers, Communists, Social Democrats and non-party workers, were brought before the court after being subjected to agonies of torture. In Hamburg, 72 workers headed by Andrei, the Communist, were made to stand before the court of the murderers: in Altona, 22 workers; in Berlin, as a result of the so-called Richardstrasse trial, 23

workers were sentenced to severe punishments and the death sentence was passed on seven of them.

As far as the fascists are concerned, to use Goering's words, "grenades are more important than fats." It is becoming more and more clear to the masses that the brown bandits are seeking a way out in war. The prisons and concentration camps are full to overflowing, crammed with Communists, social-democrats, catholics, peasants, small traders, and even members of the fascist party who have become convinced that they have been insolently and unceremoniously deceived. In a word, people are languishing in prison who have dared in any form whatsoever to express their discontent at the existing fascist system of hunger, terror, and war preparations. But the abyss between the fascist dictatorship and the masses is widening. And the fascist robbers are grasping at the executioner's axe to frighten the people.

Who was Rudolph Claus and why was he executed? Rudolph Claus came from a working-class family of people who took an active part in the social-democratic movement. When still a young man, in 1909, he began to work in the ranks of the Socialist youth. Even at that time he was fascinated by the revolutionary activity of Karl Liebknecht. As a young man of twenty, Claus, an opponent of the imperialist war, suffered all the "joys" of Prussian barrack drill, and as soon as war broke out, was despatched to the front. The trials of the war, which crippled Claus (one of his arms was totally paralysed, and the other deformed), made of him an active revolutionary, an irreconcilable enemy of the agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the social-chauvinists. In 1920, Claus joined the Communist Party of Germany.

When in 1921 Severing's police provoked the Mansfeld workers, Claus, a cripple, fought courageously shoulder to shoulder with his class comrades. On April 8, 1921, the Hamburg Emergency Tribunal sentenced him to penal servitude for life. True, after the assassination of Rathenau, Claus came under the amnesty. But right until the last minute the class of exploiters and its venal courts did not forgive Claus for participating in the armed fighting.

First, as one of the "amnestied," he was transferred from the penal prison to an ordinary one, in order to be brought up for trial a second time for the same acts in connection with which the "amnesty" had been declared. However, a power-

ful movement of mass protest shattered this disgraceful game, and Claus had to be released.

Nevertheless, the class justice of the bourgeois Weimar Republic, and subsequently of the "Third Empire" did not forget the victim it had once been deprived of. In the years of storm and strife, in 1923, Claus took part in the struggle of the workers for emancipation. And once more he fell into the hands of Weimar "justice." Here he was paid with interest for the 1922 failure, and sentenced to eight years' hard labour. He actually had to serve half of his term of imprisonment. In 1928 there was another amnesty, and he was released from prison. But right up until the last minute he was persecuted by the hatred of the exploiters, who were infuriated at the fact that they had not been able to deal with this particular victim previously. Foaming at the mouth, the bloody judges branded him as "one who took part in the bloody outrages of Max Holtz," thus trying to "justify" the death sentence brought in against Claus. Shame upon those "democratic" organs of the foreign press which, like a certain Czech Press Bureau, spread further this attempt "to justify" the execution of Claus, thus helping the fascist bandits who held sway in Germany to cover up the REAL reason for the execution of Rudolph Claus.

Ever since Claus left his prison cell, his life belonged to the political prisoners, to the proletarians, whose fate he had experienced fully himself. With tremendous energy and self-effacement he devoted himself to his work as an instructor of the International Labour Defence. The development of the I.L.D. organisations in Middle Germany was, to a considerable extent, the result of the heroic work of Claus.

After the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship, Claus remained at his fighting post, to afford assistance to the victims of the new régime.

He was once more arrested in 1933, thrown into prison, and from there transferred to a concentration camp. There he was tortured according to all the rules of the "art" displayed by the brown hangmen. All means were employed to force him to speak, to make a traitor of him; his teeth were knocked out, the nails stripped off his toes, the wounds on his feet did not heal. He was tortured by every possible means. But Rudolph Claus firmly maintained his loyalty to his class, to his movement, to his party.

When the brown hangmen decided that at last they had finally broken down the vital energy of the invalid, he was released. But he immediately threw himself once more into the work, carrying out his fighting duty. When the arrest and murder of a number of leading workers of the

I.L.D., in the beginning of 1934, dealt a severe blow at the movement, Claus, still very ill after the tortures he had so recently suffered, immediately stepped into the breach: he joined the Central Committee of the I.L.D. of Germany in order to help organise aid for the victims of fascist terror and the struggle to release Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the German proletariat.

Even in the severest underground conditions, Rudolph Claus never for a single moment ceased to seek out new ways and means of working, striving to draw into the anti-fascist fighting front the workers who still stand aloof of it. He fought with all his might to establish the united front. And if it has been possible to obtain considerable successes for the united front in Berlin, in just this sphere of solidarity, it has been due to the services rendered by Claus.

Six months of turbulent, successful work passed by, and the police sleuth-hounds once more picked up the trail of Claus and seized him. Suffering severe tortures, Claus did not surrender, and wrote the following in one of his last letters before the sentence was brought in:

"I am fully responsible for my political activity . . . Many privations will have to be endured before we have passed through these times. But everything can be borne for the sake of our convictions."

He courageously suffered the last torture, and he and his wife heroically withstood the last moral test: she was arrested, brought to him in the condemned cell, and from there transferred to the concentration camp. He died a heroic death, as proletarian revolutionaries, people of the Comintern, the people who have passed through the school of LENIN AND STALIN, meet their death. The public prosecutor asked Claus whether he had anything to say. Claus replied: "This is political murder. This is class justice. The proletariat will avenge my death."

The fascists no longer make difficulties for themselves by searching for proofs supporting the accusations of "murders committed," and the execution of Claus is noteworthy in this respect. As a motive for the sentence, the murderous fascist judges declared:

"First and foremost criminal design is being punished. The accused, by his activities and the former terms of punishment he has served, has proved that there can be no question of his reforming as regards his political convictions. Therefore the Senate could adopt no other but the highest form of punishment, and brought in the death sentence."

This motive and the declaration made by Ribbentrop on the same day that Claus was executed, to the effect that not a single convinced anti-fascist will in future be released from prison, CONSTITUTE THE MOST DEFINITE, DIRECT MENACE THAT THE DEATH SENTENCE WILL BE BROUGHT IN AGAINST

COMRADE THAELMANN AND TENS OF THOUSANDS OF
IMPRISONED ANTI-FASCIST FIGHTERS.

* * *

Not only in Germany, but throughout the whole world, this new crime committed by the fascist hangmen, must call forth an increased struggle for the release of the victims of fascism, for the release of Ernst Thaelmann. In memory of Claus and of tens of thousands who have been killed and tortured in the dungeons of the Gestapo (Secret Police), the toilers must do all in their power to wrest all political prisoners from the hands of the fascist hangmen. In many towns of Europe, protests and demonstrations against the murder of Claus are multiplying. In the declaration of protest signed by former Reichstag deputies, social-democrats and Communists, including Max Braun, Breuer, and Breitscheid, Koenen, Dengel and Munzenberg, published in the *Populaire* of December 22, 1935, it is rightly stated that:

"By the force of your protest throughout the world, put an end to the murders and barbarous outrages which are going on in the "Third Empire."

"Only by means of active brotherly solidarity, for the cause for which Rudolph Claus gave his life, can we prevent new executions, fresh murders. Solidarity alone can stop all the tortures to which Thaelmann, Mirendorf, Shuhmacher, Hoelman, Neubauer, and Ossietsky are being subjected in fascist prisons. Solidarity alone can wrest our brothers from the claws of death and torture, can give them back their freedom."

Delegations of the most varied sections of the population are knocking at the door of the fascist embassies. This movement must not cease until the bloodthirsty fascist beasts release their victims. We must weld still closer the circle of national indignation against the brown plague, we must surround its agents in all countries with hatred, we must persecute them at every step. It is the duty of the international proletariat to help the German working class in its struggle for emancipation and first and foremost in its struggle to release its leader, Ernst Thaelmann.

In one of the last appeals issued by Rudolph Claus during his illegal work, it says:

"Only by the joint struggle of the German proletariat and the workers of the whole world, will the fight on

behalf of Thaelmann end in success. Intensify the struggle inside fascist Germany! Set up Thaelmann defence committees everywhere."

Millions throughout the whole world are following this call. The fighting front against fascism, for the release of Thaelmann, will spread still wider. The united front and the people's front against the brown hangmen and gaolers represent the force which, relying upon the solidarity of the toilers of the whole world, will secure the abolition of any further death sentences, the abolition of concentration camps, general amnesty for all imprisoned opponents of Hitler, the release of Thaelmann, Mirendorf, Ossietsky and all arrested anti-fascists, and discontinuation of torturing in connection with the latter, freedom of defence and the right to select counsel, and human treatment of prisoners. And this means the struggle to abolish fascist barbarity.

* * *

In the opinion of the bloody fascist judges, "the time has gone and passed for ever" when it was possible to fight for Communism in Germany. You're wrong, sirs: you cannot give the people bread, or freedom, but only hunger, terror and war. You have shed a sea of blood. But the result of this is only that the flame of mass indignation is mounting higher. "The proletariat will avenge my death"—these were the last words of Claus, spoken by him to the fascist Public Prosecutor. Aye, the proletariat will avenge Claus and thousands of other murdered anti-fascist fighters by overthrowing the bloody fascist dictatorship which is a disgrace to the German people.

Rudolph Claus in his last words to the fascist judges, two Reichswehr Generals and two leaders of the brown gangs, said:

"I shall not dispute with you about justice. I have never done anything to harm the working-class and have proved more than once that I am not afraid of death. you can kill me, but even your hangmen cannot help you to retard the victory of revolution."

The cause for which Comrade Rudolph Claus has died, for which thousands of German Communists are fighting, will be victorious throughout the whole world.

THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT AND OUR ENEMIES

By A. RUBINES.

"THE Stakhanov movement is a new and higher stage of Socialist competition connected with the development of new technique; it is a mass Communist movement for a higher productivity of labour, which will go down as one of the most glorious pages in the history of our Socialist construction." (Stalin.)

Our great STALIN, the genius and leader of the international proletariat, in his speech at the first All-Union Conference of Stakhanov Workers,* said that the Stakhanov movement opens up before us the road "upon which alone those higher indices of Labour productivity can be achieved which are essential to the transition from Socialism to Communism and to the elimination of the difference between mental and physical labour." (Stalin.)

This magnificent movement of people of a new epoch—of working men and women, men and women collective farmers of the Soviet Union, who are surpassing the present technical standards, the existing planned capacities—opens up inexhaustible reserves in industry, transport and agriculture, and "is destined to cause a revolution in our industry." (Stalin.) The Stakhanov movement is accelerating the construction of classless Socialist society, is increasing the power of the Soviet Union, and consolidating the position of Socialism throughout the world.

The Stakhanov movement declares the struggle against present-day capitalism which dooms hundreds of millions of people to unemployment, want, hunger, and slow death. The Stakhanov movement is a new deadly weapon of Socialism in its struggle against capitalism, the weapon of a higher productivity of labour. It is a deadly weapon as far as the old world is concerned, because in the historic struggle between systems, that system wins which bears with it a higher productivity of labour, which brings mankind greater victories in its struggle against nature. "In the long run, productivity of labour is the chief, the most important thing for the victory of the new social system." (Lenin.)

Born in one of the pits in the Donetz Coal Basin, at the coal face worked by Stakhanov, this movement spread like a whirlwind throughout the Soviet Union, embracing all branches of industry, all spheres of Socialist construction.

The victory of the Stakhanov heroes, the victory of Socialist productivity of labour has focussed the attention of international public opinion, both

proletarian and bourgeois. The names of the modest working men and women, the Stakhanov workers—Stakhanov, Busygin, Smetanin, Krivonos, Dusia and Maria Vinogradova, and others are world-famous. They are known everywhere, they are known not only in the Land of Soviets, where labour is held in the greatest honour, they are known also in the lands of capital, where labour is a heavy, shameful burden which oppresses millions of the exploited toilers.

The magnificent heroic struggle of the new Soviet people for a high productivity of labour, for a cultured, and prosperous life cannot be passed over. Even the capitalist press cannot keep silent about this movement.

A number of capitalist newspapers have been compelled to admit the fact that the Stakhanov movement is really a movement of the toiling masses themselves.

The French *Le Temps* (12.11.35) writes:

"In the course of six weeks, the effort made by the miner Stakhanov has become a mighty movement covering the whole of the working class."

"The present movement" the paper continues, "is the more convincing in that it has its source in the personal initiative of the Soviet workers, and is not a more or less severe administrative measure, and it shows that the Soviet workers are capable or will soon become capable of competing with their Western comrades."

Some bourgeois journalists are trying to adjust the Stakhanov movement to suit themselves, and are striving to prove that it is possible also under capitalism. Thus the *Manchester Guardian* of November 28, 1935, assures its readers that a movement like the Stakhanov movement can take place not only under Socialism, but also under capitalism. It writes:

"The motives are the same, although one may be striving towards the Socialist, and the others towards the capitalist order."

But the whole point is that the motives, the desires, and the essence are all different. The Stakhanov movement was born of the magnificent victories of Socialism. The conditions for its rise and development were created by a number of factors including the persistent work carried on by the Party and the Soviet state to improve the material conditions of the workers and the masses of collective farmers, and to raise their cultural and technical level as well as their political consciousness and activity. These factors are as follow: The heroic struggle of the working class

* See No. 20, 1935.

during the years of the first Five-Year Plan to set up their own powerful Socialist heavy industry for the Socialist reconstruction of agriculture; the victory of the collective farming system in the rural districts (90 per cent. of the peasant farms have joined the collective farms), and the liquidation of the last capitalist class of kulaks and the remains of the exploiting classes. The Stakhanov movement grew up in the period when the national economy of the U.S.S.R. "has become completely Socialist economy" (Molotov, report at the 2nd Session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R., 10.1.1936), and Socialist economy has acquired a concise, confident rhythm, when "life has become better and more joyous."

Under capitalism there is not, and cannot be, any movement like the Stakhanov movement, i.e., a mass movement of the people prepared for by the whole development of the proletarian revolution, and coming from below, embracing the whole of the manifold processes of human labour, and causing a revolution in it.

It is enough to call to mind the great, wise words of Comrade Stalin about the roots of the Stakhanov movement, to understand all the fallacy of making any attempts to transplant this movement to capitalist soil. These roots are the improvement of the material conditions of the toilers in the U.S.S.R., the absence of exploitation in the land of Soviets, the existence of new technique, and the presence of new people who have mastered this technique. These roots will not take root on capitalist soil, for capitalism means hunger, unemployment, exploitation, wage reductions, the destruction of the productive forces, imperialist wars and fascist fanaticism.

Only in the U.S.S.R., where the proletarian revolution has destroyed once and for all the power of the landlords and capitalists, and has given the toilers not only freedom, but MATERIAL BENEFITS, and the opportunity of living prosperous and cultured lives, without having to worry about their daily bread—could the Stakhanov movement originate.

"To be able to live well and joyfully it is necessary that material benefits should be added to the benefits of political liberty." (Stalin).

Wages are increasing in the U.S.S.R. from year to year. Thus, the wages of workers employed in large-scale industry amounted at the end of 1935 to 282.5 per cent. of the corresponding figure for 1928.

Retail prices of industrial and agricultural products are systematically falling. Thus during the years 1933-35 prices on the open market dropped

as follow: Rye bread by three times; wheat bread, two and a half times; sugar, three times; meat, twice; animal fats, two and a half times, etc.

The government expenditure on the cultural requirements of the toilers has increased gigantically. If the amount assigned for this purpose in 1926 amounted to 939 million roubles, the corresponding expenditure for 1935 was expressed in the sum of 7,600 million roubles. THE REAL WAGES OF the workers are increasing month by month, the workers and collective farmers are becoming increasingly prosperous, their material well-being and cultural level are improving. The production of articles of universal consumption has increased (by 28,700 million roubles in 1935). The food industry has taken a tremendous step forward; the amount of agricultural products available for sale on the market has increased. The trade turnover in 1935 increased to 80,500 million roubles, as against 61,800 million in 1934.

Is not this all an illustration of the sturdy growth of the material well-being of the workers and collective farmers, in the U.S.S.R.? A cheerful and happy outlook, an enthusiasm for creative activity, and gaiety have arisen among the masses out of the material security of the toilers of the Soviet Union, the lack of worry about the morrow—for there is not and will not be any unemployment in the U.S.S.R.—the tremendous rise of Socialist consciousness as a result of the broad, mass, propagandist work of the Party, and widely developed Soviet democracy.

"And when one lives joyfully, work hums. Hence the high standard of output." (Stalin).

It is only in the U.S.S.R., where the toilers are working not to enrich a handful of capitalist exploiters, but for themselves, for their own toiling people, that the Stakhanov movement could originate and spread. Only in the U.S.S.R. does the sturdy growth of productivity

"lead without fail to an extension of the front of production, to an increase in the number of lathes and production aggregates at work, to a rise in the number of workers employed, to a rise in their wages, for the Soviet system which has liberated the productive forces from their capitalist fetters, cannot but lead to their all-round development." (From the resolution of the December Plenary Session of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.).

With the further increase in the productivity of labour, the increase in inventiveness and development of technique, the proletarian state will, of course, not take the road of dismissing workers, but will take the other road of further shortening the working day. Is such a perspective possible in conditions of capitalism?

In the U.S.S.R. the stormy increase in production as a result of the widespread adoption of

Stakhanov methods of work and the development of the Stakhanov movement is leading to an abundance of products, to further reductions in prices, to still greater improvements in the material well-being of the masses. But under capitalism? Can we say that the bourgeoisie are interested in a stormy increase in production? Under capitalist conditions, this leads to overproduction, crisis. The bourgeoisie, as we know, are interested in selling their commodities at monopolist prices. Neither is the worker, of course, interested in an increase in the productivity of labour under capitalist conditions, for it leads in the long run to increased unemployment and wage reductions.

That is why the painful strivings of the *Manchester Guardian* to convince anybody of the possibility of "applying" the Stakhanov movement in capitalist conditions are vain.

The Social-Democratic press also cannot remain silent about the Stakhanov movement. Many Right Social-Democratic leaders, many muddle-heads from among the ranks of the Left Social-Democracy and Trotskyists who have long ago sunk down to the camp of the counter-revolution are helping the bourgeoisie to bespatter the Stakhanov movement and invent all sorts of "arguments" against it. The Belgian *Le Peuple* (the official organ of Belgian Social-Democracy) printed an article by A. Habaru on November 30, 1935, which contained the following words:

"We think that the motives which inspired the Stakhanov movement were of a purely individualistic character . . . The Stakhanov movement comprises non-Socialist elements: the effort to raise the well-being of the individual and, to say all there is to say, the desire for gain and the thirst for official distinction is just as much in evidence as the desire to serve the 'Socialist Fatherland.'"

Habaru, the renegade Trotskyist, goes still further in the same newspaper, in its issue of January 6, 1936, and calls the Stakhanov movement anti-Socialist because the "Stakhanov workers stand in the ranks of the privileged caste" (!?). It is perfectly natural that the renegade (that is his business as a renegade) will leave no stone unturned to throw calumny at the Stakhanov movement and the Land of Soviets, where it originated!

But the arguments of the "theoreticians" like Habaru are so bankrupt that not much labour is required to make every worker understand that only class enemies can write like Habaru writes.

What sort of privileged caste is this about? The proletarian revolution in the U.S.S.R. destroyed all castes once and for all. Will Habaru, the counter-revolutionary, and his adherents kindly name any

other country in the world besides the U.S.S.R., where all castes whatsoever have been utterly destroyed once and for all? As for those elements in the Stakhanov movement which Habaru refers to as non-Socialist, every Marxist-Leninist knows that under Socialism the toilers work according to their ability and receive articles of consumption according to the amount of work they do for society. Only under Communism—the highest stage of Socialism—will every member of society work according to his ability and receive according to his needs.

The Stakhanov workers are masters of high labour productivity, who more than fulfil all existing standards of output and consequently earn considerably more than others. They naturally live better. Is it in this that the "theoreticians" of *Le Peuple* see a "privileged caste"? But the land of Socialism differs from capitalist countries in precisely this that every honest toiler in the U.S.S.R. can raise his productivity of labour and become a Stakhanov worker and so increase his wages. What is more, in the U.S.S.R., as we know, the Stakhanov workers are honoured and respected, they are glorious heroes of labour. Is this to become one of "a privileged caste," in the language of the renegade?

It has never occurred to Habaru that in the U.S.S.R. life is full of the joy of creation, that labour from being the shameful, heavy burden it was formerly considered, has become "a thing of honour, glory, valour and heroism." (Stalin.)

What forces the workers of the Soviet Union to stand in the front ranks of those who fight for a rise in the productivity of labour?

We have before us a simple, clear picture drawn by Comrade CHEMODUROV, a famous Stakhanov worker from Krivorozh, about the stimulus which inspired him to become a Stakhanov worker.

He came to the mine in 1925, an illiterate, dirty, backward, peasant. "The whole aim of my life was to earn enough to deck myself out in leather top-boots and breeches of real broadcloth. Straw sandals spoiled my life," he relates. "I liked to work, without understanding that it was necessary for the state, for the workers. I thought of one thing alone, that I must earn money." Very soon Comrade Chemodurov began to wear top-boots, breeches, and a fashionable shirt. But little by little the turbulent industrial life got a hold upon Chemodurov. "I began to understand, for example, that you cannot pour out any amount of machine oil, because the oil is OURS, that you mustn't throw the hammer down anywhere. And suddenly the 'plan caught hold of me,' I began to be interested

in the amount of ore that mine ought to give, how my comrades were working." (See *Za Industrializatsia*," December 24, 1935.)

This is how the new man of Socialist labour is born. Lenin wrote, as far back as 1919:

"Communism begins where self-sacrificing solicitousness which has overcome heavy labour, makes its appearance among the rank and file workers in connection with the increasing productivity of labour, with the defence of every pood of grain, of coal, iron and other products, obtained not for him who works individually . . . but . . . for the whole of Society . . ." (Lenin).

Seized with alarm and fury at the new factor in the victory of socialism, the capitalist press wants to render the Stakhanov movement harmless in the eyes of the toilers of the capitalist countries, by frightening them at the development of technique. The newspapers are spreading about the idea of the Stakhanov movement as the "worship of technique." The bourgeois "theoreticians" who scare the workers with the idea that machinery creates unemployment transfer their own thoughts on to soil which is absolutely alien to them.

In order to catch some of the intellectuals who believe in the "mysterious nature" of the soul of the Russian people, a solid dose of a mystical and obscure fog is emitted.

The Swiss *Neue Zurichier Zeitung* is displaying particular inventiveness in this direction. Literally panting with fury and anger, this newspaper printed the following comment written by a Russian whiteguard, under the pseudonym W.J. on October 24, 1935:

"The Soviet Union is seeking support in a new mysticism, the mysticism of the 'Stakhanov movement.' These new methods of work, which according to certain specialists, while there are certain sensible innovations, nevertheless on the whole easily lead to the exhaustion of labour power and to the wearing out of the machines, and can end in burying all the achievements of industry, give rise to a state of intoxication which the Soviet Union has given itself up to at the present moment, inspired as it is by official propaganda on all sides. There is a flourishing sports fever in Russia, which is raging more than ever before. The indifference and carelessness which existed up to quite recently are giving way to a downright religious mania. The Russian people are quickly fired, and have an everlasting belief in miracles."

We shall not dwell upon the prophecies made by this home-bred prophet. It is worth remembering that the "mysticism" of the Soviet Union consists in the fact that the Stakhanov movement marks an unprecedented blossoming forth of the productivity of labour, a tremendous growth of the technical and ideological level of the working class, which enables them to overthrow all the "technically based standards," the ONLY "BASIS" for which was the former backwardness of the Russian

working class. This "mysticism" consists in the fact that on the basis of the Stakhanov movement and the socialist competition, shock work and "excellent" movement* which paved the way for it, the Second Five-Year Plan will be fulfilled in four years in a number of industries, and the Krivoirozh Basin has already fulfilled it in three years.

This "mysticism" consists in the fact that the direct result of the Stakhanov methods of work was the over-fulfilment of the 1935 plan as against the tasks set for the third year of the Second Five-Year Plan by 9.7 per cent. in the heavy industry, 11.8 per cent. in the food industry, and 16 per cent. in the railroad transport, etc.

This "mysticism" also consists of the fact that the Stakhanov workers have mastered the slogan of their great teacher and leader, Comrade Stalin, namely, that "cadres who have mastered technique decide everything." They studied stubbornly, passing their examinations with "excellent." The "excellent" industrial studies of the shock workers of Soviet enterprises and the socialist fields, led them to criticise and overthrow the "technically based standards," which up to then had seemed some sort of inviolable fundamentals of industrial life. Almost all the Stakhanov workers have passed the state technical examination with "excellent," mastered technique, and put it to the service of their working-class state, once and for all rejecting the notorious Russian backwardness inherited from the past. In the heavy industry, 797,000 workers have passed the state technical examinations, and out of their ranks they have advanced thousands and thousands of present-day Stakhanov workers.

The December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. recognised it to be essential that:

"Minimum technical instruction must be made universal and compulsory for all working men and women, and this highly important activity must be made to serve the aim of raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to that of the engineers and technicians."

Resolutions: Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., p. 7.

The network of educational courses in industry, transport and agriculture will cover 7,680,000 people in 1936 as against 5,540,000 in 1935. In industry, transport and communications, 3,040,000 people will sit for their compulsory technical minimum examination this year. Thus, conditions are being created for drawing ever more

* Movement which aimed at the achievement by all workers of the mark "excellent" for every subject, technical or otherwise, which they were studying.

workers into the ranks of the Stakhanov fighters for higher productivity of labour, for lower costs of production, and for higher quality production.

These measures are also preparing the conditions for destroying the age-long disparity between physical and mental labour. And it is difficult to imagine the "wonders" that the productive power of human labour will produce when tens of millions of workers and collective farmers are inspired with knowledge and the creative force of the brain.

Only in the U.S.S.R. do we see man being transformed from the automaton, the slave of the machine, which he is under capitalism, into the master of the machine: only in the U.S.S.R. have tremendous possibilities been created for inventiveness on the part of the worker, for a rise in the cultural and technical level of the toilers hitherto unseen anywhere. Only under socialism are forms of labour created (socialist competition, shock work, and the Stakhanov movement), which contain a high level of culture and consciousness, self-sacrificing loyalty to the working class cause, and a rise in the creative power and initiative of the workers, which are thereby the guarantee of the elimination of the contrast which exists between manual and mental labour.

"The elimination of the contrast between mental labour and manual labour," said Stalin at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, "can be achieved only by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineers and technical workers."

This unity of mental and manual labour is already so definitely outlined in the Stakhanov movement that it is immediately being noticed by those workers who have hardly ever heard of such a difficult and complicated problem as the contrast between mental and manual labour.

"I want to say about the Stakhanov workers," said Andrianov, a plasterer, from the town of Gorky, "that I like this business because IT IS NOT A QUESTION OF BRAWN, BUT BRAINS." (*Za Industrializatsia*, December 10, 1935).

Comrade Murashko, a Donetz miner, expressed the same idea in the following words: "We are making the machines work for us, and are not becoming the slaves of the machines."

These simple words indicate a new approach to technique, they indicate the abolition of the conditions under which man is the slave of the machine, and new principles in the organisation of labour.

Neither are we scared by the "wearing out of the machines," prophesied by the oracle from the *Neue Züricher Zeitung*; the U.S.S.R. is not afraid of "the machines wearing out," if they are used

rationally and carefully. In the U.S.S.R. there is no problem of "moral amortisation." The Stakhanov workers are just the people who although they do not "worship technique," nevertheless, take care of the machine and use it rationally and carefully, thus guaranteeing the machine a maximum term for its amortisation.

Our "theoretician" from the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* is afraid not only that the machines will rapidly wear away; he foretells the rapid exhaustion of the workers. He is not at all original in his sudden "care of the people." The "humanitarians" of many bourgeois newspapers are practising compositions on this theme in many keys. The "sports fever," the "record-making," the "perfected Taylor system," the "sweating system"—all these variations are played with boring monotony on the pages of a multitude of bourgeois and social-democratic newspapers. The *Neue Züricher Zeitung*, in its leading article entitled "The Russian Illusion of Records" (29.xi.35), howls out as follows:

"A paroxysm has seized the whole of Russia . . . Russia has never before experienced such intoxication, such convulsions are of an unhealthy character, and it is difficult to imagine what an awful awakening will follow the actual dream through which the majority of the Russian youth are passing to-day."

The fascist *Volkischer Beobachter* of November 25, 1935, sees in the Stakhanov movement an attempt to raise the productivity of labour in the U.S.S.R. by "an extreme intensification of the Taylor system."

"To this end," the paper writes, "a number of workers with athletic bodies are chosen, who in extremely favourable conditions produce a doubled, and trebled output; the demand has been put forward THAT ALL THE OTHER WORKERS WILL FOLLOW THEIR EXAMPLE."

The Austrian *Neue Freie Presse* of November 12, 1935, gives its readers a short note. "The principle (of Stakhanov work) is very simple. It is the same Taylor method, only the division of labour is still more perfected."

The Austrian governmental *Reichspost* of November 30, 1935, gives the following short "estimate" of Comrade Stakhanov: "He is an Ukrainian worker who, because of his extraordinary physical strength, attains a high productivity of labour."

And Otto Bauer, who spares no words to laud to the utmost the Stakhanov movement and its results, regrets that "the possibility is not excluded," that there will be a further extreme exploitation of the workers in Soviet works. "Fears" in this direction inspire him once again to put forward for the U.S.S.R. the notorious Men-

shevik slogan of making the trade unions independent from, and neutral towards, the proletarian state.

And the bourgeois newspapers most of all portend over-production and unemployment following on the growth of production, in consequence of the Stakhanov movement.

The workers of the U.S.S.R. have heard about over-production and crisis more than once already. The hardened counter-revolutionary, Trotsky, threatened them with this. The reply to these threats are the figures and facts of the growth of the economic might and the rise in the well-being of the broad masses of the Soviet Union. The gigantic programme of industry and agriculture, the improvement in the material level of the toilers in 1936, are the best proof of the fact that there can be no menace of over-production and crises in the U.S.S.R. The industrial output for 1936 will amount to 81,000 million roubles. The total volume of capital construction throughout national economy will amount to 32,365 million roubles. Agriculture in 1936 will give 6,300 million poods of grain. The socialist village will receive agricultural machinery to the value of several thousand million roubles, 60,000 new combines and tens of thousands of new tractors. The gross production of the whole of industry will increase by 23 per cent. as against the 1935 figure. According to the 1936 plan, the national income will increase by 26.5 per cent. and will amount to 83,100 million roubles. In 1936, 8,000 million roubles are assigned to construction in the field of cultural and living requirements. The social insurance budget will also increase to 8,000 million roubles. The wages fund will be 63,400 million roubles as against 56,200 million in 1935. The average wages of the workers and office employees will increase by 8.5 per cent. All these figures will be translated into life, the Stakhanov movement makes this a surety.

The "sports" version of the Stakhanov movement is the favourite analogy in the capitalist press. The Stakhanov movement is presented as a variety of record-making in the sphere of sport.

But "record-making" in the U.S.S.R., which covers millions of people and gives a general improvement in the productivity of labour in whole branches of national economy, does not, at any rate, resemble itself, i.e., does not resemble the "record-making," about which the capitalist press is howling.

This is what the workers themselves have to say about their "record-making."

"We are not records-men or sportsmen," declared Bobilev, a welder, at the Stakhanov conference. "We have tested our Marten furnace, taken the business in

hand, performed repairs, and asked the furnace how much it can turn out. It replied 11.33 per cent."

The secret of the Stakhanov "record-making" lies in this careful, businesslike study of the production process. The Stakhanov records would have remained records if, as Stakhanov himself said, "practical conclusions had not been drawn from them immediately for use on every section throughout the whole mine," for all branches of industry, throughout the whole country.

There is already not a single branch of national economy that cannot boast of its Stakhanov workers. The Stakhanov workers make no secret of their methods. They teach them to their comrades in the factory, they make them the property of all the people, telling of their working experiences at conferences, over the wireless, in the newspapers, etc.

They meet every new Stakhanov worker who beats their records with joy and pride. Zadokhin, a plasterer, passes on his method of work to other brigades,

"and I must say," said he, "they have begun to work as well as I do. This pleases me. It is good to feel that a young generation of Stakhanov plasterers is growing up at your side." (See "Lekhaya Industria," December 12, 1935).

Busygin, a smith in the Gorky automobile works, is tremendously energetic and enthusiastic about teaching his comrades to master the new methods of work, and is pleased when one or other of the Stakhanov workers produces a good output:

"I look at it this way . . . that a true Stakhanov worker is one who not only cares for his own records, but is prepared to help his comrade with every sort of advice, who is pleased not only at his own success, but at the success of the whole of his department, the whole of his works" (speech at the conference of Stakhanov workers).

Krivoson, an engine-driver (outstanding Stakhanov worker on the railroads) not only drives his engine at a high speed himself, but persuades the other engine-drivers to follow his example:

"I began to prove that driving in this way gives good results and that we can really use the locomotives to better advantage." (Speech at the Conference of Stakhanov workers).

Under capitalism, the record-holders do not talk about their secrets. But the Stakhanov workers teach them to everyone who wants to learn.

And if we take a look at the Stakhanov records in the light of the fact that they are not isolated instances, but are the highest results of the broad movement of the toiling masses in the Union for a higher productivity of labour, then these records, as compared with the standards of the foremost factories in capitalist countries will stand out before us in all their fatal significance for the capitalist system.

COMPARISON BETWEEN RECORDS BY STAKHANOV WORKERS AND WORLD STANDARDS.

Speciality or nature of article produced. Name of Stakhanov worker and place of work.	Unit of measure.	Standard of output or record output abroad.	Record output in the U.S.S.R.
Milling machine operator (for milling machines), GUDOV, Ordjonikidze Works, Moscow.	One detail	Standard — 50 an hour (Germany)	Over 200 per shift
Operator (work on blooming), OGORODNIKOV, Magnitogorsk Works.	Ingots	Standard — 200 per shift (America)	900 per shift
Work on the moulding machines, DIANOV, Rostsel-mash.	Moulds	Standard — 350 per shift in Adams works	240 per shift
Electrolysis workers, FILCHENOK AND GERASIMOV, Volkhov works.	Baths	Eight in France	10 per shift
Electric-welders, VYSOTSKY, Engineering Works in Gorlovka (Ukraine).	Joints on motor body, in metres	Latest world record —93	126 per shift
Hubs, BUSYGIN, Gorky works.	Units per hour	60 (in America)	90 per shift
Steelmaker (duplex process), LIUTOV, Yenakievk works.	Steel taken per sq. metre of hearth, in tons	7.6 average standard in Germany	21 per shift
Bootworker, SMETANIN.	Pairs of boots	At the Bata factory (Czechoslovakia), 1,125 per shift	1,860 per shift
Weavers, The VINOGRADOVAS.	Number of automatic looms minded	90-100	144 looms

As can be seen from the above table, the foremost workers in the Soviet Union not only overtake, but exceed the standards of the foremost capitalist enterprises.

Such high results have as yet only been obtained by the Stakhanov workers, although their number is already sufficiently imposing. Thus, for example, the average percentage of Stakhanov workers to the total number of workers employed at the "Stalin" works (Leningrad Region) amounted to 12 per cent. in December, 1935, and at the Vorovsky works to 16.8 per cent., etc.

In certain departments, the number of Stakhanov workers reached 30 per cent. and more of the total workers employed there. Stakhanov records exert a tremendous influence upon the masses of the workers, and have called forth a new

upsurge of socialist competition. Stakhanov days and Stakhanov weeks are being organised in many factories. Some factories are getting ready for Stakhanov months. At the Electrostal works (Moscow region), January 5th was made a Stakhanov day. On that day the works as a whole produced 577.2 tons of steel—148 per cent. of the plan. The foundry of the "Red October" works in Stalingrad attained the following results on Stakhanov day (January 4): the standard for iron castings was fulfilled by 275 per cent; for special steel, 437 per cent., etc. The Stakhanov week at the Ordjonikidze works finished brilliantly. The assembly department fulfilled the standard by 225 per cent., the second mechanical department by 204 per cent. A Stakhanov month began on January 6.

The number of workers who more than fulfil the standard of output is growing in all factories. Below we give data for only two factories:

For the Makayev works (Ukraine), the produc-

tion of which (iron smelting) for 1935 alone was equal to the total iron-smelting of Poland and Italy taken together, and for the Sverdlovsk pipe works.

MAKAYEV WORKS (Metallurgy).					
Fulfilment of Standard	125	125-50	Percentages		Average for works
			150-200	200-300	
Workers, Actual Numbers ...	5,834	3,054	840	178	127
Increase in average output in percentages	18	36	67	137	—

SVERDLOVSK PIPE WORKS.					
Fulfilment of Standard	150-200	200-250	250-300	300-400	Over 400
Average daily wage	12.50 roubles	17.50 roubles	22.40 roubles	29.80 roubles	40.30 roubles

The figures show the tremendous over-fulfilment of the norm, which is evident in socialist factories.

These figures for these as well as other enterprises also show that the fulfilment and over-fulfilment of the norm bring in their train a tremendous increase in wages.

The tremendous over-fulfilment of the standard by a number of Stakhanov workers, which exceeds 1,000 per cent., is an illustration of the fact that the standards of output which are the basis for calculating wages are already ridiculously small for the new worker. They no longer coincide with the new technique or the new organisation of labour, or the new real capacity of the equipment, discovered by the Stakhanov workers. Thus, the locomotive construction works at Lugansk can put out two thousand locomotives annually instead of one thousand, now that the Stakhanov methods of work have been introduced. Our tractor works (Kharkov and Stalingrad) instead of an output of 144 machines in two shifts, can produce 200 machines in one shift. What truly gigantic perspectives are opening up before the U.S.S.R.! The old norms do not reflect the new high technical level to which socialist industry has risen.

Thanks to the growth of the Stakhanov movement, the cost of production is systematically falling, i.e., the expenditure per unit of production is decreasing. In order that a further struggle may be waged to lower the cost of production, the output standards must be revised. They must give a reduction in prices which "is the most correct, and real way of raising the wages of the workers." (Speech of Comrade Mikoyan at the December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.)

This is why the December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. decided that

"the present technical standards, which are now antiquated must be replaced by higher technical standards . . . provided, however, that where progressive piece rates are paid, the present scales are preserved* and the total pay-roll increased in view of the growth of the Stakhanov movement."

This signifies that the standards must be made to coincide with the new, tested, industrial possibilities of the lathe, the aggregate of machinery in the works. The whole work and responsibility of rate-fixing will be laid not upon unskilled rate-fixers, as was the practice formerly, but upon the engineering and technical staffs of the works or factory under the direct supervision of the director of the enterprise. Stakhanov workers will be drawn into the work of fixing the new standards of output in the enterprises. Side by side with a certain increase in the standard of output, the decisions of the Plenary Session of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. provides for such an organisation of wages as will in the future ensure a rise in the wages and stimulate THE GROWTH OF the productivity of labour, AS IN THE CASE OF PROGRESSIVE PIECE RATES THE PRESENT SCALES ARE PRESERVED. In what capitalist country is an increase in the standard of output possible without a reduction in the existing scales, without a reduction in wages?

In this connection, it is not without interest to call to mind the prophecies of the Right Conservative *Morning Post*, with which it tried to deafen the world over a year ago (23/viii./1934). Denying

* i.e., the rate of progressive increase in payment for output beyond the basic output required is to be preserved.

the possibility of any technical development in the U.S.S.R., this paper professorially let fall the following "truths":

"The Russians are not a mechanical-minded race. Coming as they do from a long line of agrarians, they could not be expected to learn in five years the art of finishing machine parts to one ten-thousandth part of an inch."

Selecting individual cases of disorder in Soviet enterprises, mentioned in the Soviet press, the newspaper maliciously and ambiguously published information of a "sensational" kind, thus:

"Late this Spring a large American type 'combine harvester' was shipped from a Soviet factory to a collective farm in the Ukraine. There was no one at the farm who had ever seen such a machine before and all attempts to operate it were unsuccessful."

A year later, despite their "agricultural genealogy" and lack of "technical minds," the peoples of the U.S.S.R. managed to leave the standards of output not only of the English but also the Americans far behind. With an American standard of 231 hectares per combine, the combine-operators of the Soviet machine and tractor stations covered an average per combine of 267 hectares. Moreover, individuals, presumably the more "incapable representatives of the Russian people" have covered up to 1,600 hectares per combine.

However, perhaps all these hundreds and thousands of masters of socialist labour are really people who are unusually healthy and possess phenomenal physical strength?

Of course, the Soviet people are the healthiest people in the world. This cannot be denied.

On the basis of the uninterrupted increase in the material and cultural standard of the Soviet toilers, the death rate in the U.S.S.R. is steadily falling from year to year, and the birth rate is equally steadily growing.

This process began at the end of the civil war and intervention, and during the thirteen years which have passed since then, the death rate in the U.S.S.R. has fallen by 44 per cent. The increase in the population in industrial centres is three to five times higher than in the towns in capitalist countries. Tsarist Russia occupied one of the first places in the world for its high death rate. The U.S.S.R. has acceded this priority to the old world.

Nevertheless, the Stakhanov workers are people with normal bodies, improved, it is true, on Soviet lines. In order to perform their work they do not have to use up even the excess of health which they possess, thanks to the steadily improving conditions under which they live. What is more, by rationalising the labour process, by placing people in their right working places, and perfecting the technology of production, they are striving after a smaller expenditure of strength than under the

old methods of work. Comrade Smetanin, a Stakhanov worker from the Leningrad boot factory, "Skorokhod," who gives the highest productivity in the world for stitching boots, emphasises this circumstance in his speeches:

"Physical over-exertion?" he asks, and thereupon replies: "In my work the most important thing is regular rhythm, pace. If you lose the pace, and then hurry, you're lost. I have said more than once, and repeat it again here, that I turned out 1,400 pairs of boots not by over-exertion, but by carefully studying the operation." "My movements," says Zharova, a bricklayer, "are strictly calculated, confident—and despite the fact that I lay twice as many bricks now, I get less tired."

The smithy of the Gorky auto-works, which trained Comrade Busygin, is famous throughout the world for its productivity. However, there also this increased productivity is accompanied by less tiredness on the part of the workers.

"Before, the heavy slabs lay on the floor. The worker (the smith, A.R.) had to bend down and pick them up. Now a table support has been made, the slabs are laid on it, and so the worker is freed from this tiring movement."

All the talk about Taylorism in the capitalist press is refuted by millions of statements by the workers themselves.

While the Stakhanov movement reveals a particularly full picture of the peculiarities of the Soviet socialist system, Taylorism particularly clearly reveals the peculiarities of monopolist decaying capitalism. Taylorism signifies the emptiness of labour, the complete conversion of the worker into an appendage of the machine; the Taylor system, like the Bedaux system means the abolition and de-qualification of qualified (skilled) labour power, it means the most complete separation of mental labour from manual.

According to Taylor, "the ideal worker is dull and phlegmatic, and in character is more like a bullock than anything else."*

The Stakhanov movement means the growth of the scientific culture of labour; the Stakhanov movement means the mental activity, the initiative of the worker, the growth of his cultural and industrial level means the process of eliminating the distinction between mental and manual labour.

The Stakhanov movement is a new sharpening of the situation on the front of the class struggle. It is a new victory for socialism over the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the consciousness of people. The struggle and the victories of the Stakhanov productivity of labour, sharpen the class hatred of the enemies of the working class with fresh force.

The Stakhanov movement will have a tremendous influence upon the revolutionary process

* "Scientific Organisation of Labour," page 48.

going on among the working masses throughout the whole world. Is it surprising, therefore, that the pages of the fascist newspapers are full of evil calumnies against the U.S.S.R.?

We knew, and know that every victory for socialism is accompanied by an acute class struggle, and nobody can accuse us of underestimating this factor.

Fascism is deepening the contradictions of capitalism, and suffocating in these contradictions. For the three years that it has been in power, Fascism has given the proletariat and the toiling peasantry nothing but privations, terror, tortures, dungeons and prisons. All political liberties have

been taken away; even the reformist trade unions have been closed down. The intensification of labour is increasing, women are being thrown out of industry, and real wages are falling. The best working class fighters are perishing in prisons and dying under the tortures of the Hitler executioners.

The U.S.S.R. has entered the year 1936 with a tremendous rallying of the forces of the people around the party and around our great Stalin. The year 1936 is particularly characteristic in that millions of the masses of the people are really feeling the results of the victories of socialism.

The U.S.S.R. has taken the road to real ABUNDANCE, the road to new and mighty victories.

ON THE PAGES OF THE COMMUNIST PRESS

THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT AS DEALT WITH BY THE COMMUNIST PRESS

By ROTOR.

“. . . The victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. provides the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries with a mighty weapon for influencing the broad masses of the toilers. Our old methods of agitation and propaganda about the U.S.S.R. are now inadequate . . . (D. Z. Manuilsky, Report of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern).

“In one part of the earth at least, all that we have been fighting for, for half a century, is now being put into practice. This gives me indescribable joy, although I cannot and shall not see it, because I am 70 years old already. But I can pass this on to others as something worth copying.” (From a letter received from a Prague worker).

OVER four months have passed since Stakhanov, a miner working in one of the pits in the Donetz Basin (the “Central Irmino” pit), cut 102 tons of coal in one shift during the night of September 1, the normal output being six to seven tons. As the *New York Times* put it, the world dictionary has been enriched by a new word—“Stakhanov.”

The words “Stakhanov” and “Stakhanov methods” have become famous far beyond the confines of the first Socialist state in the world. The Stakhanov movement, the movement of foremost working men and women to increase the productivity of labour — has spread like lightning throughout the whole of the enormous territory of the Soviet Union. The Stakhanov movement is the expression of a new upward drive, a higher stage of socialist competition. The Stakhanov movement ensures a gigantic growth of the productivity of labour, a tremendous growth of the material well-being of the people in the only

country in the world where there are no parasitic classes and exploitation and for which crises and unemployment hold no terrors, and where planned economy reigns.

“The Stakhanov movement must not be regarded as an ordinary mass movement of working men and women. It is a movement of working men and women which will go down as one of the most glorious pages in the history of our socialist construction.” (Stalin).

“As I understand it,” writes a worker from Gablenz (Czechoslovakia), “the Stakhanov movement possesses a mighty force which accelerates the building of socialism, and which, thanks to the creation of even better living conditions, raises still higher the intellectual and moral level of every toiler.”

“When I heard over the radio,” writes a worker from Switzerland, “of the brilliant achievements of the Stakhanov workers, of their tasks and aims, I somehow felt particularly clearly that the strength and ideals of the youth in capitalist countries are senselessly wasted, or are directed along a false road through fascist phraseology . . . Dear comrades, your victories, your uninterrupted progress towards the classless society compensate us for the defeats which fascism and reaction have temporarily inflicted upon us.”

These, and many other workers’ letters published in the legal and illegal Communist press, workers’ letters which come by diverse ways to the Soviet Union, testify to the tense attention with which the working class of the whole world are following the tremendous changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union, and the victorious march forward of the Stakhanov movement.

And this is quite understandable, because the Stakhanov movement, being the result of the tense struggle of the Party, of the tremendous

revolution which has taken place in the economic life and in the minds of the people during the years of victorious socialist construction, "is preparing the conditions for the transition from Socialism to Communism" (Stalin), to the Communism which has long been the dream of the oppressed and exploited. Communism, as we know, represents a higher stage of development than Socialism. Under Communism each works according to his ability and receives according to his needs. Under Communism the contrast between physical labour and mental labour will be destroyed, and the high productivity of labour will ensure an abundance of products. And we are living witnesses of these processes which are going on in the U.S.S.R. in connection with the development of the Stakhanov movement. The Stakhanov movement indicates a further increase in the wealth of the working class of the Soviet Union, a growth of abundance and a new cultural and technical advance among them. The rise in the cultural and technical level of the workers is one of the causes of the Stakhanov movement. It is one of the conditions also which will ensure it a further advance among the whole of the people.

The Stakhanov movement very convincingly demonstrates before the whole world the superiority of the Socialist system on the question which is decisive for the victory of a new social order, namely, the question of the productivity of labour. The Stakhanov workers are masters of a high productivity of labour who have beaten world records, and are demonstrating to the whole of mankind that only under the conditions presented by the Soviet system, where there is no exploitation of man by man, is the ground assured for a rise in productivity of labour, for high wages and for a rise in the well-being of the toiling masses which are unheard of in capitalist countries.

The Stakhanov movement, which is a tremendous victory for socialism, a victory for the general line of the Leninist Party and its Stalinist Central Committee, has raised all the problems of socialism on to a new, higher level. In this movement, many of the forecasts of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, have found their confirmation in practice for the first time. The Stakhanov movement makes it possible to give a clear picture to the masses throughout the world of the advantages and the superiority of the socialist system, to raise all the problems connected with socialism before them. In our mighty struggle against capitalism, the Stakhanov movement provides us with a weapon of tremendous force and conviction, as the great Lenin once pointed out in the following words:

"To-day, we exert our main influence over the international revolution by our economic policy."

In this connection, the question arises as to how the legal and illegal press of our brother Communist Parties have been able to make use of this effective weapon, whether they have been able to reveal the Stakhanov movement as a new triumph of the proletarian revolution, whether they have successfully fulfilled the task set by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, namely:

"... of appealing to wider sections of the toiling population, by showing them, on the basis of the concrete example of the U.S.S.R. what their fate will be under socialism." (Manuilsky).

* * *

The Communist newspapers in capitalist countries have adopted a number of measures to popularise the success of the Stakhanov movement among the masses. To this end all our Party newspapers published the historic speech made by Comrade Stalin at the Conference of Stakhanov workers engaged in industry and transport; they published reports of the Stakhanov movement from their correspondents in the U.S.S.R., and printed telegrams and other brief items of information about the Stakhanov workers and the Stakhanov movement, while a number of the papers published special articles explaining the character and importance of the Stakhanov movement.

L'Humanité, the central organ of the Communist Party of France, published comments on Comrade Stalin's speech in a number of leading articles, and especially emphasised the source and causes of the Stakhanov movement in the following way in an article on November 22:

"Why have the proletarians of the Soviet Union been able to raise their moral level, their intellectual and technical culture to such heights? Stalin explains this convincingly. Because the living conditions in the Soviet Union are improving daily; because wages are increasing, because nobody is afraid of unemployment, and everybody is sure of the morrow. Further, because the workers do not labour to enrich a parasite class, but work for themselves, for their own future. And, finally, because the Soviet Union is now producing such cadres, such fine workers, who are capable of mastering the work of up-to-date technique."

The *Daily Worker*, central organ of the C.P. of Great Britain, also dealt with the historic importance of Stalin's speech at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanov workers of industry and transport:

"The victory of socialism, its superiority over capitalism, lies in the superiority of free socialist labour over capitalist slavery. . . . Socialist labour has shown itself capable of producing abundance of products, of creating prosperity, not for a limited class of exploiters, but for the whole of the people. Increased production, further mastering over the secrets of modern machine technique, will mean further progress. . . . The

Stakhanov Conference and Stalin's speech are a great turning point in world history . . . For us, in Britain, where the miners, under-nourished, under-paid, suffering from the scourge of unemployment, are entering into yet another great battle to win the right to live from their masters, the name of Stakhanov will also be a revolutionary inspiration."

The American *Daily Worker*, on November 10, printed an editorial note:

"The Soviet Union has become the fortress of the proletariat and every victory of Socialism in the Land of the Soviets is a big step forward in the direction of peace, of the defeat of fascism, of the emancipation of the workers from capitalist and imperialist slavery."

The Prague (Czecho-Slovakia) *Rote Fahne* (German edition) is giving very much space to explaining the character and tasks of the Stakhanov movement: it is publishing a number of articles from its own correspondent in the U.S.S.R. and replying to the numerous questions asked by working women in the textile industry of North Bohemia, etc.

Unfortunately, however, the editorial board of the *Rote Fahne* has not been able to deal a crushing blow at the lying campaign being carried on about the Stakhanov movement and the Soviet Union, just as it has not proved able to give exhaustive replies to the questions raised by workers about the Stakhanov movement.

Meanwhile, our class enemies have very rapidly understood the tremendous significance of this movement which is revolutionising the workers. It is no accident that it is just the German fascist press that has given the signal for a new anti-Soviet campaign. The fascist press was the first to raise a howl around the question of the Stakhanov movement. "The most hated man in the Soviet Union," "The slave-driver Stakhanov," "A 'Stakhanov' working girl beaten up," "Soviet working women defend themselves against exploitation," "Robbery of man and machines"—such are the hysterical wails arising from the front pages of the *Angriff* and the *Voelkischer Beobachter*; the fascists who are dooming the German people to starvation, write about the "exploitation" of the Russian workers through new methods of work, and try to depict the Stakhanov movement as something in the nature of "socialist exploitation," "red slavery," thereby providing a new impetus to anti-Soviet calumny!

Of course, other voices are also to be heard in the bourgeois camp. There are people there also who understand that the Stakhanov movement cannot be defamed by such "arguments." And so they "recognise" the tremendous importance of the Stakhanov movement as a "specifically Russian" movement, which, however, contains nothing socialist in it, and can only be justified by Russian conditions, by the backwardness of the country and the people who live there.

The *Czechske Slovo* writes, for example, in its issue dated December 12, 1935:

"It is a question of methods of education for whipping up the workers. . . True, these methods can be successful among the Russian people who fundamentally have continued to remain a lot of great, naïve children . . . It would not be possible to do anything of the kind with the well-read, thinking, Czech worker. It is possible in Russia. . ."

And, finally, there are a number of socialist newspapers which, although anti-soviet until quite recently, have, under the weight of facts and the influence of the growing sympathy displayed by the social-democratic workers towards the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. now been compelled to change their tone, on questions concerning the Stakhanov movement.

The *Sozial-demokraten* (Sweden) published a series of articles on the Stakhanov movement headed: "A New Type of Man, A New Type of Work."

The *Robotnizke Noviny* (Slovakia) wrote the following on November 20:

"What is going on to-day in the Soviet Union is a joyful thing . . . It is proof of the vitality of Socialism, and this is the whole point. It is proof of the fact that the moral level of the workers is rising without any compulsion . . . For the worker sees that he is increasing the speed at which he is working not to bring advantage to the capitalists, but to himself, and that the perfecting of production does not bring in its train loss of work and new enslavement for the workers, but brings an improvement in their position as a whole state. The Stakhanov workers in Russia are proving that Socialism is possible and feasible from the purely economic viewpoint as well . . ."

Besides these more or less "official" utterances of the press, "the voice of the people" can also be heard. Lively discussions have broken out everywhere in the world, among the workers in the factories. The Stakhanov movement has become a subject for daily discussion. During the dinner break, after work, at home, after radio broadcasts from Moscow, everywhere groups are to be found arguing violently for and against the Stakhanov movement.

In these circumstances, it was very important that the example of the socialist system should be used to show the superiority of the socialist system and compel all the enemies of socialism to hold their tongues. In this connection we must once more emphasise the fact that the scope of this mighty movement and its historic importance HAVE NOT BEEN FULLY UNDERSTOOD, and that our newspapers in general have not succeeded in showing the toiling masses CONCRETELY, using the example of the Stakhanov movement and the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat in their own countries, the difference between living conditions under capitalism and under socialism.

In their articles on the Stakhanov movement the majority of our Communist newspapers have not replied to the attacks made by our enemies, have not dissected all the arguments of the enemy, and in some places only adopted an attitude of defence.

How does this arise?

It arises out of the fact that in popularising the Stakhanov movement as a tremendous triumph for socialism, we have not applied offensive tactics.

It arises out of the fact that sometimes the editors of these NEWSPAPERS THEMSELVES HAVE NOT UNDERSTOOD THE TREMENDOUS IMPORTANCE AND PROFOUND REVOLUTIONARY CHARACTER OF THE MOVEMENT.

Take, for example, the Prague *Rote Fahne*, already mentioned, which has given much space in its pages to the Stakhanov movement. Instead of bringing down arguments in favour of the Stakhanov victory upon the heads of the bourgeois newspaper scribes, the *Rote Fahne* has taken up a position of defence. And it was no accident that some of the readers of the *Rote Fahne* received a wrong impression about the Stakhanov movement, and perplexing questions arose. This was expressed in the letters sent to the editor. For instance, one miner wrote:

"Workers are thinking that since the employers in all enterprises in Czechoslovakia and in all capitalist countries are, as it is, squeezing out of the workers all that they can, they will now point to the Russian udarniks, whose output leaves that of the Czechoslovakian workers far behind, and easily make it appear that the workers here, mostly miners, are idlers. Moreover, miners here cannot understand how the Stakhanov records are possible at all, since the management of the mines demand the utmost possible output from them and they can only meet the demand by straining their forces to the last drop."

And so, instead, after such a reaction to the Stakhanov movement, of emphasising the main point in the question, and explaining the difference between labour under socialism and labour under capitalism, putting forward this difference and again and again pointing out that the question is not one that can be compared with capitalist rationalisation, the *Rote Fahne* writes:

"The Stakhanov movement is indeed rationalisation . . . Yes, the capitalists do the same . . ."

What is more, the point is left out that under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the centre of gravity as regards rationalisation measures is not increasing the intensity of labour as in capitalist rationalisation. The centre of gravity as regards rationalisation in the U.S.S.R. lies in bringing order into the productive process, in establishing a division of labour on a wide scale, in squeezing out of technique the maximum that can be squeezed out of it. The Soviet worker, as distinct from the worker in capitalist countries, works seven hours per working day, with one full day's

rest after every five working days; miners work for six hours a day; all toilers have an annual holiday of from two to four weeks on full pay; tremendous sums of money are spent on labour protection, etc. The *Rote Fahne* forgets all that.

By way of illustration, the *Rote Fahne* publishes two drawings, showing how the workers labour and sweat under socialism and under capitalism, how they use the same methods of work, the only difference shown being that in one case, under capitalism, the capitalist for whom they work stands over them, and in the other—the Stakhanov worker (this is supposed to signify that here the worker works for himself), whom the whole of the fascist press has already characterised as a slave-driver, as a man who "whips on" the workers to obtain a greater output. The main question, namely, that of the different nature of labour under socialism and under capitalism (under capitalism the worker toils for the capitalist and in the U.S.S.R. he works for himself, for his own class) has been passed over here as well.

The *Rote Fahne* has not shown that the Stakhanov workers have surpassed the world records of output because they know for whom and why they are working. They know that labour is being transformed from forced labour for the exploiters, carried on in order to earn a living, as it is under capitalism, into joyful, creative work, into work for oneself, for one's own class, and consequently the work goes well, and the workers tire less.

How many convincing examples could be given from the speeches of the Stakhanov workers themselves, to show the real importance of the Stakhanov movement, which "is called upon to make a revolution in our industry." (Stalin.)

Comrade Sarkisov,* in his speech at the recent Plenary session of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., quoted extremely convincing data:

"One of our doctors in the Donbass Anthracite Trust, kept a record for two months (October and November) of the sickness among the Stakhanov workers as compared with the non-Stakhanov workers. Here are the results: The number of non-Stakhanov workers given sick-leave from work during these two months was 8.4 for every 100 workers, while among the Stakhanov workers only 1.3. The number of non-Stakhanov workers given leave of absence as a result of miner's trauma was 2.1 out of every 100, while among the Stakhanov workers only 0.4."

"Stalin: 'What's the point?'"

Sarkisov: "THE POINT IS THAT THE STAKHANOV WORKERS HAVE MASTERED THE TECHNIQUE, AND THERE ARE NO CASES OF TRAUMA OR OF ACCIDENTS AMONG THEM. THE STAKHANOV WORKER KNOWS HOW BEST TO TACKLE THE COAL FACE, HOW THE PROPPING NEEDS TO BE DONE, SO THAT THE EARTH WILL NOT FALL IN. AND SO IT IS OBVIOUS THAT HE EARNS GOOD WAGES. HE LIVES FAR BETTER, IS FAR BETTER

* Secretary of the Donetz Regional Committee of the C.P.S.U.

OFF, AND AS A RESULT SICKNESS AMONG THE STAKHANOV WORKERS IS MOST INSIGNIFICANT. And yet all kinds of counter-revolutionary elements have said that Stakhanov methods imply so much exertion of muscle and physical strength that they create a dangerous situation as far as safety measures are concerned. As you see, facts point to just the opposite. There is not the slightest doubt that THE WAY TO DO AWAY WITH SICKNESS AND TRAUMA AMONG OUR WORKERS LIES THROUGH DEVELOPING THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT IN THE MINES." (Applause).

The Communist press must devote considerably more attention to replying to the "arguments" and calumny of the enemies of the working class and of the Soviet Union, to the effect that the Stakhanov movement signifies the "socialist sweating system," the "physical annihilation of the workers," etc.

Here is what Alexi Stakhanov says of his work:

"It is not a question of physical strength. I am no more tired now, when I produce over 100 tons, than I was when I was giving only 14 tons. On the contrary, it is considerably easier and simpler to work now. I work, the man behind me does the propping, and the work proceeds smoothly." (Pravda, November 12).

The weaver, A. Vinogradova, says the following on the same point:

"Allow me, comrades, to say that in spite of the fact that I am 45, I do not feel tired after my work, because I have better food, because I am free from worry as regards my family life, and general conditions which make it possible for me to be healthy and happy." (Pravda, November 17).

And Dusia Vinogradova, the Young Communist, who has been transferred from 70 machines to 144, said the following in her speech at the conference of the Stakhanov workers:

"There is no fuss and bother in my work, but perfect calm. I am told that there are articles in the capitalist press about us being 'exhausted.' Why, after work I study, and carry on social work; I am a Pioneer leader, and am helping to bring up the new generation."* (Pravda, November 12).

Simple answers, which will convince any worker!

We must also show concretely the increase in the wages of the individual worker, the increase in the total wage-bill and the increase in the number of workers engaged, so as to smash all the fascist chatter about wage-reductions and unemployment.

The Communist press must give a particularly close ear to the questions and doubts of the workers. It must discover those questions in each individual country which are of particular interest to the workers in connection with the Stakhanov movement, and those of them which arise out of doubts and misunderstandings. And when we reply to the technical questions which interest the workers (such as to how it is possible for this or that Stakhanov worker to give such an output), we must never lose sight of the political perspective,

* The Communist Children's Organisation.

explaining how it has become possible at all to bring about such achievements in general, and how they lead to a rise in the well-being of each individual Stakhanov worker, as well as to a rise in the general well-being of all workers, how they are leading to the creation of the new Socialist being.

In their press the Communists must raise questions connected with the Stakhanov movement from the viewpoint, the conditions and situation in their own country, and draw a picture of the perspectives of socialism on the basis of the gigantic victories of the future Stakhanov movement in their own country.

In England, the miners are raising the question of a general increase in wages. All the acute problems of the coal industry are on the order of the day. During the discussion in the House of Commons, prominent Conservatives declared that machinery is to blame for the crisis in the coal industry. In such a situation, we can prove that under socialism, the Stakhanov movement in the Donetz Basin is solving the "coal problem," and also the "problem of the wages" of the miners. How the same machinery, which in the hands of the British capitalist means unemployment, "over-production," wage reductions, and "depressed areas," means, in the hands of a "non-party Bolshevik" like Stakhanov, a rise in the productivity of labour in the interests of the entire socialist economy, an increase in the well-being of all toilers.

The Stakhanov workers are advanced people educated by the Bolsheviks, and constitute a skilful combination of exclusive loyalty to the socialist cause with a profound knowledge of the technical side of production, a creative approach to their own labour. The Stakhanov movement signifies an unheard-of rise in the productivity of labour and a considerable improvement in the material conditions of the workers themselves who take part in the movement.

Almost all those present at the conference of Stakhanov workers reported how wages have increased by leaps and bounds in consequence of the transition to Stakhanov methods of work.

In America they are clearing up the remains of the bankrupt N.R.A. policy. The technocrats are continuing with all their might to prove the great happiness which the machine means for mankind, and are proposing to organise a more just "planned economy" within the framework of capitalism. In these circumstances, the Stakhanov movement provides a fine opportunity for proving that, under the capitalist order, technique will over and over again inevitably create its own contradictions and engender want and unemployment.

In France, a big discussion is taking place around the question of the future of the young generation, and about the importance of the human individual. What a fine opportunity to make the Stakhanov movement a starting point and to raise the question of the development of the creative forces of each toiler, the question of the individual under socialism, giving concrete examples of the new, socialist individual in the Soviet Union!

There is not a single question in everyday capitalist life that does not offer new material for raising the question of the Stakhanov movement in the spirit of an offensive.

The following are some such questions:

The question of restrictions under the further development of technique, of unemployment, of machines, of the destruction of new technical inventions under capitalism, on the one hand, and of the beginning of the new technical revolution, the Stakhanov movement, on the other. The question of the dialectic change in the attitude of the workers towards machines: from the machine-wreckers to the Stakhanovites, to revolutionaries in the sphere of technique.

The question of THE PAUPERISATION OF THE MIDDLE SECTIONS OF SOCIETY and the de-classing of the unemployed, on the one hand, and of the rise in the cultural and technical level of the workers, the beginning of the elimination of the gulf which exists between physical and mental labour, on the other.

The question of the rise in the WELL-BEING of the working class and masses of collective farmers in the U.S.S.R., in consequence of the growth of the productivity of labour; one of the causes which brought about the Stakhanov movement being that life has improved, that life has become better and more joyous. This is one of the decisive conditions for ever newer and newer victories by the working class on the front of socialist construction, and for the successful movement on the road to its higher phase, Communism.

The question of the development of the SMALL NATIONALITIES under socialism: the attitude of the Armenian, the Tadjik, and other workers, collec-

tive farmers, Stakhanov workers towards the capital of their socialist fatherland, Moscow, and the attitude of Moscow towards them; the attitude of the Ukrainian peasant, the Ukrainian worker in Western Ukraine towards the capital of the ruling nation — Warsaw, and the attitude of Warsaw towards them.

Point by point we can deal in this way with all the phenomena of the Stakhanov movement, all the chief points in the historic speech made by Comrade Stalin, and can find hundreds of points from which to start in order to reveal socialist reality and draw a picture of the prospects of revolution, make our starting point the peculiarities and problems of each individual country. Point by point we can deal with all the problems of capitalist countries with all their national peculiarities, and everywhere find ways of linking up these questions with the Stakhanov movement and the new problems of socialism.

The most important thing is to take up the offensive determinedly and confidently, and to popularise all the problems of socialism in a broad and new fashion. In simple language, on the basis of the Stakhanov movement, we can more determinedly, more firmly and more confidently give a fine picture to the masses of the growth and development of socialism.

Not for a single minute must we forget that the friends of the Soviet Union cover a considerably wider circle of people than Communist circles, and that their number can and must be increased considerably. In popularising the Soviet Union and the Stakhanov movement, as well as when dealing with all the other questions of our mass agitation, we must use a language and a style, we must use arguments, which will make it possible for the Communist press, on the basis of the example of the Soviet Union, to show the masses of toilers in an easily accessible and convincing form. what future awaits them under socialism.

The popularisation of the Stakhanov movement can and must become the starting point for the winning of thousands of new supporters of socialism, and for convincing them of the superiority of the socialist order.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LENIN, SELECTED WORKS: VOLS. III, IV, V, VI

(A Review*)

WITH the close of the 7th Congress of the C.I. and the clear tactical line given to the world proletariat, and its vanguard, the Communist Party, for the common struggle against fascism and war, not only must we study closely the Congress decisions and discussion, but we must turn again and again to the writings of the master tactician of the revolutionary movement, Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin).

The history of the Bolshevik Party is bound up in the life and work of Lenin. One can read the authentic party history books with tremendous interest and enthusiasm, because they form a living record of proletarian class struggle. But one must also go to the works of Lenin and Stalin to get the deeper and that more intimate acquaintance with the periods, the stages of the movement, the personalities, ideas, problems and conflicts through which the Bolsheviks had to pass on the road to ultimate victory. There is no richer store of factual material for the history of Bolshevism than in the collected works of Lenin; there is no better source of knowledge and understanding of how Bolsheviks should work in conditions of legality or illegality, (or how to combine both) for the party press and the building of the Party, in the struggle for a united front, against imperialist war; for the winning of the majority of the masses for the proletarian revolution.

We have already noticed in these columns, volumes I and II of these "Selected Works" of Lenin. Here, we wish to speak of the remaining four volumes issued, up to the moment. In Vol. III we have a rich collection of pamphlets, articles, and speeches by Lenin which gives the character, driving forces and the perspectives of the revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia. 1905, which was the prologue to the October Revolution of 1917, was a period in which the working class of Russia came to the front to play an active rôle in the gigantic political mass movements of that time. Important problems were raised, problems of organisation, principles and tactics. Whatever differences existed within the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party after the Second Party Congress in 1903—and there were big differences

—all of these were brought into the open in the turbulent period of the revolution, and had to be fought out. The contents of this book comprise not only a history of this internal struggle, but in the polemics the reader gets a historical picture of the class forces in the revolution.

This book is divided into five parts. The first part contains a brilliant pamphlet on "The Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" (minus three chapters omitted for technical reasons). The second part contains three chapters of a booklet on "The Agrarian-Peasant Question in the Revolution of 1905-1907." The third part deals with the events from January to December, 1905. The fourth part deals with the fight against the constitutional illusions, fostered by the liberal bourgeoisie and the Mensheviks who got scared by the uprisings of the proletariat and peasantry and began "luring the people with a police-monarchist constitution," and the fifth part is on "The Party in the Period of the Revolution."

Immediately after the Third Congress of the Bolsheviks and the Conference of the Mensheviks, both of which took place in the Spring of 1905, Lenin in the "Two Tactics" made a comparison between the resolutions of both gatherings, systematically tackling all the arguments of the Mensheviks on the question of tactics. Martynov, who was then a leader of Menshevism, had written a pamphlet in which he left out entirely the rôle of the peasantry in the bourgeois democratic revolution, gave the hegemony to the liberal bourgeoisie and tried to prove that the rôle of the proletariat was only to push the bourgeoisie into power, but that neither the proletariat nor the party should take part in a Provisional Revolutionary Government. Lenin attacked these ideas and brought to the forefront the questions connected with a Provisional Government as the Government of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry and also the questions connected with the armed uprising. At the same time in this period he also attacked the "left" variety of Menshevik ideas of Parvus and Trotsky who came to the conclusion that "only the proletariat can bring about the revolutionary change in Russia."

The Mensheviks were mortally afraid that the bourgeoisie would desert the revolution if the proletariat took part in the revolutionary-democratic

* V. I. Lenin, "Selected Works," Vols. III, IV, V, and VI. Published by the Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U.S.S.R., Moscow and Leningrad.

dictatorship. To this argument Lenin gave a complete answer, and said

"No one could blame the representatives of the proletariat if, having done everything in their power, their efforts are defeated by the resistance of the reaction, the treachery of the bourgeoisie and the ignorance of the masses. But everybody, and the class-conscious proletariat above all, will condemn social-democracy if it restricts the revolutionary energy of the democratic revolution and dampens revolutionary enthusiasm by the fear of winning, fear lest the bourgeoisie desert."

At the Third Congress of the Bolsheviks, well defined views as to the attitude of the Party towards the peasant movement were worked out. Nevertheless, a number of comrades particularly in Saratov, had other views and issued a leaflet explaining their ideas. In reply to this leaflet in the second part of this book on "The Agrarian Programme of Social Democracy"—a model of Leninist analysis — Lenin expounded the basic ideas of Bolshevism on the peasant question. The two years 1905-07 were years of fierce struggle by the peasants against the landlords. In the light of these experiences Lenin considered it absolutely necessary to re-examine the agrarian programme of the Party. With an enormous wealth of data on landed property, he set about this task in his own inimitable style, analysing the forms of land ownership and the central point of the struggle, which he declared to be a struggle for the abolition of the feudal latifundia. "In order to establish really free farming in Russia, it is necessary," declared Lenin, "to 'disenclose' all the lands, those of the landlords as well as the allotments. The whole system of mediaeval landownership must be broken up and all lands must be made equal for the free farmers upon a free soil" . . . The expression of this economic necessity is the nationalisation of the land. "The nationalisation of the land," declared Lenin, is not only the sole means for complete liquidation of mediaevalism in agriculture but also the best form of agrarian relationships conceivable under capitalism."

In these pages Lenin subjects the experiences of the uprisings and fierce struggles against the forces of Tzarism to a relentless and logical criticism. The article on the "Lessons of the Moscow uprising," is a brilliant exposition of the military tactical teachings of Marx and Engels. Lenin attacked with great vigour the servility of the bourgeoisie and the faint-heartedness of the Mensheviks and intellectuals who had no faith in the revolutionary energy of the working-class! "Liberty," declared Lenin, "is more necessary to the workers than anybody else. Only the workers are capable of fighting at the head of the people for complete liberty, for a democratic republic. And they will fight for it to the end."

The revolution of 1905-1907 brought sharply to

the front the antagonism between the peasants and liberal bourgeoisie over the question as to the form the bourgeois régime was to take in Russia. The proletariat naturally took an energetic part in this struggle—a struggle which was reflected in the conflict between Bolshevism and Menshevism. After the severe defeats of the revolution, the Party was faced with a grave crisis. During the uprising the party suffered numerous losses. Many of the old Party leaders, some of whom were intellectuals, had been arrested. Their places were now taken by a new type, a social-democratic worker type. After the defeats tendencies arose for liquidating the illegal party, and a belief that only in peaceful and tolerated organisations should one seek the elements for the revival. Lenin waged a fierce struggle against all such tendencies.

With the characteristic optimism of the true revolutionary leader it was precisely in moments of transition from one stage to another, when vacillations were taking place within the Party that Lenin shone most brilliantly.

Out of the strike movements and revolutionary manifestations among the youth of the democratic intelligentsia that marked the revival after 1905-6, Lenin saw new forces arising. With these new forces he saw the possibilities for solving the new tasks that stood before the revolution. He analyses the period and is speaking about the stage which the revolutionary movement had then reached. One might imagine he is speaking to us after the 7th World Congress of the C.I. in the following passage:

"The revolutionary proletariat, as it were, surrounds itself with a certain atmosphere, inaccessible to the government, of sympathy and support, both within the working-class and within other classes, too (which, of course, agree with only a small part of the demands of labour democracy). At the beginning of the movement a Social-Democrat had to do a great deal of educational work, or concentrate his efforts almost exclusively on economic agitation. But, now, these functions one after another, are passing into the hands of new forces, of wider masses who are being attracted to the movement . . . In the beginning we had to teach the workers the alphabet both in the literal and in the figurative sense. Now, the level of political literacy has risen so enormously that it is possible, and it is our duty, to concentrate all our efforts on the more direct Social-Democratic aims of giving organised leadership to the revolutionary torrent." (Vol. III, page 435).

In this "Party crisis," Trotsky tried to assume the rôle of "saviour" of the situation, by pretending to be above "factions," while in reality, under high-falutin talk of "unity" he was defending and supporting the liquidators of the Party.

Lenin exposes this rôle of "Saviour" assumed by Trotsky. We think it will not be out of place to quote here in full what Lenin has to say of Trotsky:

"In 1903 he (Trotsky) was a Menshevik; he abandoned

Menshevism in 1904, returned to the Mensheviks in 1905, and merely flaunted ultra-revolutionary phrases; in 1906 he left them again; at the end of 1906 he advocated electoral agreement with the Cadets (i.e., was virtually once more with the Mensheviks) and in the spring of 1907 at the London Conference he said that he differed from Rosa Luxemburg on individual shades of ideas rather than on political tendencies. Trotsky one day plagiarises the ideological stock-in-trade of one faction; next day he plagiarises that of another, and therefore declares himself to be standing above both factions."

Lenin cites the fact that in January, 1910, the Central Committee of the Party established close ties with Trotsky's newspaper "Pravda" and appointed a representative of the C.C. as one of the editors. Owing to Trotsky's anti-Party policy, a rupture took place. In Copenhagen, during the International Socialist Congress (1910) Plekhanov as representing the Party Mensheviks,* together with Lenin and a Polish comrade entered a protest against the way Trotsky was representing Party affairs in the German Press. Trotsky, concluded Lenin, represented a "general anti-Party trend" in the Russian Social-Democracy.

The fourth volume of these Collected Works deals with the years of reaction and of the new revival (1908-1914). In these years Lenin conducted a ruthless struggle against all those trends of thought leading to liquidation of the Party, and conciliation. During the period of counter-revolution the slogans were raised by the liberal bourgeoisie for "an open Party," for the abandonment of illegal activities. The Mensheviks tried to introduce these slogans into the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers. In actual practice the defence of the slogan "a struggle for an open Party . . . just as in Europe" made by the Mensheviks, if successful would have destroyed the party organisation.

In 1912 an All-Russian Conference of the Bolsheviks took place in Prague. This conference lasted twelve days and proceeded largely under the guidance of Lenin. This conference marked the crowning stage in the struggle against all the baggage of liquidation, of Trotskyan centrism and conciliationist elements that had been hampering the Party. It put an end to the "Party crisis" and marked the final split with opportunism, the struggle against which Lenin had already begun in 1903. It was at this conference that Stalin was co-opted on to the Central Committee, while most of Comrade Stalin's companions in arms of to-day came forward in this period.

Already in 1910 there were symptoms of a revolutionary revival throughout the entire labour movement in Russia. A series of strikes took place culminating in the great strike of the

workers in the Lena goldfields. The terrible savage butchery of 500 workers shook the whole of Russia to its foundation. The Party contacts with the masses were strengthened. On the basis of the resolution of the Prague Conference the Party participated in the strike movement and street demonstrations. It carried on a great campaign for the collection of funds for the workers' press, a campaign around social insurance elections and trade union elections. In this way, the Party combined legal with illegal forms of activity. The great mass of the workers now began to follow the lead of the Bolsheviks.

Almost on top of the Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks a conference took place in Vienna in August (1912) attended by a number of groups whose liquidatory tendencies were pronounced. The principal organiser and leader of this conference was Trotsky; it consisted entirely of various elements who were only united in their hatred of Bolshevism. This Conference abandoned the demand for a democratic republic as an immediate slogan and substituted for it the liberal slogan of a fully empowered Duma and universal suffrage. For nationalisation of the land they brought forward the liberal demand for the revision of the agrarian legislation of the Third Duma. They abandoned the demand of the armed nation for the standing army, permitted support for the liberal candidates and tried to adapt the party organisations to the "new forms and methods of the open labour movement." This anti-Bolshevik bloc of Trotsky (the August bloc as it was termed), soon broke up, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, as a result of its "putrified lack of principles." But it did not hinder Trotsky from continuing his factional struggle against Lenin and the Bolsheviks under the hypocritical camouflage of "Party unity" and "non-factionalism." Thus we see how Trotsky had already harboured in the period of reaction and in the period of revolutionary revival the elements of counter-revolution then expressed in liquidationism.

Another important conference in 1912 was the conference of the Menshevik Caucasian Regional League which passed a resolution on "Cultural National Autonomy." This started a big discussion on the National question in which the Mensheviks, the Trotsky centrists, Bundists and petty-bourgeois elements advocated Cultural-National autonomy in opposition to the Party programme which demanded the right of nations to self-determination. In this volume (IV) Lenin takes up the national question and gives a smashing criticism particularly of the views of Rosa Luxemburg, citing Marx and Engels against Rosa. Lenin gives a brilliant exposition of Marxism. "Complete

* Those who were Mensheviks but stood for preserving the illegal Party.

equality of rights for all nations; the right of nations to self-determination; the amalgamation of the workers of all nations—this," declares Lenin, "is the national programme that Marxism, the experience of the whole world, and the experience of Russia, teaches the workers." Those who want a compact exposition of Lenin's teachings on the national question must read this brilliant article.

The mass of inflammable material in world politics was growing rapidly in this period. From these pages of Lenin's writings we see how the Bolshevik Party was preparing for the revolution that was to break out in 1917. The problem as to the type of party necessary for the historic task before the proletariat was solved, and a complete break with opportunism and all centrist petty-bourgeois liberal baggage had been made. Views of the Bolshevik Party on questions of the struggle for daily demands, on trade unionism and co-operation, on war and the insurrection, on the national question—on all these questions the Bolsheviks were crystal clear. Nor did Lenin confine himself to the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. He carried the same relentless struggle against all forms of opportunism into the International movement. Only the crassest defender of opportunism and bourgeois social reformism can fail to see the preparedness of the Bolshevik Party for the mighty surge of the social revolution.

In volume V we have the famous booklets of Lenin on "Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism," on "The Collapse of the Second International," and a number of extremely important articles on the tactics of the Bolshevik Party towards the imperialist war. It is sufficient to mention the resolutions of the Bolshevik Party in the first days of the war, the articles on the criticism of bourgeois pacifism and socialist pacifism, and several articles, including a speech and theses on the right of nations to self-determination. Of special interest to the English-speaking readers is a section in which Lenin gives a characterisation of "The Irish Rebellion of 1916." There are two outstanding articles in this volume of particular interest at the moment. First, the one on "Defeat of One's Own Government in the Imperialist War." In these articles Lenin declared "a revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but desire the defeat of its own government. This is an axiom. It is disputed only by the conscious partisans or the helpless satellites of the social-chauvinists." To this Trotsky replied that to desire Russia's defeat is "an uncalled-for and unjustifiable concession to the political methodology of social patriotism which substitutes for the revolutionary struggle against the war and

the conditions that cause it, what, under present conditions, is an extremely arbitrary orientation towards the lesser evil."

Lenin analyses this "high-flown phraseology with which Trotsky always justifies opportunism," and shows how "a revolutionary struggle against the war," unless it means revolutionary ACTION against one's own government in time of war is an empty and meaningless exclamation. Revolution in wartime is civil war, and the transformation of war between governments into civil war is on the one hand facilitated by military reverses ("defeats") of governments; on the other hand, it is impossible really to strive for such a transformation without thereby facilitating defeat." To those who want a clear picture of the difference in the Leninist and Trotskyist line on imperialist war these articles are indispensable.

The other interesting articles we would direct attention to are the articles on "The United States of Europe Slogan." At a conference of the sections of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party abroad, held in Switzerland; a discussion took place on this slogan. As the discussion took a one-sided political turn it was decided to postpone the question pending a discussion on the economic side of it in the press.

Lenin subjects this slogan to a brilliant critical analysis in his own inimitable style with statistics in hand. He contrasts the slogan of a "United States of Europe," which he characterised as "the organisation of reaction to retard the more rapid development of America" with "The United States of the World" (not of Europe alone) as a state form of national federation and national freedom which we connect with socialism—until the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic state.

This slogan of a United States of the World, declares Lenin, would hardly be a correct slogan, first because it merges with socialism, second, because IT MAY BE WRONGLY INTERPRETED TO MEAN THAT THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN A SINGLE COUNTRY IS IMPOSSIBLE (emphasis ours); it may also create misconception as to the relations of such a country to others. Here Lenin goes on to develop and apply the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism, which he declares to be an absolute law, and proves that "the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country."

This article written in August, 1915, two years before the October Revolution (1917) settles the question as to the attitude of the Bolsheviks before the revolution to the problem of whether it is possible to build socialism in a single country—

a question solved in practice to-day throughout the Soviet Union thanks to the firm Bolshevik line led by Stalin against the Trotskyists and opportunist distorters of Lenin's teachings.

Volume VI, comprising over 500 pages, covers the period from the February revolution up to the fourth anniversary of the October revolution. Part one includes the famous "Letters from Afar," Letters on tactics, and theses on "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution," in which the basic problems before the proletariat are given with great clarity and concreteness. Part two deals with internal Party questions, part three with the proletariat and the Party on the road to October, including the famous speech on the war made to the first All-Russian Congress of Soviets (June, 1917). Part four contains reports, resolutions and speeches by Lenin in the hectic days between February and October revealing the enormous importance which Lenin and the Bolshevik Party attached to the peasantry and the agrarian question. The final part six deals with questions arising out of the October Revolution, Congresses of Soviet Deputies, reports and decrees on problems of peace and land; decrees on Socialisation of the National Economy, on Consumers Communes; theses, speeches and decrees on the Constituent Assembly and its dissolution.

Included in this volume is the speech by Lenin on the "Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution." For the first time in thousands of years, declares Lenin, the slogan of "a war on the slaves of all nations against the slave-owners of all nations" has been transformed from a vague

expectation into a clear political programme, into the first victory of the proletariat. But this first victory is not yet the final victory. "Our last—but most important, most difficult, and still most uncompleted task—is economic construction, the laying of an economic foundation for the new, the socialist edifice." Would that Vladimir Ilyich were alive to-day to witness the mighty triumphs in socialist industry and socialist agriculture achieved throughout the Soviet Union; to witness the utter rout of Trotskyism, now sunk to the lowest of the dregs of counter-revolution, thanks to the fulfilment of his dearest wishes by his most faithful, loyal and devoted disciple, Comrade Stalin.

These six volumes of Selected Works of Lenin comprise a veritable treasure store of priceless writings and teachings by the great continuer of the work of Marx and Engels. And not only as continuer, but in bringing to his task his own inimitable genius, as thinker, teacher and revolutionary leader and fighter, Lenin has deepened and enriched Marxism, developing the thought of Marx and Engels precisely in the period of imperialism, and the proletarian revolution, and giving to the international revolutionary proletariat a rich gift of revolutionary scientific theory and practice that for ever enshrines him in the hearts of the millions of toilers and the oppressed peoples of the world. The width, range and scope of these writings make them indispensable alike to every proletarian student, and revolutionary worker and leader.

THOS. BELL.

"BRITONS WARNED TO LEAVE"

IF YOU want to know and *understand* what is really going on in China,

IF YOU want articles on the Red Army of China written by its Leaders,

IF YOU are dissatisfied with the reports of mystified Newspaper writers,

Get "CHINA AT BAY" - 6d.

MODERN BOOKS, LTD.

THE REPORT OF THE 7TH CONGRESS COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

700 Demy 8vo pages, with Art Plate Frontispiece of
G. Dimitrov.

Preface *written exclusively* for this British Edition by
G. Dimitrov.

Detailed Contents List for Easy Reference.

Index of Subjects.

Index of Persons.

17 SECTIONS. BOUND IN FIRST-CLASS STYLE,
COMPLETE WITH DUST JACKET

3/6

ORDER NOW.

SUPPLY IS LIMITED.

WORKERS BOOKSHOP, CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.

25,000 OF COMPLETE EDITION ALREADY SOLD

G. DIMITROV

“WHAT YOU CAN DO AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR” Id.

An abridged edition of the world-famous 7th Congress Speeches.

Nothing better to hand to a sympathiser.

The pamphlet of the hour by the World's Greatest Authority.

Answers simply, short and to the point,

WHAT IS FASCISM ?

Why has it conquered in certain countries ?

WHAT SHOULD THE WORKERS DO ?

First 50,000 edition selling rapidly.

3d. DOZEN.

PLUS POSTAGE.

ORDER NOW.

Reports of the 7th Congress Communist International

1.	G. DIMITROV.	The Working Class in the Struggle against Fascism	2d.
2.	„	Reply to Discussion on above	1d.
3.	„	Concluding Address to 7th Congress ...	1d.
4.	W. PIECK.	Report of the E.C.C.I., with Reply to Discussion	3d.
5.	ERCOLI.	The Preparations for War	2d.
6.	D. MANUILSKY.	The Victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.	2d.
7.	„	Report to the Active members of Moscow organisation on 7th Congress	2d.
8.	„	Engels in the struggle for revolutionary Marxism	2d.
9.	O. KUUSINEN.	The Youth	2d.
10.	WAN MIN.	The Colonial Peoples	2d.
11.	Resolutions and Decisions		2d.
M.	CACHIN.	The Fight for the People's Front in France	1d.
M.	THOREZ.	The Successes of the Anti-Fascist United Front	2d.
A.	MARTY.	For Peace! For the Defence of the Soviet Union!	1d.

Obtainable from

WORKERS' BOOKSHOP, 38 CLERKENWELL GREEN, LONDON, E.C.1.

THE DAILY WORKER

for

essential daily information on every
phase of working class life and struggle.

BOOK REVIEWS every Wednesday
WOMEN'S PAGE every Saturday
CO-OP. NOTES every Wednesday
TRADE UNION NOTES every Monday
and
THE WORKERS' NOTE-BOOK
and
WHAT'S ON every day

7d. per week post free, from
"DAILY WORKER," NELSON PLACE, CAYTON ST., E.C.1.

TO ADVERTISERS

THE DAILY WORKER has a steadily mounting circulation and is a valuable
ADVERTISING MEDIUM. Write Advertisement Manager, Daily Worker,
Nelson Place, Cayton Street, E.C.1, for full terms and special quotations.