THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. Nos. 9-10. ONE SHILLING April, 1929

PUBLISHED BY MODERN BOOKS,
LTD., 26 BEDFORD ROW, W.C.1, AND
PRINTED BY DORRIT PRESS (T.U.)
68-70, LANT STREET, S.E.1, ENGLAND.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. Nos. 9-10. ONE SHILLING April, 1929

Contents

	Page
The Road of the Comintern. *Editorial*	258
The Comintern in the East. *Editorial*	273
On the Eve of Fresh Battles. *S. Gussiev*	293
Marx and Lenin in the Proletarian Revolution. *E. Yaroslavsky* ...	313
The C.P. of the Soviet Union and the Communist International. *Bela Kun*	325
The Comintern and the Struggle for the Masses. *A. Lozovsky* ...	333
Revolutionary Alliance of the Workers and Peasantry. *V. Kolarov*	346
War, Revolution and the Birth of the Comintern. *G. Zinoviev* ...	360
Surrender of the Second International in the Emancipation of Women. *Klara Zetkin*	371
The Comintern and the Second International on Capitalist Stabilisation. *A. J. Bennett*	383
The Road to the Communist International. *C. Kabakchiev*	388
Ten Years of the Comintern and the International Red Aid. *Felix Kon*	396
The Bankers' Conference at Paris	401
Ten Years' Fighting Experiences of the C.P. of Germany. *W. Ulbricht*	406
The Third International and the Working Class Movement in the Last Ten Years. *P. Semard*	412
The C.P. of Great Britain Under the Banner of the Comintern. *T. Bell*	419
The Communist International and the Foundation of the C.P. of China. *Yu-Ang-Li*	422
On the Road to the First Congress. *Boris Reinstein*	428
The Foundation of the Comintern and the Spartakusbund. *Hugo Eberlein*	436
The Formation of the Communist International. *J. Fineberg* ...	443
Ten Years of "The Communist International"	446
Ten Years of Comintern Publications. *M. Krepps*	448

The Road of the Comintern

"THE universal historical importance of the Third, Communist International consists in the fact that it has begun to realise the greatest of Marx's slogans, the slogan which summarised the age-long development of socialism and the workers' movement, the slogan which is expressed in the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . A new era in world history has begun. Humanity is throwing off the last form of slavery: capitalist wage slavery." So Lenin defined the importance of the Communist International, in his article "The Third International: it Place in History."

The Communist International was founded in 1919, but its story begins even earlier. At the very beginning of the world war, impressed by the bankruptcy of the Second International Lenin raised the question of the foundation of a new International. The manifesto of the C.C. of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, issued on November 1st, 1914, reads: "It is impossible to fulfil the task of socialism at the present time, it is impossible to achieve a true international concentration of the workers without a resolute break with opportunism and an explanation of the inevitability of its collapse to the masses. . . . The masses will create a new International despite all obstacles."

With a view to preparing elements for the new International during the war, Lenin began to organise the "Zimmerwald Left Group" at the conferences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal. When the February revolution broke out in April, 1917, the All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) declared in its resolution: "The task of our party, operating in a country where the revolution has begun earlier than elsewhere, is to take on itself the initiative in the creation of a Third International, making a final break with the 'defencists' and also resolutely struggling against the intermediary policy of the 'centre.' In order to realise this task, says the same resolution, one pre-requisite was indispensable: "The new Socialist International can be created only by the workers themselves by their revolutionary struggle in their own countries." This pre-requisite was assured by the triumphant October revolution. The Third International began to have existence in fact when the proletariat in Russia seized power, when the Bolshevik Party renamed itself the Communist Party, when a Communist Party was founded in Germany also, when throughout the whole world the proletarian masses showed a general trend towards the Soviets, and the first congress only gave formulation to that existence. Thus the Third International was a reaction to the bankruptcy of the Second International and was the revolutionary child of October.

* * * * *

WHAT are the objective conditions requisite to the realisation of the tasks the Third International sets itself? This question was answered in 1919 by the "Appeal for the calling of the first congress of the Third International"; "In our opinion the new International should be based on the acceptance of the following propositions. . . . (1) this is the epoch of the decomposition and break-up of the world capitalist system, which will mean the break-up of European culture in general if capitalism, with its irreconcilable antagonisms, is not destroyed. (2) The present task of the working class is the immediate seizure of State Power. . . , etc."*

Ten years have passed since the founding of the Communist International, and we have to ask ourselves whether the first proposition which lies at the basis of the new International remains true even to-day, whether the proposition that "this is the epoch of the decomposition and break-up of the world capitalist system" is also true to-day. It is from this proposition that the basic differences between the Third and the Second Internationals, between us Communists and the social democrats who have become agents of the bourgeoisie, have their starting point.

* Text taken from "The Two Internationals," by R. Palme Dutt, p. 64.

LOOKING back over the past ten years, we see that history has effected certain corrections in the initial opinion of the founders of the Comintern, namely that of the improbability of any considerably protracted independent development of the Soviet Republic on the one hand, and the tempo of development of the world proletarian revolution on the other. But we also see that the basic proposition as to the nature of the present epoch, which lay at the basis of the Third International, remains inviolable. The consolidation of the Soviet system in the U.S.S.R., and its prolonged movement forward towards socialism without the support of a victorious revolution in other countries, a thing which seemed altogether improbable, has become a fact. The tempo of development of the proletarian revolution in the more highly developed capitalist countries has proved to be slower than had been anticipated. But taken as a whole, the present epoch remains one of the crisis of capitalism and the epoch of the proletarian revolution, in full accord with the initial prognosis.

Even at the Comintern third congress Lenin noted the necessity of making certain corrections to the initial prognosis: "Even before the revolution, and after it also, we thought that immediately, or in any case very swiftly, there would be a development of revolution in the remaining countries, those where capitalism was more highly developed, or, if the contrary proved to be the case, we were bound to go under. . . . But in reality the movement did not take such a straight course as we had expected. So far the revolution has not arrived in the other large, most highly developed capitalist countries. . . . Then what are we to do now? The necessity of the moment is for a basic preparation of the revolution and for a profound study of its concrete development in the foremost capitalist countries. That is the first lesson which we must draw from the international situation. We must exploit this brief breathing space for the benefit of our Russian Republic, in order to adapt our tactics to this zig-zag in the line of history."

IN confirmation of their proposition that it is impossible to construct socialism in any one country, not by reason of the inevitability of intervention, but owing to the ostensible intrinsic impotence of the backward, agrarian-industrial Soviet Republic to make any prolonged forward movement towards socialism in conditions of the capitalist encirclement, the Trotskyists are very fond of quoting certain of Lenin's utterances relating to this period when ruin reigned in the U.S.S.R., and when he expected that a revolution was on the point of being victorious—if not to-day then to-morrow, in the leading capitalist countries. But they stubbornly ignore what he said later, in 1922 and 1923, when he became convinced that on the one hand the world revolution had slowed down, and that on the other the Soviet Republic was beginning independently to emerge from the ruin. The Trotskyists willingly quote those of Lenin's utterances made during the war communism period, in which he says that the Soviet Republic will perish if the revolution in the West does not come to its aid, utterances in which he had in mind failure definitely owing to intervention and ruin, and not owing to the absence of intrinsic forces for development. And they very unwillingly quote still later utterances in which he no longer compared, but contrasted the Soviet system with "State capitalism," in which he emphasised that in the Soviet Republic exist "all that is necessary and adequate to the construction of the socialist society." (Speech at the Fourth Comintern Congress and his articles "On Co-operation.")

So much the less are the Trotskyists disposed to take into account the enormous successes which the Soviet Republic has achieved since Lenin's death, successes which in their tempo have greatly exceeded his expectations. This shows that whilst, as though jesting at the truth, they call themselves "Bolshevik-Leninists," they are first, a typical "tail group," and secondly renegade defeatists. Lenin turned his gaze ahead, they turn their gaze backward. Lenin said that the proletarian revolution in the West would save the Russian revolution at a time when the waves of revolution in the West had risen to a great height, and when the hope of imminent victory in the capitalist countries was heartening the Russian proletariat, exhausted with hunger, ruin and the civil war. The Trotskyists

croak that the construction of socialism in the Soviet Republic is doomed to failure at a time when a direct revolutionary situation does not exist in other countries, and so they destroy all faith in the victory of the world revolution and bury the October revolution.

DESPITE the croaking of the Trotskyists, who have not ceased their croaking for one minute since the day of Lenin's death, socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. is going ahead unflaggingly, overcoming the greatest of difficulties and rising from stage to stage. After Lenin's death the Soviet Republic accomplished the restoration of economy, consolidated its currency, developed co-operation to enormous dimensions, and restored production to its pre-war level. Then it surpassed that pre-war level, entered upon the period of the reconstruction of economy and the industrialisation of the country, and beginning with the fifteenth congress, set out on the road of the collectivisation of agriculture, thus beginning to eradicate the very roots of capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

DESPITE these self-evident facts, in unison with the social-democrats, the renegades of Communism affirm that the elements of capitalism are developing more swiftly in the Soviet Republic than are the elements of socialism, that the Soviet Republic is retrogressing, that "Thermidor" is approaching and indeed has already arrived. In an article, "What would Lenin do to-day in order to save the Russian revolution?" published in "Der Kampf," Friedrich Adler says: "As the expectations of October have not been fulfilled, it is indispensable that at the very least March should be saved." In other words, as the socialist revolution in Russia is now bankrupt, it is necessary that at the least its bourgeois revolution should be saved.

The Russian and German Trotskyist renegades of Communism are saying the same thing in slightly different words. In "Die Fahne des Communismus," for February 1st, 1929, we read: "For Lenin and for every Leninist there was never any doubt that this process (of the complete realisation of socialism in the Soviet Republic) can be accomplished only in the event of revolution being victorious in at least one highly developed capitalist country. This pre-requisite has not been realised. . . . The defeat of the German revolution in 1923, the defeat of the British proletariat and the British general strike, and the defeat of the Chinese revolution have had decisive influence on development. . . . These decisive events were bound to have their influence on the development of the Russian revolution also. For whilst in Russia all the pre-requisites for construction do exist, yet Russia is closely bound up with the conditions of development of "world economy" and its political consequences. . . ." "In accordance with this," the journal continues, "the policy of the Soviet Government has declined, it has taken the path to Thermidor and Thermidor has already arrived." "It is quite evident," the journal concludes, "that the continuing decline of the Russian revolution is resulting in the transferring of the centre of the revolutionary movement away from Russia into the more highly developed capitalist countries."

Still later, on February 11th this year, the organ of the "left wing Communists," "Volkswille," published a resolution passed by the Plenum of Ruth Fischer's "Lenin-Bund," which states that since Trotsky's exile, "Thermidor has already arrived and the party accordingly welcomes the Russian Trotskyists' demand for the introduction of secret voting at the works and factories," in other words, the introduction of the methods of bourgeois parliamentarism into the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We see that between the deliberations of the German and Russian Trotskyists and those of Friedrich Adler there is no difference whatever, the more so as Friedrich Adler attempts to justify himself by reference to Lenin, who it is claimed would confirm his deductions if he were still alive.

WHAT are the facts on which these croaking crows base their arguments? On the increasing advance of the kulak in the Soviet Republic, to whom the Soviet Government is ostensibly making concessions. Is the increased activity of the kulak element in the twelfth year of the dictatorship of the proletariat anything unexpected by the Bolsheviks? Is this any argument against Lenin's strategic plan? Not in the very least.

Lenin knew and said that in the last resort the period of the proletarian dictatorship would lead to a cessation of the class struggle and the withering away of classes. But at the same time he repeated again and again that so long as there are dozens of millions of peasant husbandries in the U.S.S.R., a basis for the revival of capitalism would remain—that only the collectivisation of the countryside and the reconstruction of its husbandry on the basis of large-scale machine production would finally destroy that basis.

From this it arises that during the present stage of development of the Soviet Republic, at every economic difficulty, the capitalist elements are bound inevitably to increase their counter-revolutionary activity, and that this activity will increase all the more, the stronger the attack made on it by the Soviet Government, and the more resolutely that Government pursues the course towards socialism. And as is well known, the kulak activity of recent times is connected with this very fact.

The economic difficulties which have arisen out of the lag in the tempo of agriculture behind the tempo of development of socialist economy is being exploited by the kulaks, and that the more energetically, the more resolutely the Soviet Government pursues the course of the collectivisation of the countryside and the elimination of capitalist elements from it. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the class struggle does not cease; it did not cease after the transference from war communism to NEP; under NEP it only takes on new forms, Whilst retaining these new forms, at the turning points that class struggle does not decline but intensifies in severity. And we are passing such a turning point in the U.S.S.R. at the present time; the greater activity of the kulaks of recent times is the product not of the decline of socialism, but on the contrary of the fact that a course is being pursued for an acceleration of the tempo of industrialisation of all economy and for the collectivisation of the countryside. The greater activity of the kulaks would be a symptom of decline and retreat "from October to March" if, under the pressure of the kulak elements, the Soviet Government retreated from the decisions of the fifteenth party congress, if it retarded the tempo of industrialisation, if it renounced the collectivisation and productive co-operation of the villages. But we know that the situation is exactly the converse, that the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., basing itself on the will of the great majority of the party, has carried on and is still continuing the most energetic struggle with the right wingers and conciliators, who vacillated as the result of the economic difficulties and are seeking to drag the party backwards. Such vacillations were to be found in the C.P.S.U. at all times of sharp change, during all its history, and it will deal with them as it has always dealt with them.

* * * * *

DESPITE the enormous difficulties, the Soviet regime is successfully constructing socialism, is successfully moving on towards socialism in the capitalist surroundings. But it has to be said that this would be quite impossible, that the Soviet regime would not be in a condition to strengthen its positions, if the crisis in capitalism were to disappear from the environing capitalist world and a new period of flourishing capitalism were to arrive. The social-democrats and Communist renegades know full well that a mortal danger would then threaten the hated Soviet Republic. Consequently the second fundamental argument against the Communists consists in the crisis of capitalism in the capitalist environment being ostensibly overcome.

They note with satisfaction that the first wave of revolution which rose in Europe immediately after the war ended with the defeat of the proletariat everywhere except in Russia, and that the second revolutionary crisis, which developed in 1923 in Germany on the basis of the same post-war destruction and the Ruhr occupation, ended with the defeat of the proletariat, and that finally the revolutionary crises which have developed in the restoration period in the Far West and East, that the General Strike in Britain and the Chinese revolution have also ended in the defeat of the proletariat. As a result, they say, capitalism has not only grown stronger through the whole world, but only now is it beginning to spread throughout the globe, continuing its triumphal progress even in the colonies.

LET us consider in more detail the arguments of these apologists and lackeys of capitalism. As an example of these apologetics we shall analyse the objections which a certain A. Schiffin (N. Verner) made to the program of the Comintern, and particularly against its theses on the crisis of capitalism, in an article published in "Die Gesellschaft" for January, 1929. We briefly analyse his argument point by point.

The first thesis in the Comintern program surveys the colonial problem "through the spectacles of the post-war period." It still considers decisive "the inevitability of conflict between the great powers of financial capital, owing to the partitioning of the colonies and spheres of influence," and meantime in the same program there is realisation of the fact that the American bourgeoisie, who are masters of the chief positions in world economy, do not possess large colonial territories, and that Germany also, who has broken the record from the technical aspect, does not possess any colonies. So it is clear that the Comintern program is in the first place internally contradictory, that secondly this program has overlooked the chief alterations which have occurred in world economy since the war.

One cannot say whether stupidity or hypocrisy preponderates in this affirmation of the "contradictions" in the Comintern program. Is it really not known to the worthy social-democratic author that now more than ever before the U.S.A. is striving for imperialist expansion, that it is striving at this very moment to transform all Latin America into its monopolist sphere of influence, that on this basis the antagonism between the U.S.A. and the British Empire increases in severity from year to year? Is it not well known, even to this estimable author, that Germany is now making desperate efforts to take the broad high road of imperialism, to build up her armaments again for this purpose, and that his own party of social-democracy is zealously assisting its bourgeoisie in this task, that faithful to the "spirit of the times" it was the first to draw up a program of armaments?

SECOND thesis. The program makes no attempt to investigate the conditions of the class struggle in the political framework of the "post war period," i.e., "within the framework of democracy." The author, like all the rest of the international social-democracy, considers the specifically characteristic feature of the post-war period to be the "triumph of democracy." This impudent statements based, of course, on the fact that the Hohenzollern monarchy has been transformed into a "democratic" republic, whilst the Habsburg monarchy has disintegrated and several "democratic" republics have arisen on its ruins. The true value of such "democracies" was revealed by Friedrich Engels in his letter to Bebel on December 2nd, 1884. "In the moment of revolution pure democracy has a temporary importance for a brief while .... as a last anchor of salvation for the bourgeois and even the feudal economy.... In any event, during a crisis, and the day after that crisis, our sole antagonist is the entire reactionary mass, grouped around pure democracy. And I consider that this must not be left out of sight for one moment."

These words of Engels are truly prophetic. We have seen how before our eyes, under the flag of "pure democracy," and with the active support of the social democracy, this fusion with the bourgeoisie in a single "ractionary mass" has battered at the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. We have seen how during the succeeding stage this "democracy" has everywhere begun to take on fascist aspects. We have seen the complete triumph of fascism in Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Spain, Poland, Latvia and Yugo-Slavia and we are now witnessing preparations for a fascist coup d'etat in Czecho-Slovakia. Such is the appearance of the "political convalescence" of capitalism after the war. Whilst before the war the decline of parliamentarism had already set in, it has now become an accomplished fact.

THIRD thesis. "The defeats in Britain and China connoted something more than a tactical lack of success. It connotes the bankruptcy of the entire political prospect of the Comintern." In this regard the author's views completely coincide with those of the Trotskyists.

Against this absurd statement two arguments are sufficient. First, the victory of the general strike in Britain would have connoted the break-up of the strongest imperialism in the world, whilst the victory of the Chinese

revolution would to the same extent have meant a mortal blow to world imperialism, for it would have served as the signal for the insurrection of all the colonies. It is quite obvious that the British proletariat, in which, from the forties onward to the end of the great war reformism and labour aristocracy have ruled, could not accomplish such a great task at one stroke. It is also quite obvious that the young Chinese C.P., which only began to be formed during the Chinese revolution, could not, within the space of a couple of years or so develop to such an extent that it could settle the great Chinese problem at one stroke. On the contrary, one has to be astonished that the Chinese C.P. has succeeded within two or three years in achieving such a growth in numbers, and in transforming itself into a true mass revolutionary party.

Consequently, we must consider both the British general strike and the Chinese revolution as "dress rehearsals" for the coming victorious revolution, just as the 1905 revolution in Russia was a rehearsal for the February victory and then for the October revolution. Secondly, the defeat of the strike in Britain has not to any considerable extent assisted the British bourgeoisie to restrain the unbroken decline of British capitalism. In exactly the same way the defeat of the Chinese revolution has not led to the establishment of any of the pre-requisites to the restoration of China, not even to a reformist solution of the agrarian problem, to a real uniting of China for her emancipation from semi-colonial dependence. Meantime both the defeat of the British proletariat and that of the Chinese proletariat has prepared the ground for the "third period" of the crisis in capitalism, in which both the intrinsic and extrinsic antagonisms in the capitalist world have intensified all along the line.

FOURTH thesis. In the program "the central contraposition of the polarised classes in a completely developed capitalist society is represented as a peripheric social phenomenon, as a political phenomenon only accompanying imperialist wars and colonial emancipation movements." This is a misrepresentation of the Comintern program, it is a distortion of its sense, a distortion which by the way finds justification in the false interpretations of the decisions reached by the Comintern Sixth Congress as given by the right wing Communists and conciliators.

In the program the intensification of the intrinsic antagonisms of modern capitalism is represented as being as characteristic a feature of the present crisis of capitalism as is the intensification of the extrinsic antagonisms. The program also notes the chief source of these antagonisms, namely the antagonism between the increase in productive forces and the contracted markets. And the facts unconditionally confirm this specific feature of present-day capitalism as distinct from the pre-war, so-called "normal" capitalism. The characteristic feature of the present, as distinct from the pre-war period is the fact that in connection with the contraction of the markets, the extension of production does not keep pace with the extremely swift development in the productivity of labour evoked by the centralisation of production, technical improvements and capitalist rationalisation. As a result we are now observing a number of phenomena which so-called "normal capitalism" did not involve.

First there is an alternation in unemployment, the development of colossal chronic unemployment. In Germany with its favourable economic situation of recent years, unemployment is still twice or thrice the average unemployment in the period of 1907-13. In Britain, taking the period from 1921 to 1928, the number of unemployed has fluctuated from 8 per cent. to 23 per cent. of the total employed workers. During the period from 1900 to 1914, the unemployed numbered on the average only some 4.5 per cent. Even in the "flourishing" North American United States there are from 3 to 3.5 million unemployed at the present time. In general, in the pre-war period the unemployed in capitalist countries numbered on the average some three to four millions, whilst it now amounts to at least ten to twelve millions.

The second distinctive feature of modern capitalism by comparison with the pre-war "normal" variety is that together with the swift growth in technique and the increase in the organic composition of capital, and also the extraordinary centralisation of production, we observe not an improvement of the situation of the working class and not an extension

of the circle of labour aristocracy, but on the the cost of living, a drop in the real wages, contrary a general worsening of the situation —a colossal over-intensity of labour, a rise in and a lengthening of the working day, without mentioning the colossal increase in unemployment. As for labour aristocracy, its base is shrinking, whilst its upper group is becoming still more closely blended with the bourgeoisie.

The more or less honest bourgeois writers do not deny these facts. Thus for instance, in the publication "The significance of the rationalisation of German economy," issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Berlin, Professor Bon, dealing with German capitalist rationalisation, says:

> "Its essence lies not in the sphere of technique, but in the social and financial planes. . . . The main task of trustification consists not in a diminution of production expenditures by the improvement of technique, but in the maintenance of high or enhanced prices, despite the diminishing production expenses."

Still more interesting is the lecture of the bourgeois writer Briffs, in a collection of lectures read during 1927 in the People's University, published under the title, "Union for further preparation in economics." In his lecture Briffs demonstrates that the technical improvements are being used by the cartels in Germany in order to increase their receipts. but not in order to extend production on the basis of a lowering of prices. Consequently rationalisation leads to a diminution in the number of employed and a fall in real wages, which in its turn gives a further stimulus to rationalisation.

The masses, who after a number of defeats of the revolution have pinned their hopes to the rationalisation of industry, have now everywhere seen this reverse side of capitalist rationalisation. Consequently everywhere is to be observed an increase of enormous economic struggles, which have a tendency to be transformed into political struggles.

FIFTH thesis. The Comintern program rejects the theory of decolonisation only because it is unpleasant to the Comintern, because it depreciates the role of the proletariat as an "anti-imperialist factor," and thus destroys the Communist theory of colonial revolutions. That is an absolute lie. The Communist International does not fit the facts into its schemes and strategic plans, but on the contrary it deduces its strategic plan from the actual tendencies of social development. In correspondence with this, the Comintern does not think of denying the fact of the development of capitalism in the colonies, but it emphasises that, owing to the imperialist policy of the Great Powers, capitalism plays only a subsidiary role to the metropolis ["Mother Country"] that it establishes only a raw material base for the imperialist Powers, and by no means leads to the industrialisation of the colonies and to their decolonisation. Consequently the problem of the anti-imperialist revolutions in the colonies retains all its force.

SIXTH thesis. The Comintern puts the revolutionary emphasis only on war, because it has invented the theory of the inevitability of a new world war, consequently it has raised a prospect witnessing, in Otto Bauer's words, "to the Comintern's passivity and humility" in relation to the war danger. And in this declaration the obvious lie competes with a repellant hypocrisy. The Comintern by no means binds up the revolutionary prospect solely with war. The modern intensification of capitalism's intrinsic antagonisms, as characterised in the Comintern program, is of itself creating sufficient explosive material for a revolution without the aid of war.

The fact of the British general strike, equally with the fact of the Chinese revolution, shows eloquently enough that the direct revolutionary situation may arise without any direct connection with a new imperialist war. The position is not that the Communists speculate on war. The position is that new imperialist wars are the subject of speculation and cannot but be the subject of speculation, by the bourgeoisie, which is seeking a way out of unresolvable antagonisms, a way out of the present crisis of capitalism. If the Communists never cease to unmask this fact of the imperialists' preparations for war, they thus do not render the approach of war easier, but more difficult—they delay its approach. At the same time the Comintern prepares the ground for its transformation into revolution

when none the less it breaks out despite the will of the Communists, and thus the Comintern proves itself to be the sole force in all the world which puts up any opposition to the imminent imperialist war. On the other hand the pacifist burblings of the international social-democrats only serve to hide the truth from the masses, and the finest possible method of preparing for the war. For that matter, at the present time the international social-democrats do not restrict themselves to sending up a pacifist smoke screen for the imperialist war now being prepared, but themselves are openly participating in its preparation.

* * * * *

IN order to achieve the victory of the proletariat we need not only the existence of objectively favourable conditions, but also a sufficient maturity in the subjective factor—the Communist Parties. How have these parties developed during the past ten years? First and foremost let us deal with the numerical growth of the parties and the sphere of their distribution.

When ten years ago the first congress of the Comintern assembled, with the exception of the Russian Party, Communist parties were in reality still only propagandist organisations. In his report to the Comintern Second Congress, Lenin said: "At the first congress we were essentially only propagandists, we had only thrown to the proletariat of the entire world the basic ideas, had only flung out the call to struggle, we were only asking where were the people who are able to take this road."

At the present time sections of the Comintern are scattered over the whole world, in all corners of the globe. At the present moment the Comintern has 43 sections, of which 20 are illegal. In the legal sections, in which a registration is made of the party membership, there are, excluding the C.P.S.U.. 794,000 members; together with the C.P.S.U., the total membership of the C.P.'s constitutes 1,605,000. If to this figure be added 2,400,000 Young Communists, we have an army of four million persons. Some idea of the influence exerted by the Communist parties can be obtained by the number of votes cast at the last elections during 1927 and 1928, in various countries. Many C.P.'s did not participate in the elections; many could not participate owing to their illegal situation. For the candidates of the nineteen parties which did participate in elections in capitalist countries 6.750,000 votes were cast.

We see that the Comintern at the present time unites quite a solid army. But if the number of Communists in capitalist countries, and particularly in Europe, be compared with those of the social-democrats it would appear that the membership of the Second International in European capitalist countries considerably exceeds the membership of the Comintern. Moreover, during the present period of partial stabilisation the membership of the Comintern in capitalist countries has declined seriously by comparison with the moments of revolutionary uplift which have occurred during the last decade. It is true the social-democrats admit that their statements that Communism is "the product of the inflation period" have not been justified. The inflation period has passed long since and there is no immediate revolutionary situation anywhere at the moment, but still the Comintern and the Communist parties have maintained their existence even in countries where fascist terror rages. But the fact of the numerical superiority of the membership of the social-democratic parties by comparison with the membership of the Communist parties in capitalist countries, and the fact of the decline of the latter during the period of partial stabilisation of capitalism by comparison with 1921 or 1923, enables the international social-democrats to console themselves with the thought that the Comintern is in a state of decline.

IN order to get a sound view, one that is in accordance with the reality of the specific importance of the membership of the Comintern by comparison with the membership of the Second International, one has first and foremost to realise the profound difference in the very character of the two internationals. If we take the largest party of the Second International, the German social-democratic party, we see that from the very moment of its foundation right down to the war it grew regularly from year to year. So also after the war it continued to unite an enormous number of workers, and its numbers fell

swiftly only at a moment of revolutionary crisis. We observe a totally different picture in the case of the Russian Bolshevik party before the war, for its numerical increase was subjected to considerable fluctuations, and even in 1917, at the time of the April conference, its membership did not amount to more than 24,000. The same can be said of the German Communist Party, which grew swiftly only during a direct revolutionary situation, and then dropped in numbers and stabilised its membership at about 120,000. This difference finds a natural explanation in the fact that the Bolshevik Party before the war and all the Communist parties of capitalist countries after the war were and remain revolutionary parties, which set and still set themselves the direct task of overthrowing the existing State system. But the German social-democratic party was never a revolutionary party in the direct sense of the word. Even at its best, when it was forced to carry on underground activity, it did not set itself the aim of direct revolutionary struggle for power. After the war it became fused with the bourgeois State apparatus and began to play the role of open agent of the bourgeoisie among the working class. It is obvious that when there is no direct revolutionary situation it is very easy for such a governmental party to maintain or even increase its membership, for no sacrifices whatever are called for from those who attach themselves to it. On the contrary, membership of such a party ensures its members, especially its higher officials, many extra titbits from the laden table of the bourgeoisie.

FROM the very moment of its foundation the Comintern took clear account of this fact and did not blind itself with any illusions. In the resolution "On the role of the party in the proletarian revolution," adopted at the Second Comintern Congress in 1920, we read: "So long as the State power remains unconquered by the proletariat . . . . it will be the rule for the Communist Party to have only a minority of workers in its organised ranks. . . . Only after the final defeat of the bourgeois system becomes obvious to all, will all or almost all the workers enter the ranks of the Communist parties."

From this it by no means follows that the Communist parties do not and ought not to set themselves the task of winning the majority of the working class to their side even within the framework of the bourgeois system, that task is obligatory. On this matter, at the Third Comintern congress, Lenin, in his speech on the tactics of the Russian Communist Party, said: "The chief base of capitalism in the industrial capitalist countries is that very section of the working class organised in the Second and Two-and-a-Half International. If it had no basis in this section of the workers, on these counter-revolutionary elements in the working class, the international bourgeoisie would be quite unable to hold out. . . . The more organised the proletariat in a highly developed capitalist country, the more fundamental is the work demanded of us by history in preparing for the revolution and the more fundamentally have we got to win over the majority of the working class."

Thus the Comintern, headed by Lenin, at the third congress set itself the task of winning the majority of the working class even within the framework of capitalist society. But how the Comintern understands this winning of the working class is evident from the resolution adopted at the same third congress: "The conquest of exclusive influence over the majority of the working class, the attraction of its most active section into the direct struggle, is at the present moment the most important task of the Communist International." Thus the Comintern counted and still counts on the winning of exclusive influence over the majority of the working class, and only on the attraction of the most active section of the proletariat into the direct struggle in the bourgeois States. This, by the way, by no means excludes the necessity of the most energetic struggle for the organisational consolidation of that influence by the introduction of nuclei into the enterprises for instance. But we must beware of creating illusions for ourselves: capitalism sets certain, albeit very elastic, limits to the organisational consolidation of the Communists' influence, and the actual conquest of influence over the majority of the working class is possible only in conditions of a direct revolutionary situation, as the experience of the past decade has shown.

If we consider the results achieved by the Comintern during the past ten years from this

aspect, if we consider the membership of the Communist parties at the present time from this aspect, we come to the conclusion that the social-democrats have nothing whatever to rejoice about; as soon as a direct revolutionary situation arises, the majority of the working class will be on our side, and not theirs.

* * * * *

THE chief task consists in learning in Leninist fashion how to organise the revolution. Consequently the numerical growth of the Communist parties is not so important as their ideological growth, their revolutionary steeling, their iron welding. If we consider the Comintern and the past ten years of Communist Party history from this aspect, and if we compare that history with the history of the social-democratic parties, at the first superficial glance it may appear that the situation was and remains less "prosperous" for the Communist parties of the capitalist countries than for the social-democratic parties. In the latter internal party life flows on the whole smoothly and peacefully. Only during the first post-war revolutionary crisis did the centrists and independents split off from the Second International, forming the Two-and-a-Half International. Only during this period did any considerable section leave that International to join the Communist International. But when the first, highest revolutionary wave rolled back the Two-and-a-Half International happily returned to the bosom of the Second International, and since then life in that International flows softly and gently.

Even if there are so-called "left-wing" "opposition" tendencies in this or that party of the Second International, between these "left wing" tendencies and the right wing majority there is no stern struggle. For the roles have been previously divided between them, and both these wings pursue one and the same counter-revolutionary end—the consolidation of capitalist stabilisation, the support of the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie and the struggle against Communism. The "right wingers" and the "left wingers" accomplish this common task only by different methods, in dependence on the conditions of the moment and on this or that section of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie which is being subjected to the working up process.

THE situation is otherwise in the Communist parties. During the past decade almost every one of the Communist parties has lived through a number of more or less severe crises, and during these crises one group or another directed by this or that retrogressive leader has broken away or been expelled from them. In the German C.P. for instance, Levi and Friesland were excluded in 1921, the ultra-left group of Korsch-Katz- Scholem and the Ruth-Fischer-Maslov-Urbahns group were expelled in 1926, and in 1928 the right wingers were excluded. In 1923 the Frossard group left the French C.P., in 1924 Souvarine, in the autumn of 1924 the anarcho-syndicalist group of Monatte-Rosmer, in 1925 the right wing opportunistic group of Loriot-Pas, in 1928 the Trotskyist group of Treint and Suzanne Girault. In 1928 Van Overstraten (the founder of the party) was excluded from the C.P. of Belgium, in Holland the group of trade union workers with Sneevliet at their head, and afterwards Wynkoop and the leading trade union organisation N.A.S. left the party. Höglund left the Swedish C.P., and in 1925 the right wing opportunist Lore and in 1928 the Trotskyist group of Cannon were excluded from the Workers' (Communist) Party of America. And so the founders of the Chinese C.P., Tang-Ping Siang and Cheng-Du-Su have been excluded from the party. And more than a few opposition members have been excluded from the C.P.S.U.

IF we ask why the Communist parties pass so frequently through crises at a time when peace and benevolence reigns in the hearts of the social-democratic parties, the answer will be the same as that to the preceding question of why the numerical membership of the social-democratic parties in capitalist countries exceeds the membership of the Communist parties. The reason for this difference consists in the fact that the social-democratic parties set themselves a very easy task, that of playing the lackey to the dominant bourgeoisie, whilst the Communist parties set themselves a task of colossal difficulty, that of overthrowing the capitalist system, a task demanding extraordinary ideological strength of

resistance, extraordinary flexibility, and an extraordinary firmness of iron discipline.

The Communist parties now existing in the leading capitalist countries, which have been forged amidst difficulties, are capable of realising the great task which history has set them. The Comintern fully realised the position from its very beginning. In 1919 in the article, "The Third International and its place in history," Lenin wrote: "I have already more than once had to remark that by comparison with the leading countries it was easier for the Russians to begin the great proletarian revolution. . . . It was easier for us to begin because in the first place the political backwardness of the Tsarist monarchy, extraordinary for a European country, evoked a more than ordinary strength in the revolutionary pressure of the masses. Secondly, the backwardness of Russia had the peculiar effect of fusing the proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie with the peasant revolution against the landed proprietors. . . . Thirdly, the revolution of 1905 did an extraordinary amount in the direction of educating the masses of workers and peasants politically, both in the sense of acquainting their advance guard with the "last word" in socialism in the West, and in the sense of the revolutionary activity of the masses. Without such a "dress rehearsal" as was 1905, the revolution in 1917, both the bourgeois February and the proletarian October revolution, would have been impossible, and so on." And later, in his speech, "The anniversary of the Third, Communist International," in 1920, Lenin spoke in the same sense: "If the International had not been in the hands of traitors, who at the political moment saved the bourgeoisie, there would have been many chances that directly after the war, in many of the warring countries, and also in certain neutral countries, where the people were armed, a revolution could have been effected swiftly and then the result would have been different. It transpired that this could not be; the revolution on such a swift scale could not be, but it is necessary to traverse the whole road of development which we had to begin even before our first revolution, before 1905. Only because of the fact that more than ten years had passed before 1917 did we prove capable of directing the proletariat."

We shall now consider how the Comintern has fulfilled Lenin's will, how the Communist parties of the capitalist countries have during the past ten years traversed at an accelerated pace the course of study which the Russian Bolshevik party traversed from the very beginning of the 20th century. We shall only briefly stop to consider the chief and vital moments in the ten years' history of the Comintern.

At the first Comintern congress only the basic ideas distinguishing the International from the Second International, those concerning the bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat, were laid down.

The Comintern Second Congress assembled in 1920, when the revolutionary wave in the capitalist countries of Europe had risen very high, when the attraction of the European proletarian masses towards the soviets was extraordinarily strong, when partly under the pressure of the masses, partly for the sake of deluding those masses, the centrists were outbidding each other in expressing the desire with this or that reservation to adhere to the Comintern. At that congress, the leader of the Comintern, Lenin, declared, in the theses on the basic tasks of the Third Congress of the Comintern: "For the Communist parties the task of the moment now consists not in accelerating the revolution, but in strengthening the preparation of the proletariat."

It was for this preparation of the proletariat that the second congress worked out the constitution of the Communist parties, gave concrete formulation to the tasks of the Communist parties, filled in the content of the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and worked out an agrarian program on the national and colonial problems, so as to arm the proletariat and make it capable of playing the role of leader in the proletarian revolution. For the same purpose of preparing the proletariat for the revolution, the second congress drew up the 21 conditions of entry into the Communist party, which were to play the part of barrier against the influx of opportunistic elements into the party. At the second, as at the first congress, the chief fire was directed to the right, against the opportunist centrists, as being the chief enemy. At the same congress

a struggle was waged against the errors of the "left wing" tendencies, against the infantile diseases of leftism. But the second congress recognised these infantile diseases as less dangerous and more easily remediable than the right wing opportunist errors. In accordance with this view the second congress adopted one attitude to the centrists who then were manifesting a trend towards the Communist International, and another to the revolutionary anarcho-syndicalist elements. For whilst before the war the main line of demarcation for the Marxists had to be drawn between them and the anarchists, the main line of demarcation now had to be drawn between the Communists together with the sympathetic masses of anarchist-syndicalist elements who recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat on the one hand, and the opportunists who reject that dictatorship or recognise it only in words, on the other. The second congress was essentially the first foundation congress, for it laid down all the bases in principle of the Communist parties, and on the basis of the decisions come to by the second congress a swift process of differentiation began in the centrist parties, and the fusion of the revolutionary sections with the Communist organisations.

Mass Communist parties began to take swift shape in Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia and elsewhere. But the initial process of crystallisation of the Communist parties did not keep pace with the course of the revolutionary events, but lagged behind it. Consequently, with the active support of the social-democrats, the bourgeoisie succeeded in repulsing the first revolutionary attack of the proletariat in the West-European capitalist countries. This was owing to the fact that such mass parties, rich in revolutionary experience, has had been the Bolshevik party in Russia, were non-existent in the West-European capitalist countries at the moment of crisis, and that these parties only now had hurriedly to be organised under the fire of the first revolutionary battles. The Communists, such as the Spartacists and the Hungarian Communists, displayed great heroism in these battles, but they were still without the requisite qualities necessary for organising the revolution and for directing it in Leninist fashion.

THE third congress assembled in 1921 after a number of defeats had been inflicted on the European proletariat, defeats which had their apogee in the defeat of the March, 1921, attack in Germany. The third congress assembled at a moment when the European proletariat had to pass temporarily from attack to defence, when simultaneously, after the Kronstadt mutiny the Russian proletariat also had to execute an extensive manœuvre and to pass from war communism to NEP. In accordance with the new situation the third congress drew up the slogan, "To the Masses!" and the slogan of struggle for sectional demands with a view to winning the great masses. After the third congress, during the first two plenums of the E.C.C.I. and at the fourth congress, which met in 1922, the same basic line was followed.

With the same view to winning the masses the slogan of the "united front" was raised, and then the slogan of the "Workers' Government." These slogans of sectional demands were at that time inadequately clearly formulated, and in consequence at the E.C.C.I. third plenum and at the fifth congress it became necessary to give precision to their sense in order to avoid an opportunist interpretation. But independently of that, the Young Communist parties, which had only recently laid down lines of demarcation between themselves and centrism, found it difficult to assimilate this new tactics correctly. Only well tempered and ideologically strong Bolshevik parties could retreat and manœuvre without falling into opportunism. Consequently certain parties and tendencies in the Comintern sections in Latin countries refused to recognise the united front tactics or recognised it only partially (the Italian section) concealing their actual passivity behind "revolutionary implacability," whilst other parties and tendencies interpreted the united front tactics opportunistically in the sense of a left wing bloc (in France) or in the sense of a coalition with the social-democrats (in Germany and Czecho-Slovakia).

THIS inability to effect a Bolshevik combination of revolutionary endurance with tactical flexibility made itself felt when in 1923 a new revolutionary crisis arrived in

central Europe, in connection with the occupation of the Ruhr.

During this second revolutionary wave there were not only an objective revolutionary situation but also mass Communist parties, i.e., all the requisite conditions for a triumphant proletarian revolution were present. But the Young Communist parties which in 1921 had had to pass swiftly from attack to defence, and in 1923 had as swiftly to pass from defence to attack, proved unable to cope with the situation. Owing to its social-democratic vestiges, its un-Leninist understanding of the interrelationship between the proletariat and the peasantry at a time of revolution, the Bulgarian Communist party remained passive during the Tsankov coup d'etat and the overthrow of the "peasant union" government of Stambulinsky, owing to the fact that Stambulinsky had also persecuted the Communists. This was a terrible mistake, which the isolated September rising, headed by the Communists, could do nothing to correct.

The Brandler leadership of the German Communist party had not succeeded in dropping their old left wing social-democratism wholly and completely for Leninism, or in assimilating the Leninist methods of organisation of the revolution; and when the moment of severe revolutionary crisis arrived they sang small, took the road of organic-coalition with the "left wing" social democrats, dammed up the revolutionary movement, severed themselves from the leading divisions of the proletariat, and capitulated without a struggle. And this at a time when in the localities the leading divisions of the proletariat, led by the Communists, were heroically struggling, as at Hamburg, or were straining for the struggle, as at Berlin. In Poland, during the Cracow rising, the Communist leadership committed profoundly opportunist errors, revealing the existence of strong social-democratic survivals of their old left wing radicalism similar to that of the Brandlerites.

ALL this showed that the sincere desire to accept all the Comintern resolutions, drawn up in a strict Leninist spirit, is still far from meaning that one has become a real Leninist; and in order to achieve that it is also necessary, as Lenin said in his last speech at the Comintern fourth congress, to learn to translate the Russian revolutions into the various languages, and this can only be done on the basis of personal experience. Consequently the Comintern fifth congress, which assembled in 1924, summarised all the above indicated opportunistic errors, and put forward the "Bolshevisation" of the party as the basic slogan.

After the fifth congress it became manifest that a period of partial stabilisation of capitalism had arrived, with the realisation of the Dawes Plan, and with the beginning of the revival of German capitalism on the ground prepared by the defeats of the German proletariat.

This estimate of the new world situation was given by the Comintern at the E.C.C.I. fifth plenum in 1925. The partial stabilisation of capitalism in Central Europe had engendered ultra-left deviations in those C.P.'s which had already lived through revolutionary battles (the German, Polish, Italian and Soviet Union C.P.'s. In the C.P. of Germany these leftward deviations were expressed in the trade union and party tactics, which led to a severance from the proletarian masses, while in the C.P.S.U. they found expression in the Trotskyist opposition, which preached a tactics leading to a severance from the main peasant masses. The same partial stabilisation engendered rightward deviations in parties which had not so far experienced a direct revolutionary situation and had not yet smelt powder (France and Czecho-Slovakia). The ultra-lefts of the 1925-26 period were in marked distinction from the ultra-lefts of 1921-22. The ultra-leftism of 1921-22 was in the nature of an "infantile disease of leftism." The ultra-leftism of 1925-26 reflected the despondent mood of the petty bourgeois elements of the Communist parties (Ruth Fischer, Trotsky). In exactly the same way the rightward deviations of 1925-26 were much more injurious than the rightward deviation of 1920-21; at that earlier period part of the right wingers together with the masses stood on the road leading to Communism, whilst now the rightward deviations connoted a retreat from Communism. In accordance with this changed situation the struggle waged by the Comintern against these deviations, begun with the open letter of August, 1925 to the

German C.P. was much more ruthless, and ended in expulsion from the party.

IN 1926-27, now on the basis of the partial stabilisation of capitalism, a revolutionary crisis developed in the far West and in the East. In Britain a general strike broke out, and afterwards the great revolution flamed up in China. In both these cases the proletariat once more suffered defeat; in Britain owing to conditions objective to the Communist party, and in China mainly owing to the immaturity of the leadership of the young, only then developing Communist Party.

In Britain, despite its extremely small numerical strength, the Communist Party succeeded in placing itself ahead of the movement, in moving it forward and conducing to the transformation of the economic into a political struggle. Here the proletariat suffered defeat not owing to any fault of the Communist party, but owing to the deeply rooted opportunism in the British labour movement, and owing to the proletariat's parliamentary illusions, which allowed the General Council the possibility of betraying the working class and lead it to defeat despite the excellent militant mood of the masses.

In China the Communist Party, a very young party and one under a purely "intellectual" leadership, was not able to put into force the sound strategic line which the Comintern had mapped out at the Eighth Plenum. Despite this the rank-and-file members of the Chinese C.P. performed prodigies of heroism in innumerable struggles. At the initial period of the revolution the Chinese C.P. leadership revealed inadequate independence, and became the allies of the national revolutionary bourgeoisie, an appendage to the Kuomintang. When the agrarian revolution began to develop, despite the instructions given by the Comintern, that leadership proved unprepared for the transfer from one stage of the revolution to another, and began to dam the agrarian revolution, so facilitating the victory of the Chiang-Kai-Shek counter-revolution. After the proletariat had suffered defeat the Chinese C.P. took a leftward course, but the new leadership overleapt the mark in this new direction and plunged into "putschism."

The first revolutionary cycle in China ended with the Canton rising, which for the first time unfurled the banner of the Soviets in China and to that extent was of very great historical significance. But this was the end of the first revolutionary wave. It was not the beginning of a new—the new wave of revolution still lies ahead. In both these cases, that of the general strike in Britain and the revolution in China, just as during the revolutionary crisis of 1923 in Germany, it was revealed that the proletariat and its advance-guard, the Communist Party, could achieve victory under present historical conditions not all at once, but only after a great "dress rehearsal," as was the case with the proletariat of Russia, which succeeded in being victorious owing to the rehearsal of 1905.

AFTER the defeat of the British general strike and the Chinese revolution, the "third period" in the crisis of capitalism arrived. The intensification of internal and international antagonisms, and the leftward trend of the working class on the one hand, and the formation of a united counter-revolutionary front from the extreme conservatives to the "left wing" social-democrats inclusive on the other, all factors arising out of this third period, dictated new tactics. The Comintern gave timely formulation to these tactics in February, 1928, at the E.C.C.I. ninth plenum, in reference to the C.P.'s of France and Britain, under the slogans of "Class against class," and of a more resolute struggle against social-democracy, and the establishment of a united front only from the bottom up. Later, at the Profintern fourth congress the new course was applied to the developing economic struggles also. At this fourth congress the questions of the independent leadership by the C.P.'s of the economic struggle and of the relation of the C.P.'s to the unorganised masses were raised for the first time.

THE intensification of the antagonisms, the approach of the war danger, the maturing of enormous economic struggles in the capitalist countries and the simultaneous intensification of the class antagonisms in the U.S.S.R. have evoked vacillations to the right in all the sections of the Comintern. In its theses the sixth congress gave a general

characterisation of the present "third period" of the crisis in capitalism, and gave instructions for the struggle with the right wing danger and with the conciliators as being the chief danger in the Comintern at the present stage. At the same time the sixth congress drew up the program of the Communist International, which program was the expression of all the experience of the past revolutionary movements of the proletariat, and formulated the tasks arising out of that experience and out of the present-day historical situation.

Since the sixth congress all the sections of the Comintern have been participating in struggles and are preparing themselves for still greater struggles. The C.P.S.U. is mobilising the masses for the elimination of economic difficulties, for the elimination of the defects in the Soviet and economic machinery, for raising the productivity of labour, for raising the labour discipline in the factories and works, for raising the fertility of the land, the development of collectivisation in the villages, the struggle with the kulaks and with the capitalist elements in the towns, and the defence of the Republic against the imperialist intervention now preparing. The sections of the Comintern in capitalist countries are learning to master an independent leadership in the growing economic struggles and to transform them into political battles, breaking through the united front of trustified capital, State machinery and social-democracy, overcoming the sabotage of the right wing and conciliatory elements in their own ranks. In these countries, the Comintern sections are also mobilising the masses against intervention in the U.S.S.R. All the Comintern sections are reorganising their ranks, carrying on a struggle with the right wingers and conciliators, with the backward, vacillating, retreating (or on the point of retreating) elements, all along the line.

* * * * *

THUS the Communist International has traversed and is still traversing the road laid down for it by the genius of their leader Lenin. We now stand before a new cycle of wars and revolutions. The imperialist bourgeoisie is seeking a way out of the present crisis of capitalism by the method of new imperialist wars, and first and foremost by a war against the Soviet Republic: the centre of the world revolution.

We cannot say when this cloud will burst, but we know that when the world bourgeoisie decides to play this, its last card, it will have on its side all the international social-democracy, as it had them on its side in 1914. But they will be incomparably more abject, incomparably more slavishly devoted to their bourgeois master. But against it will be the Soviet Republic, which is not retrogressing as all the chorus of social-democrats and Communist renegades would assure us, but grows stronger with every year, overcoming all difficulties. Against it will be the vast and ever vaster masses of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, which have already outlived or are in process of outliving their bourgeois democratic illusions, which have already accumulated a rich experience in revolutionary battles, which are ranged and will remain ranged around the banner of Communism. Against it will be the millions and millions of peasants in the colonies and semi-colonies, a considerable proportion of which has already had revolutionary experience, and the enormous majority of which desires to obtain its emancipation from the imperialistic yoke. And finally, against it will be not the Second International, opportunistically degenerate, as in 1914, but the Third International, which stands firmly by the teaching of Marx and Lenin, the teaching of the Paris Commune and of October. Consequently we can await the future with confidence. "Let come what may, the triumphal holiday will be for us to keep," as the great Russian Socialist, Chernyshevsky, said.

The Comintern in the East

"THE socialist revolution will be not only and mainly a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in every country against their own bourgeoisie; no, it will be a struggle of all the colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism against international imperialism." This indication of the role, the importance and the specific weight of the colonial struggle in the world proletarian revolution, given by Lenin in his speech at the All-Russian Congress of Communist Organisations of Eastern Peoples, was made on the basis not only of a scientific prediction, but of the experience of the first large-scale open struggles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in a number of important areas. The Russian Communist Party programme adopted in the spring of 1919, in presaging the approach of the world social revolution, indicated that the civil war of the toilers against the imperialists and exploiters in all the foremost countries was beginning to join forces with the national war against international imperialism. As we know, comrade Lenin demanded that the programme should lay down "with absolute exactitude that which existed." Thus, even at the foundation of the Comintern, it was possible to speak with absolute exactitude of the beginning of a unification of two streams: the revolutionary pressure of the workers within each country, on the one hand, and the revolutionary pressure of the peoples oppressed by imperialism on the other.

To-day, summarising the results of ten years of the Comintern's struggle, on the basis of experience one can write not only of the various forms of the unification of these streams, but also of the character of the combined blows which alone can avail to effect a real break in the imperialist front and an overthrow of imperialism by a combination of the proletarian struggle with the colonial revolution.

THE first five years of the Comintern's struggle could, to a certain extent, be characterised mainly as a period of open militant attacks of the proletariat in the European capitalist countries. The distinctive feature of the second five years is the rise of the wave of revolutionary insurrections and battles of the colonial peoples, battles which, although different in degree of organisation, consciousness and scale, and by the role and importance of the proletarian leadership, are nonetheless bound up one with another as parts of the world proletarian revolution.

Whilst the first five years were mainly a dress rehearsal for the last decisive battle in the capitalist countries, the second five years were a rehearsal, a preparatory advance-guard battle, which was carried on throughout the world, in various longitudes and latitudes.

Summarising the results of the colonial revolution, it is necessary first and foremost to say that nowhere has the revolution of the oppressed masses yet fulfilled its task, nowhere has a temporarily achieved victory been successful in stabilising its position and maintaining itself against the counter-attack of world capital. Moreover, in a number of countries the colonial revolution has already, in its development and transference to a higher stage of the class struggle, come up against the open treachery of the bourgeois wing of the national emancipation movement; treachery which has been manifested by the union of the native bourgeois forces with imperialism against the proletariat and the peasantry. Further, the struggle has been held up at the initial stage, before the class differentiation in the national camp had become completely clear to the masses. Everywhere, and in certain cases after big victories, the revolutionary movement of the masses has been drowned in blood, has been decapitated by the mass extermination of the finest militants of the proletariat and the pauperised peasantry. None the less, the colonial revolution is still alive. Not only is it alive in the sense that nowhere has bourgeois nationalism in alliance with imperialism been successful in resolving the most elementary of the tasks of the colonial revolution, not only in

the sense that the policy of imperialism in all countries is acquiring an increasingly aggressive and predatory nature, excluding all possibility of any "liberalism" whatever in its maintenance of colonial monopoly, not only in the sense that new sections of humanity are beginning to be drawn into the revolutionary struggle (within the last few months the black slaves of tropical Africa, who hitherto have stood outside the world movement), not only in the sense that the general crisis of capitalist economy compels the imperialistic rivals into a frantic chase to extend the territory of their colonial robbery. These are not the only reasons why the colonial parts of the world revolution are increasing in numbers and in strength. The surety that the oppressed will reach their victory with the minimum possible sacrifice, in the minimum possible historical period, is the fact that, being part of the world revolution, the colonial revolution has already learnt, in Marx's words, to be "ever self-critical; they . . . are pitilessly scornful of the half-measures, the weaknesses, the futility of their preliminary essays. . . . Again and again they shrink back, appalled before the vague immensity of their own aims. But, at long last, a situation is reached whence retreat is impossible." (*Eighteenth Brumaire,* 1926 ed.) The colonial revolution has become a fact, and so it is capable of learning by its past errors, of drawing lessons from its defeats, of accumulating experience, in consciousness and action, in the theory and practice of its advance-guard.

IN the colonial countries with the largest sections of industrial and railway proletariat, the Communists have succeeded in developing their organisations, despite the appalling terror, despite the mobilisation of all the forces of imperialism with the object of breaking down all connection, all relations between the fighters of the colonies and the international proletariat, despite all the highly rationalised methods of provocation and espionage, bribery and deception, with the aid of which the imperialist bourgeoisie seeks to poison the national revolutionary movement. Even where Communists have been burnt as torches on the streets, where thousands are rotting alive in exile for being suspected of sympathy for Bolshevism, where the hunt after every class-conscious worker is pursued with all the resources of "bourgeois civilisation"—even there the proletariat has succeeded in preserving the Communist Parties and groups in one form or another, in larger or smaller numbers; has succeeded in developing the idea of Soviets and the Soviet revolution as a motive and as an organising force. The Canton rising and the slogans bloodily impressed on its standards constitute an advance-post on the front of the colonial struggle, and possibly for many countries a far-flung advance-post. But no matter where the colonial revolution may break out, no matter what the stage through which it passes, the Chinese experience is vital for it. No matter how heavy the blows suffered by us, no matter how great our losses, no matter how feeble has been the work of the C.P.'s of the imperialist countries in the task of active participation in the colonial struggle, no matter how rare the indispensable Marxist literature which has so far reached the toiling masses of the colonies and semi-colonies, still one can definitely say that the idea, the slogans and the principles of the Soviet revolution have now been translated into the language of all the oppressed peoples, are already beginning to enter into their practical struggle.

The co-ordination of the two streams of the world revolution—the proletarian and the colonial—has to a greater or less extent already been achieved in the ideological, class, political sphere. More than that it is impossible to say at present; organisationally the connection is far from adequate to deprive imperialism of the technical possibility of inflicting blows on separate, dissevered divisions of the socialist revolution. The absence of an adequate organisational connection between the colonial insurrections and the international proletariat cannot but intensify the scattered nature of the attacks of the toilers in isolated colonies and semi-colonies. The differences in time, in kind and in place of these attacks make it easier for imperialism to throw itself with united forces on that section of the colonial revolution most dangerous to it at any given moment.

THE most serious attacks on British imperialism during the last five years—the General Strike and the miners' lock-out and the Chinese revolution—were disintegrated from the organisational aspect. Whilst handling the General Strike, bribing its staff, with the aid of the reformists accomplishing the complicated manœuvre of breaking up the workers' organisations during the miners' lock-out, British imperialism could work without a glance to the East. At that particular moment no direct danger threatened its rear from China or India. And immediately after, imperialist Britain could take the road of military intervention in China, having had its hands completely free to achieve the break-up of its workers and the complete paralysis of the trade unions. Thus the British strike was not supported by a movement in the colonies; on the other hand, the Chinese revolution did not receive any real proletarian support from the British workers, without which its victory was impossible. The rising in Indonesia broke out before it had obtained the possibility of co-ordinating its action with the revolution in China, and the anæmic Dutch imperialism could risk a war with the millions of masses, knowing that, in the event of its failure, it was ensured the support of world imperialism, which at that time was not tied up in the military partitioning of China. As we know, in Indonesia itself the rising in Java was suppressed before the risings in the other islands had broken out, and these latter were in their turn shattered by the Dutch troops who had been set free by the bloody execution in Java. The same can be said of the war campaign of the Riffs in Northern Africa in 1925 against the French and Spanish imperialisms, which campaign waxed and waned without any correspondence with the Druse rising in Syria, which in its turn developed isolated from the flows and ebbs of the workers' movement in France. In South and Central America a number of risings, elemental strikes and mass anti-imperialist movements, which had as their source a protest against the aggressiveness of North American imperialism, and were to a greater or less degree a reflection of the Mexican revolution, remained within the bounds of isolated countries, and could not unite in a general movement against the dictatorship of Washington. Even the heroic guerilla war in Nicaragua did not become the centre of such a unification. Finally, the two revolutionary colonial streams which possibly are destined to play a decisive role in the coming five years, the Chinese and the Indian revolutions, despite the unquestionable growth of mutual activity between them, prove to be separated at the highest points of their development: the curve of the revolutionary wave in India, which is now rising to a level which, in the sense of the activity of the working masses, is so far unprecedented, coincides with an interval between two waves in the Chinese revolution.

THE dissipation, the isolation of the movements in separate colonies, is the result of the fact that imperialism has still retained its ability to manœuvre in the East, partly in consequence of the inequality of the degree of economic development of the Eastern countries, partly in consequence of the absence of open conflicts in the imperialist camp, and partly because imperialism still has at its disposal its influential agents among the workers (reformism) and in the colonial (bourgeois nationalism) movements. From this aspect the basic strategic task in the organisational sphere is work for the co-ordination of attacks in at least the most important colonies and semi-colonies, whilst ensuring a genuinely revolutionary support from the proletariat of capitalist countries during the period of the development of its activity. But it is necessary also to take into account the other side of this phenomenon. The very variety of the forms of colonial revolution, its wide dimensions, embracing the most heterogeneous countries in their economic depelopment and character of oppression, the very periodicity of the wave flowing across all the continents, with all the variation in time and in the level of the highest flood-points, all witness to the profundity of the forces which are being developed in the colonies against the entire imperialist system. The inequality of the development of imperialism, conditioning inevitably the inequality of development of the colonial movement, has none the less as its basic tendency the strengthening, dissemina-

tion and intensification of the imperialist oppression, and consequently the extensification and intensification of the struggle of the oppressed masses against their enslavers.

"The misfortune of the Irish," Lenin wrote in 1916 (*Results of the Discussion on Self-Determination*), "consists in the fact that they rose at the wrong time, when the European insurrection of the proletariat had not yet matured. Capitalism is not constructed so harmoniously that different sources of insurrections should overflow at once of themselves without failures and defeats. On the contrary, it is the fact of their variation in time, in nature and in place that guarantees the extent and the depth of the general movement; only in the experience of revolutionary movements which are untimely, sectional, disintegrated and therefore unsuccessful, the masses will acquire experience, learn to assemble their forces and discover their true leaders, the socialist proletariat, and thus prepare the general attack, just as separate strikes, local and national demonstrations, outbreaks in the army, explosions among the peasantry and so on prepared the general attack in 1905."

WHAT was correct in 1916 when applied to Ireland, can now be applied to all the national revolutionary movements, with the one essential proviso that the very scale of the struggle has grown extraordinarily, has taken on world dimensions, and that in accordance with this the very character and content of that struggle have changed. We have had untimely, sectional, scattered, and consequently unsuccessful, revolutionary movements, but on a scale embracing tens and hundreds of millions of toilers. The experience acquired as the result of these failures has consequently become the experience of the overwhelming majority of oppressed humanity. Forces are still far from everywhere, and in any case far from adequately assembled, the advance-guard of the national movement has far from sufficiently developed and organised. But still it can be said with confidence that everywhere the revolutionary wave has passed, the oppressed masses have seen their true leaders, the Communist proletarians, have realised the necessity of their leadership, and the new rise of the revolutionary wave will have its beginning and development under the leadership of the proletariat.

But if the colonial revolution has nowhere yet succeeded in solving its tasks, the past ten years are characterised only by a first wave of that revolution, the 1905 "rehearsal" in the colonies, merely opening the road to their October, then in what sense can one speak of the successes of the Communist movement and Communist tactics in the colonial East?

IN a speech devoted to the first anniversary of the Comintern, made at the triumphal session of the Moscow Soviet on March 6th, 1920, comrade Lenin raised very definitely the question of the inter-relationships between the direct and complete victory of the socialist revolution and the successes of the Comintern, as an organisation preparing and organising that victory. Lenin said: "During the first period of the revolution, many hoped that the socialist revolution would begin in Europe at the moment directly connected with the close of the imperialist war, for at that moment, when the masses were armed, the revolution could have been achieved with the greatest success even in certain countries of the West. . . . . It transpired that this was not so; revolution on such a swift scale did not occur." In the same speech, in summarising the year's activity of the Comintern, Lenin said: "During this past year the Communist International has achieved successes which one could never have hoped for, and one can say boldly that no one expected such enormous successes when it was founded." How is this seeming contradiction—the enormous success of the Comintern, on the one hand, and the impossibility of achieving a solution of the tasks of the revolution on such a swift scale as many had hoped, on the other—to be explained? By the fact that the obstacles on the road to the victorious development of the revolution proved to be much more serious than had been expected; in particular in western Europe, the treachery of the socialist leaders proved to be stronger and they had greater influence than was to have been expected. In "An Infantile Disorder," Lenin pointed out that after "the proletarian revolution in Russia and the victories of that revolu-

tion on an international scale, victories unexpected to the bourgeoisie and the philistines, the whole world has become different, the bourgeoisie everywhere have become different also. Still earlier, in the following words, he characterised the entire system of difficulties revealed in the process of the socialist revolution and demanding the extension of the front of struggle and the drawing in of fresh reserves in order to overcome them:

"It is quite clear that the socialist revolution, which is moving on the whole world, can in no way consist only in the victory of the proletariat in each country over its own bourgeoisie. That would be possible if the revolution proceeded easily and swiftly. We know that the imperialists do not allow that, that all countries are armed to the teeth against their own internal Bolshevism, and all countries are thinking only of how to defeat Bolshevism at home. Consequently, civil war is arising in every country, and the old socialist compromisers are drawn into that war on the side of the bourgeoisie. Thus the socialist revolution will not be only and mainly a struggle of the revolutionary proletariat in each country against its own bourgeoisie; no, it will be a struggle of all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism against international imperialism." (Speech at the All-Russian Congress of the Communist organisations of Eastern peoples.)

BUT just because the revolution has need of drawing in ever fresh reserves, of the finest organisations of the advance-guard, of bringing up more and more of the vast masses to the fighting lines in order to achieve the victory, the Comintern's success in its propagandist organisational work is not necessarily to be accompanied immediately by a direct resolution of the ultimate tasks of the socialist revolution. Consequently, when talking of the speed with which the influence of the Comintern was extended during the first years, passing as it did "from victory to victory," Lenin did not consider that this estimate was refuted by the fact which he himself recognised, namely that "the revolution (in Western Europe) had taken a slower road: It had taken our road, but at a much slower pace."

THE same has to be said in no less even if in no greater degree of the second five years of the Comintern, one of the characteristic features of which period is the entry of the colonial reserves. There is no justification whatever for hiding or depreciating those political, tactical and organisational errors, weaknesses and gaps which have been displayed with great severity, especially in the colonies, or for refusing to admit that the revolution has here had to decide the most difficult tasks and to carry out the most complex of manœuvres in a new, little studied, peculiar situation. In its decisions, the Sixth Congress of the Comintern gave an estimate of these errors, an analysis of their sources, and, on the basis of this experience, formulated lessons for the coming struggle. But there is just as little justification for not seeing the objective difficulties which have arisen on the road of revolution in the colonies.

"The whole world has now changed; the bourgeoisie have changed also; that situation has been revealed in the colonies still more strongly than even in the capitalist countries. Just because the colonial revolution has become a part, and an extraordinarily essential part, of the socialist revolution, imperialism is coming to regard any national emancipation movement of the masses, even in the most elemental of forms, as a direct threat to its existence. The Chinese revolution has appeared as a particularly menacing portent to imperialism. During the days of the victory of the Shanghai workers, it became clear as dayight to all, whether friends or foes, that the Chinese revolution had found the knot of the entire imperialist system. A decisive victory at this point would mean a mortal blow to that system. There ensued a mobilisation of all the forms of armament of world imperialism, not only of the fleet, not only of diplomacy, but of social-reformism, in order to win success at Shanghai, to maintain the "prestige," i.e., the "right" of colonial spoliation throughout the East. Only now is it evident what diplomatic efforts, what complaisance in relation to one another the imperialists displayed in the Shanghai and Wuhan days, in order to achieve unity of action to shatter the Chinese revolution. Now it may be as clear as daylight to the broad masses of the European and Ameri-

can proletariat that the reformists of all countries, and of Britain first and foremost, have reproduced the treachery of 1914 by giving their practical support to imperialism at that moment. The Indian revolution will have against it a united world imperialism, albeit in a different form from that applying in regard to China, because Britain's colonial monopoly arouses frantic jealousy on the part of American capital. The colonial revolution will only be able to exploit the conflicts in the imperialist camp to any real purpose after it has captured and consolidated important positions. This situation can only change in the direction of an essential alleviation of the tasks of the colonial revolutionary after the development of an open war conflict in the imperialist camp, i.e., after the beginning of a new world war.

"The treachery of the social-democratic leaders proved to be greater than one could have anticipated." Translated into the language of the class relationships in the colonies, this situation applies with all the more force, the more definitely the question of the intensification of the revolution is raised by the course of development. From this aspect, not only the very fact of the Canton commune, but all the road which led to it defined the treachery, and the ruthlessness of that treachery, on the part of bourgeois nationalism. Not only the imperialist, but the native bourgeoisie have changed. Naturally, not in all the colonies, because of the different degree of development of class relationships, has the treachery of bourgeois nationalism been determined with equal clarity. But there can be no doubt that no matter what the situation in which the colonial revolution develops in different countries, the approaching possibility of its intensification will project before it like a shadow the open transference of bourgeois nationalism to the camp of counter-revolution. Every movement forward, whilst drawing into itself and organising wider and wider masses of the toilers, will simultaneously extend the front of the class enemies of the revolution. Hence the inevitability of continually fresh, continually more resolute organisational efforts in order that the colonial revolutions should pass from their 1905 to their October.

The second five years have given flesh and blood to the slogan issued by the Comintern for the peoples of the East: "Proletarians of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" The task of the coming five years is to achieve real victories under this slogan.

2.

CONCERNING this slogan Lenin wrote: "Of course, from the aspect of the Communist Manifesto this is inaccurate, but the Communist Manifesto was written under quite different conditions. From the aspect of the present day politics it is accurate. Relations have intensified in severity. All Germany is in ferment, all Asia is in ferment." (Lenin's speech on "Concessions," 27th November, 1920.)

In order to estimate the role and importance of the colonial struggle in the socialist revolution at the present time, it has to be remembered how this question arose at various stages of historical development, beginning from the time when the Communist Manifesto was written, down to our days. We can indicate merely the main points of that development, corresponding to the alterations in the objective situation, and only in the broadest outline.

In 1858 Marx wrote to Engels:

"In reality the task of bourgeois society consists in establishing a world market at least in broad outline, and in establishing a production resting on that basis. And as the world is a globe, it seems to me that with the colonisation of California and Australia, and with the open door in China and Japan, that job is done. The difficult question for us is: on the Continent the revolution is inevitable and will immediately take a socialist character. In this little corner will it not inevitably be shattered, owing to the fact that over an incommensurably wider territory the movement of bourgeois society is still along a rising line." Marx-Engels correspondence.—Translated from Russian.)

WHEN Marx raised this question there could still be no talk of the national emancipation movement in the colonies forming a part of the world socialist revolution. Hence the fear that the movement in the colonies, which was developing on the basis

of a rising line of capitalism, might hinder the development of the socialist revolution in Europe. It is true that before this, in 1853, Marx had written of India that: "In any case in the more or less distant future is to be expected with certainty a rebirth of this great and interesting country," at the same time pointing out that this rebirth was impossible "as long as in Great Britain itself the present ruling classes are not displaced by the industrial proletariat or the Indians themselves become sufficiently strong to shake off the British yoke once for all." ("India under British Rule," vide "Labour Monthly," December, 1925.) But, in the first place, this formula has a most general algebraic quality ("In the more or less distant future"), secondly, in talking of the two possibilities of a rebirth of India, either through a socialist revolution in Britain or through a national emancipation of the bourgeois society in India, Marx does not yet set the problem, which he formulated five years later, of the inter-relationships between the socialist revolution and the bourgeois democratic revolution in the colonies.

The problem formulated in 1858 in the article quoted above, was for Marx at that period bound up (as also was the assumption that not a national movement in Ireland, but a workers' movement in Britain itself would liberate Ireland) with the expectation of a speedy arrival of the socialist reovlution in Europe. ("If," says Lenin, "capitalism in Europe had been overthrown as swiftly as Marx at first expected, there would have been no place for a bourgeois-democratic general national movement in Ireland.")

AS for Ireland, as the national movement arose and developed, Marx not only counselled the British workers to support it, but in 1870 provided a definite and complete formulation of the importance of the separation of Ireland to the acceleration of the socialist revolution in Britain. As we know, the "Jura Federation," which was under Bakunin's influence, accused the General Council of the I.W.M.A. of demanding an amnesty for the Irish revolutionaries, and so occupying themselves with "local political issues not entering into their competence." In giving an official answer to this reproach in a document of the General Council, Marx wrote:

"The attitude of the I.W.M.A. on the Irish question is very clear. Its first task is to accelerate the social revolution in Britain. To this end it is necessary to strike a decisive blow in Ireland." ("Letters to Kugelmann" —the resolution of the General Council for 1st January, 1870.)

In one of the letters written in this year Marx speaks of the importance of the Irish question to the international workers' movement in a still more categorical form:

"After many years of study of the Irish question, I have come to the conclusion that a decisive blow to the ruling classes of Britain can be inflicted not in Britain, but only in Ireland (and it would have a decisive importance for the workers' movement throughout the world." (Marx-Engels correspondence.)

THIS complete formula given by Marx agrees with the above quoted estimate of the role and importance of the colonial revolution given by Lenin. The difference, but one which practically is very essential, is that Marx at that time had no justification for extending that formula to the national revolutionary movement in the colonies, whilst Lenin could state that "the East . . . . has finally been drawn into the mill-wheel of the revolutionary movement."*

But as soon as the first signs of a possible rise of the movement appeared in India, Marx gave not only a clear picture of the British spoliation of the last type, a picture which retains all its aptness even for the present time, but also speaks more definitely of the forces which were ripening for insurrection against the colonial oppression. In a letter of 1881, he wrote:

* This distinction may not be obvious at first glance owing to the fact that Marx and Engels call Ireland a colony ("Ireland may be regarded as the first British colony, one which by its proximity to the metropolis is still administered in the old way" (Engels' letter to Marx, 23rd May, 1856). But it is necessary to realise that Engels distinguishes between a true colony, i.e., land occupied by European population, and "only subjected lands, occupied by natives." In modern terminology the first developed into dominions, the second are colonies.

"In India serious difficulties are being prepared for the British Government, if not general risings. The amount which the British take annually from the Indians—in the form of rent, railway dividends from railways useless to the Indians themselves, pensions to military and civil officials, costs of the Afghan and other wars, etc., the amount which they take without any equivalent and quite independently of what the Indians must send annually to Britain quite without recompense—exceeds the entire total sum of the receipts of the sixty million land and industrial workers of India! This is a bloody, a clamant affair. Famine years follow one after another there and reach dimensions unprecedented in Europe. A real conspiracy is being formed among the population against the British, and in it the Hindus and Moslems are participating jointly. The British Government knows that a "ferment" of some kind is going on in the masses, but these superficial people (I refer to the governmental officials) do not want to see clearly in front of them, do not want to realise the full dimensions of the danger threatening them! To delude others, so as finally to delude themselves—there you have all parliamentary wisdom in a few words! So much the better!" (Marx-Engels Correspondence. Letter to Danielson, 19th February, 1881.)

MARX did not survive to the period when the chief colonial markets were opened by force and captured by imperialism. That period, when capitalist production has almost exhausted all the possibilities of resolving the internal antagonism of its development by emergence on to the external, free market (the nineties), could be observed by Engels. Nor did Engels live to see imperialism (one of the symptoms of which, as we know, was the territorial partitioning of all the colonies among the largest imperialist Powers). But he could realise that British and Japanese trade was inflicting mortal blows on China's national isolation, and was drawing it into the world capitalist turnover. The presence of inter-action between the processes in the colonies and the destruction of the very bases of the capitalist system could be established by him with complete scientific certainty. In letters written from 1892 to 1894, Engels returns several times to the question of what importance to the development of the socialist revolution has the fact of the conquest of China by capitalism? Thus in a letter to Danielson in 1892 Engels points out the "heroic resources of commercial policy" which are applied by capitalist countries, *i.e.*, the violent opening up of new markets for themselves, and says:

"The latest market thus opened to British trade, and one capable of evoking a temporary revival of prosperity, is China. This is why British capital is so insistent on the construction of Chinese railroads. But Chinese railroads connote the destruction of all the bases of petty Chinese agriculture and home industry, whilst in this case this evil will not be compensated for even to a small extent by the development of their own large-scale industry. And so hundreds of millions of people will be reduced to a complete impossibility of existence. The result will be such a mass emigration as the world has never seen before, and one which will flood America, Europe and Asia with the hated Chinese. This new competition in the labour sphere will begin to compete with American, Australian and European labour on the basis of the Chinese conception of a satisfactory standard of existence; and, as we know, the Chinese standard of existence is the lowest of all the standards existing in the world. And so, if the entire system of production in Europe does not succeed in changing before this moment arrives, it will have to take steps to make the necessary adjustment then." (*Ibid.*)

CONCERNING the influence which the disintegration of the old economic and social system in China will have on the development of the revolution in capitalist countries, Engels writes in 1894:

"Millions will be left idle, and will be compelled to emigrate; they will make their road to Europe, which they will overflow in masses. This mass competition, both in your country and in this, will swiftly drive the situation on to a *dénouement*. Thus the conquest of China by capitalism will at the same time give an impetus to the crash of capitalism in Europe and America." (*Ibid.*)

As we have seen, in the eighties Marx had as yet no basis for talking of the existence of inter-activity between the processes in the colonies and the general crisis of capitalism.

But in the above cited letters Engels in the nineties can characterise the economic and social crisis in the colonies as a factor in the general crisis of the whole capitalist system. In such a situation, the colonial problem is an element which intensifies the intrinsic antagonisms of capitalism and accelerates its destruction. But at the same time Engels does not refer as yet to the oppressed masses of China as independent participants in the world revolution, as an active ally of the socialist proletariat. Further, the influence of the economic crisis in the colonies, and particularly in China, on the revolution in Europe and America, is here presented in the form of mass emigration, which by flooding the capitalist countries will there set up impossible conditions of labour and undermine the whole system of capitalist production. The strength of the influence of the mass Chinese emigration was, as we know, to a considerable extent mitigated by the barriers raised to it by the capitalist countries, as the result of which the inter-action between the process of conquering China for capitalism and the crash of capitalism in Europe and America took other forms.

FROM the aspect of the mass inter-relationships which still existed in Engels' days between the national emancipation movement in the colonies and the maturing proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries, it was impossible not to take into account also the possibility that after the victory of the socialist revolution in the capitalist countries certain colonies, in which the emancipation movement would be headed by elements afraid of the colonies being drawn into the road of socialist development, would declare war against the socialist state. As we know, Engels raised this question very clearly in a letter to Kautsky written in 1892. Lenin, when quoting this letter in 1916, wrote :

"Engels by no means assumes that the economic revolution would of itself and directly solve all the difficulties. The economic revolution will stimulate all the peoples to trend towards socialism, but at the same time it is possible that there will be revolutions against the socialist State and wars. The adaptation of policy to economy will occur inevitably, but not at once and not smoothly, not simply, not directly. Engels only postulates one factor as "unquestionable," and that is an unconditionally internationalist principle which he applies to all "foreign peoples," *i.e.*, not only to the colonial peoples ; to compel them to be happy would mean to undermine the victory of socialism." (Lenin : "Results of the Discussion on Self-Determination.")

Engels' letter can serve now as an indication of the distance the colonial revolution has travelled during the last two decades.

At the present time, the attack of such emancipated colonies as India against the victorious proletariat in the metropolis is very improbable. At the present time, the overthrow of the imperialists in the colonies, as also the victory of the socialist revolution in the capitalist countries, given the fusion of both the streams of revolutionary struggles, pre-supposes such an international solidarity of the toilers as cannot but have a still greater effect at the moment of and after the victory of the proletariat. On the other hand, the interweaving of the native reactionary forces with imperialism, the rapprochement between them and bourgeois nationalism, has gone so far, and it will go still farther in the most important colonies and semi-colonies, that the defeat of imperialism will simultaneously connote the defeat of the feudal reaction and the treacherous bourgeois nationalism. And finally, the role of the industrial, transport and agricultural workers and the peasant poor in the national revolutionary movement will grow as the fighting ability of the proletariat in the capitalist countries grows stronger, and this will make more and more probable the hegemony of the proletariat in the national revolution at the moment of the crash of the imperialist machine of enslavement.

THE epoch of wars and proletarian revolutions changes the character of the national emancipation movement. This assumption was given definite formulation in the following words of Lenin :

"Whilst before the epoch of world revolution the movement for national emancipation

constituted part of the general democratic movement, now, however, after the victory of the Soviet revolution in Russia and the beginning of the period of world revolution, the movement for national emancipation constitutes part of the world proletarian revolution."

But even during the epoch of imperialism the character of the colonial movement as part of the world proletarian revolution is not defined in a moment. During the course of this epoch one can also distinguish two main periods in the development of the colonial movement; the first period is that of the awakening of the East; the second is the "direct participation of the peoples of the East in the determination of the destinies of the whole world."

The first period, defined by the beginning of the development of monopoly capitalism, received a mighty impulse from the 1905 revolution. Before the imperialist war, or rather during the pre-war period, Lenin had already counterposed "advanced Asia" to "backward Europe."

"World capitalism and the Russian movement of 1905 has completed the awakening of Asia. Hundreds of millions sunk and demoralised in mediæval stagnation have awakened to a new life and to the struggle for the elemental rights of humanity, for democracy. . . . The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power among the leading proletariat of Europe herald the new period of world history which is opening at the beginning of the twentieth century." ("The Awakening of Asia." 1913.)

IT is as yet impossible to say what will be the results of the settlement of capitalist production in the colonies during this period. On the other hand, for the proletariat of Europe the struggle for power has not as yet developed to such an extent as to be able to guide the national revolutionary stream into its proper channel and carry it along with itself, directing it along a socialist duct. Both the character and the motive forces of the colonial revolution during this first period were defined by this. It is a question of struggle for the "elementary rights of humanity, for democracy." The bearers of this democratic movement are the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the bourgeoisie. In contraposition to the imperialist bourgeoisie of the West, "already three-quarters rotten," Lenin speaks of the bourgeoisie of the East as "there still going with the people against reaction." (Ibid.) The main question linked up with this class character of the motive forces of the revolution consists in how much will be permanently won by this method of conquest.

"The Chinese freedom is won by the alliance of the peasant democracy and the Liberal bourgeoisie: whether the peasants, undirected by a party of the proletariat, will be able to hold on to their democratic positions against the liberals who are only awaiting a convenient moment in order to turn to the right—only the distant future will show." ("Renewed China," 1912.)

STANDING by the cradle of the national emancipation movement in the colonies under imperialism, Lenin diagnoses the chief danger, which revealed itself completely only at later stages of development, in one form in Kemalist Turkey, with a comparatively weak development of the proletariat, and in the other form in Chiang-Kai-Shek China, where a mass proletarian movement has already developed and the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat have matured. But at that time it was still impossible to speak of the proletariat as the motive force of the revolution. If one were to be realistic in one's opinions, one could and had to speak of the "peasantry undirected by a party of the proletariat."

But even such a correlationship of class forces in the camp of the national emancipation movement as Lenin noted on the eve of the imperialist war could not be observed by Engels, when writing in 1882 on the rising of Arabi Pasha in Egypt against the British domination:

"It seems to me that on the Egyptian question you take the so-called national party too much under your protection. We do not know very much about Arabia. But there are ten who say that he is an ordinary pasha who does not want to allow the financiers the right of extracting taxes because he wishes to pocket them himself in Eastern fashion, for every one who holds a favourable opinion of him. It is once more the everlasting story of a peasant country. . . . The refusal to pay the

Khedive's debts is a clever move. But the question arises, what next? And we western European socialists must not allow ourselves to be bridled quite so easily as all the Egyptian fellaheen and all the Latin peoples. . . . In my view, we can very well come out in favour of the oppressed fellaheen, without sharing their momentary illusions (for a people composed of peasantry is customarily subjected to trickery for many centuries, until at last experience teaches them a little sense), and against the cruelties of the British, without at the same time allying ourselves with their temporary war antagonists," (Marx-Engels' Archives, vol. 1. Engels' letter to Bernstein, August 9th, 1882.)

It would be the worst of errors to draw from these words the conclusion that Engels at all under-estimated the obligation of the proletariat in regard to the national movements. Again and again Lenin pointed out that "the policy of Marx and Engels towards the Irish question gave a great model, one which retains an enormous practical importance down to the present time, of what attitude the proletariat of the oppressing nations should adopt towards national movements." ("The right of nations to self-determination," April, 1914.) But this model attitude became possible only just because Marx and Engels took a sternly critical attitude to the national question, correctly estimating its historic importance. The Comintern adopted this attitude completely and unconditionally in its decisions and in its practice. "For the proletariat and the Communist International during the epoch of imperialism it is especially important to recognise the definite economic facts, and in the resolution of all colonial and national problems to start not from abstract assumptions but from the phenomena arising in definite reality." (Lenin: "Speech at the Comintern Second Congress," 1920.)

THE above quotation from Engels' letter is suggestive just because at its basis lies a characterisation of the definite reality, because from this aspect it gives an estimate of the stage at which the national movement in Egypt had arrived. At that time, the revolutionary democratic forces which could have exploited such a "clever move" as the refusal to pay the Khedive's debts were still non-existent. Experience had not yet taught the fellaheen "sense." Thus the movement could not get away from the influence of native feudalism. In such a correlationship of the class forces in the country, the movement headed by the national party could not become a starting point for the emancipation of the country from British domination.

Thus we have before us various forms of development of the colonial movement.

One is described by Engels in dealing with Egypt in the eighties, when the peasantry still submitted to the yoke of the pasha, who was striving to replace the oppression of imperialism by his own no less reactionary oppression.

The second is described by Lenin in reference to the awakening East, after the 1905 revolution and before the imperialist war: the peasant democracy is one of the bearers of the democratic movement. But the influence of the socialist proletariat is still absolutely non-existent, and could not exist.

The situation changes during the period of the imperialist war. The crisis associated with the war is revealed in the colonies. The tiny fires of nationalist insurrections break out in the colonies and in Egypt. The results of imperialism drawing the colonies into capitalist production are beginning to reveal themselves. In the theses relating to 1916, one of the clauses of which ("The socialist revolution and the right of the nations to self-determination") characterises the connection between the national and the colonial movement of the given epoch, Lenin wrote:

"The socialists must support the most revolutionary elements of the bourgeois-democratic, national emancipation movements in these countries ("semi-colonial countries, such as China, Persia, Turkey and all the colonies") in the most determined fashion, and aid their rising against the imperialist powers oppressing them."

After the October revolution and the beginning of the period of world revolution in the most highly developed countries, the prerequisites are set up for a mass Communist movement. In accordance with this, the Second Congress of the Comintern could give a complete characterisation of the motive forces of the colonial revolution.

IN his speech at the Second Congress of the Comintern Lenin, commenting on the purport of the theses on the national and colonial problems, put forward and emphasised the following main ideas:

"First, what is the most important, the main idea of our theses? The difference between the oppressed and the oppressing peoples. We underline this difference in contradistinction to the Second International and bourgeois democracy. This idea of the difference, the division of the peoples into oppressing and oppressed, pervades all the theses. The second governing idea of our theses consists in our view that in the present world situation, after the imperialist war, the mutual relationships of the peoples, the whole world system of States is determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet States, at the head of which is Soviet Russia. . . . Third, I should like particularly to underline the question of the bourgeois democratic movement in the backward countries. This question indeed evoked certain differences of opinion. . . . There is not the least doubt that any nationalist movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement. . . . It would be Utopian to think that the proletarian parties, even if they can penetrate generally into such countries, can carry out Communist tactics and Communist policy in these backward countries, without having definite relations with the peasant movement, without supporting it in practice." But as "very frequently, and perhaps in the majority of cases, although the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries support the national movement, at the same time they struggle against all the revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes," we "have considered the only sound attitude almost everywhere to substitute for the expression 'bourgeois-democratic' the expression 'nationalist-revolutionary.' The purport of this change is that we as Communists must and will support the bourgeois emancipation movements only when those movements are genuinely revolutionary, when their representatives will not hinder us from educating and organising the peasantry and the vast masses of the exploited in the revolutionary spirit." Further, "the unconditional duty of the Communist Parties, and of those elements which are attached to them, is to carry on propaganda for the idea of peasant Soviets, Soviets of toilers everywhere and anywhere, both in the backward countries and in the colonies, and there they must strive, as far as conditions permit, to set up soviets of the toiling people." Finally, "the Communist International must establish and give theoretical basis to the assumption that, with the aid of the proletariat of the leading countries, the backward countries can pass to the Soviet system and, through definite degrees of development, to Communism, avoiding the capitalist stage of development." (Lenin, speech at the Second Congress of the Communist International.)

THE imperialist war dragged the dependent peoples into world history. It accelerated more and more the process of transferring capitalist production to the colonies. It snatched whole regiments of colonial divisions out of the scrap-heap and taught the "coloured" soldiers how to use firearms. "After the period of the awakening of the East, the period of the direct participation of the Eastern peoples in the resolution of the destinies of the whole world enters the present-day revolution." The East came finally to the revolutionary movement just because of that first imperialist war, and were finally drawn into the general world revolutionary movement. Imperialism is not in a condition either to annihilate or to diminish the importance of the fact that capitalist production is being transferred to the colonies. It is not in a condition to turn back the wheel of the historical cycle of events. The colonial monopoly may (and this is the case in growing degree) distort and caricature the industrial development of the colonies, damming the development of their productive forces, contracting those spheres of production which by their development might weaken the economic dependence of the colonies on the metropolises, and not allowing the colonies to industrialise in the real sense of the word. But it cannot turn them off the road of capitalist production. By combining the perfection of American and European rationalisation with the barbarian peculation of vital labour power, it can thrust out of production the already developing ranks of industrial and railway proletariat, but it cannot restore the old pre-capitalist, social and economic relationships, under which the exhausted land could feed at least on famine

rations such densely populated countries as India and China. Still less is it capable of mitigating to any extent whatever its own economic or political policy of violence and oppression. The experience of the counter-revolution in China and India, Indonesia, Morocco, Syria and so on, shows that nowhere has imperialism ever fulfilled, nor could it fulfil one of the promises given by it during the bloody suppression of the insurrections. The government of Chiang Kai Shek, set up by imperialism against the workers' and peasants' revolution, begins its "land reforms" with a million peasants condemned this year to hunger and hungry death; all the proposals of the "royal agrarian commission" in India, with its propagandist promises to revive the agriculture of the country, so far amount to a new famine disaster in the Indian countryside. The social-reformism which is penetrating into the colonies under cover of the terror, now taking on the form of yellow trade unions (in China), then the form of Mondism (in India) is the companion of and a factor in capitalist rationalisation, which connotes the combination of the rapacious colonial exhaustion of labour power with the most perfect methods of American-European exploitation.

THE more the general crisis of capitalism increases in severity, the more ruthless becomes the struggle for markets and for sources of raw materials and spheres for the investment of capital, the nearer the competition between the capitalists approaches to an open war conflict, so the more does every imperialist pillager become interested in the maintenance of its own colonial power, which puts into its uncontrolled disposition enormous material human resources. On the other hand, the farther capitalist development has proceeded in the one or the other colony, so the more dangerous does any demonstration of liberalism become for imperialism, for it cannot but intensify th antagonisms btween the demands for the increase of productive power and the colonial oppression which provides the covering.

"Britain," wrote Marx in 1869, "has never governed Ireland in any other fashion, nor can it govern it so long as the present alliance continues, otherwise than by resort to the most shameful of terror and the most contemptible of corruption." (Letter to Kugelmann.) This indication of the nature of colonial monopoly has reference to the period of industrial capitalism, during a rising curve in its development. During the epoch of imperialism, when all the world is divided up among a handful of large robbers, the terror of the colonial expropriators becomes more and more contemptible, its bribery more and more shameful. After a brief mitigation of the colonial pressure, evoked by a weakening in the position of imperialism in the colonies during the war, it is being renewed with fresh, monstrous force. "After this peaceful epoch we have witnessed a monstrous increase of oppression, we see a return to colonial and war oppression still worse than before." (Lenin: Report at Second Congress of the Comintern.)

Finally, after a number of colonial revolutions and bloody risings, the blows of which have been directed at the very heart of the capitalist system, after the imperialist expropriators have become convinced of the fact that they are not strong enough to call a halt to the revolutionary movement in the colonies, violence and provocation are becoming the sole form of administration of the colonies.

THE Sixth Congress of the Comintern, taking into account this historically definite and primarily economic situation, called on Communists, both in the imperialist countries and in the colonies, to unmask the lie that imperialism wishes or is able to carry out a policy of decolonisation or to move towards "the free development of the colonies" in any form whatever. In the colonies, where the growing antagonisms of imperialism are revealed particularly clearly, where the bourgeois civilisation went naked during the days of the flourishing of capitalism, in the colonies, Lenin's words, spoken concerning the period of the decline of the old world, have special application: "The bourgeoisie can at present torture, mutilate and murder freely. But it cannot stop the inevitable and, from the world historical aspect, by no means distant complete freedom of the revolutionary proletariat."

The present stage of the colonial revolution is defined, both by its general character and by the tendencies of its development, as part

of the world revolution. We have seen that the Soviet revolution was one of the mighty impulses as the result of which the movement of millions and hundreds of millions, in fact of the enormous majority of the population of the world, at first directed to national emancipation, is now being directed against capitalism and imperialism. And in order to ensure its further victorious development, the colonial revolution needs the support of the international proletariat and the support of the Soviet revolution.

"It is a self-evident fact that this revolutionary movement of the Eastern peoples can now be given a successful solution in no other way than in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism." (Lenin.)

It is instructive that the same thought, uttered at the congress of the Communist organisations of Eastern peoples, was considered by Lenin as needing repetition at the congress of toiling cossacks:

"In all the countries of the world, in the very India where three hundred million human beings, British agricultural labourers, are oppressed, there is an awakening to consciousness, and the revolutionary movement is growing with every day. They all gaze at one star, at the star of the Soviet Republic, because they know that that republic has made the greatest of sacrifices for the struggle with the imperialists, and has stood firm against desperate trials."

BUT this means that the very character of this form of emancipation movement, the place which it occupies in the international theatre of class struggle, is defined and verified by its relationship with the Soviet Union. This has reference to the estimate both of the various stages of the national movement, and also to the separate groups inside its camp. This situation, revealed immediately after October, is emphasised particularly strongly at the present time by the experience of the first round of colonial wars and revolts. The most instructive, but not the sole example, is the development of the Chinese revolution and counter-revolution. The turning point in that development was accompanied, as we know, by a change in attitude towards the Soviet Union. From this aspect one can foresee whither the various national parties and groups in India are going. In India the large-scale bourgeoisie crossed the bounds dividing it from counter-revolution from the moment that it made its position in regard to the British war on the Soviet Union a matter for trading with the Baldwin Government. By lessons of heavy defeats and sacrifices the oppressed masses of the colonies are being convinced of the justice of the declaration made by the Second Congress, that "in the present-day international situation there is no salvation for the dependent and weak nations save in alliance with the Soviet republics."

But the October revolution gave not only a mighty impetus to the development of the national revolutionary movement. It also gave indications of how, in the peculiar circumstances of a country with a preponderance of pre-capitalist relationships, the alliance of the "peasant war" with the workers' movement is being prepared and achieved. Lenin emphasised the extremely "difficult and peculiar, but especially grateful task" confronting all the Communists of the East. Developing this thought, at the congress of the Communist organisations of the Eastern peoples he said:

"You must find peculiar forms of that alliance between the leading proletariat of all the world with the toiling and oppressed masses of the East who are living in mediæval conditions. We in our country have on a small scale achieved that which you will achieve on a large scale in large countries."

In one of his posthumous articles: ("On our revolution") Lenin approaches a characterisation of the peculiar features of the October revolution from the very aspect of what in the development of Russia bordered with the incipient and in part already begun revolutions of the East.

"It never enters their (the Mensheviks') heads that for instance Russia, standing on the confines of the civilised countries and the countries which for the first time by this war have been finally drawn into the sphere of civilisation, the countries of all the East, the non-European countries, that Russia consequently could and necessarily had to display certain peculiarities, lying, of course, along

the general line of world development, but distinguishing her revolution from all the older Western European countries and introducing certain partial novelties in the transition to the Eastern countries."

IT would, of course, be highly erroneous to put a "broad" interpretation on this indication of Lenin's in the sense of the transference of the Russian 1905, February and October to the colonial countries. The similar strategic task, the combination of the "peasant war with the workers' movement," must there find its solution under a completely different international situation, in a different distribution of class forces in the camp of revolution, in a different specific importance of the proletariat and the peasantry, at any rate in the majority of colonies.

Despite all these extraordinary important essential reservations, it remains unquestionable that without the experience of October the colonial revolutions could find neither political slogans nor tactical roads, nor organisational forms which would afford the possibility of ensuring the hegemony of the proletariat in the national revolutionary movement, and would win the oppressed masses of the colonies to the banner of the world revolution.

The organisational form of a possible closer alliance of the Communist proletariat of the oppressing countries with the revolutionary movement of the colonies and of the backward countries generally, is the formation of soviets in the backward countries. Starting from the experience of the October revolution, from the practical work of the Russian Communists in the former Tsarist colonies, where precapitalist relationships still dominated, at the Second Congress Lenin put forward the position that "the unquestionable duty of the Communist parties and of the elements attached to them is the propaganda of the idea of peasant soviets, of soviets of toilers anywhere and everywhere in both backward countries and in the colonies; and there they must strive so far as conditions permit to set up Soviets of the toiling people. . . ." (Report of the Commission on the national and colonial questions.)

The ten years' experience of the struggle has completely confirmed this instruction. No matter what the isolated errors committed in putting it into practice, that idea has won the East. By the tenth anniversary of the Communist International one can state that the word "Soviet" exists not only in all the languages of the world, that it not only is to be heard everywhere where the oppressed, exploited masses rise in revolt against their enslavers, but that it is already being transformed into deed. The slogan of the Soviets as the form of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, ensuring the overthrow of the alien and national yoke and the realisation of the agrarian revolution, and making further development impossible, had been raised in China, Indonesia, India, Egypt, etc., even before Canton. Despite its tragic fate, the Canton commune incarnated that slogan in flesh and blood, carried it not only to the factories and works, where the proletariat, young but already rich in sacrifice, is organising its forces for new battles, but also into the huts of the pauperised peasantry, in whose consciousness is only just emerging a conception of the road of emancipation from slavery and serfdom.

THE soviet form of the colonial revolution is the form in which the plebeian democratic revolution in the colonies may grow up into a socialist revolution. As we know, this problem was set by Lenin in his speech at the congress in the form of a task: "to establish and theoretically to base this assumption that with the aid of the proletariat of the leading countries the backward countries can pass to the soviet system and by definite degrees of development to Communism, avoiding the capitalist stage of development."

To what extent has the solution of this task come nearer during the past decade? The answer to this question is rendered easier if we survey its historical conditions.

In answer to Vera Zasulitch's question whether it was possible for the Russian commune to develop in a socialist direction, Marx wrote:

"In order that collective labour may replace parcellised labour—the form of private appropriation—in agriculture, two things are necessary: the economic need for such a transformation, and the material conditions for its realisation." (Marx-Engels Archives, vol. 1, p. 275.)

The question of the socialist road of development of the colonies after the victory of the revolution includes the question of the development of the preponderantly pre-capitalist forms of economy into collective forms. In the investigation of this problem it thus becomes necessary to consider the presence of both the factors to which Marx referred :

1. The economic necessity of such a transformation.

2. The material bases for its realisation.

But is the method of stating this question of transformation permissible? Is not the capitalist stage of development of national economy inevitable to these backward countries which are now emancipating themselves? At the Second Congress Lenin gave an answer in the negative to this question. In his article "On Our Revolution" he established the general assumption that, "with a general co-ordinated law of development, at no time in world history are there excluded, on the contrary, there are to be expected separate spheres of development representing peculiarities either in form or in the order of that development."

WE know that this was also Marx's method of approach to the question of the destinies of Russian capitalism. In a letter in the Russian journal, "Journal of the Fatherland," devoted to this issue, Marx protested against the tendency "absolutely to transform my sketch of the origin of capitalism in Western Europe into an historico-philosophic theory of the general course of economic development, into a fatalist theory to which all peoples must be subjected, no matter what the historical conditions in which they find themselves." In the course of the letter he gives general indications as to the necessity of taking into account the peculiar, definite historical environment without which an understanding of the differences in the results arising from the similar international phenomena are not to be understood :

"Events startlingly analogous but arising in an historically different environment, lead to absolutely different results. Studying each of these evolutions in isolation, and then comparing them with each other, it is easy to find the key to an understanding of these phenomena, but it is never permissible to come to their understanding by always and everywhere applying one and the same skeleton key of some historico-philosophic theory, the chief quality of which consists in its being super-historical." (Marx-Engels correspondence.)

Thus this formula of Marx really does not exclude but, on the contrary, presupposes that with a general co-ordinated law of development there will be "peculiarities either of form or in the order of development, the certain sectional novel features which determine the character of the revolution, its stages, its development in the corresponding countries.

From the aspect of a definite historical situation, what new factors has the development of the colonial revolution during the last ten years provided for the determination of the "necessities" and "possibilities" of its development in the corresponding countries?

1. The necessity of a socialist development of economy. The experience of the Chinese revolution has shown that imperialism cannot be driven out of the oppressed country if the axe is not laid to the roots of its economic power in the country. But these roots are first and foremost the strategic positions seized by imperialists in the sphere of production, transport, the credit system and trade. Hence the vital necessity that the revolution should nationalise the factories, banks, all the railway and automobile transport, the plantations, the large commercial syndicates, etc., seized by imperialism. But it must not be forgotten that China is only a semi-colony, and this involves the existence of rudiments of a government albeit superficially subjected directly to imperialism, and a rather larger possibility than in the colonies of developing national industry and trade. And meantime it has transpired in China that the greater the danger menacing imperialism, so the more desperately it hangs on to its privileges, the more closely and tightly it intertwines economic with political annexation, the more it strives to exploit all its economic resources in order to consolidate the political positions threatened, and at the same time the more frantically and passionately does it exploit political, diplomatic and military violence in order to consolidate the old and to seize new economic strategic points.

NATURALLY there still remains the possibility of economic without political annexation, *i.e.*, the economic subjection and exploitation of the formally independent country by finance capital. But the general intensification of the antagonisms throughout the capitalist system renders inevitable a tendency to the further fusion of economic annexation with colonial monopoly in the form of the further political enslavement of the "independent" countries. And so much the more in the colonies and semi-colonies, where imperialism could hold on and drown the revolt of millions in blood only owing to this fusion of the economic and political monopoly, so much the more is it impossible there to overthrow imperialism without expropriating it. This is confirmed in particular by the fact that in essence China is even now close to an open military partitioning or to a concealed partitioning into spheres of influence, despite the fact that the Chiang Kai Shek government, tugged this way and that by the various imperialists, feigns these convulsions to be "freedom and independence of orientation." This is so clear in India that even the petty bourgeois intelligentsia which is playing with radicalism cannot but put forward the slogan of the nationalisation of the basic spheres of industry.

The same Chinese experience has shown that the character of the revolutionary struggle and the tendencies of its development may raise as an immediate issue the question of the administration not only of the enterprises belonging to the foreigners, but also to a certain extent of the large-scale enterprises belonging to the native bourgeoisie. The history of the Wuhan government showed that in face of the malignant sabotage of the bourgeoisie, operating on the basis of imperialism, the revolutionary government has no other course than to take on itself the direction of the closed and abandoned enterprises. There is no justification whatever for considering that during the new rise of the revolutionary wave the bourgeoisie will not answer the victory of the revolutionary masses with a similar provocation and sabotage. On the contrary, all the evidence indicates that the native bourgeoisie will more and more link their destinies with imperialism, counting on its "protection" from the victorious revolution.

WHILST imperialism will not finally abandon the colonies so long as it is not economically shattered and thrown into the sea, of the native bourgeoisie it can be said that its sabotage will not be overcome before the Soviet regime reveals its readiness and ability to take over the direction of the large-scale economy of the saboteurs.

But whilst the necessity, from the aspect of the basic tasks of the colonial revolution, of the transformation of private property in a large part of the large-scale enterprises into national property during the victorious development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in its struggle with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, is thus not open to doubt, do the material conditions for its realisation, for the consequential growth of the bourgeois-democratic into the proletarian revolution, exist?

In answering this question three main factors have to be considered:

1. "The old, bourgeois and imperialist Europe, which has grown accustomed to considering itself the hub of the world, has rotted and burst in the first imperialist massacre like a stinking ulcer."

2. The development of socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

3. The question of the possibility of direct aid to the socialist movement of the colonies from the victorious proletariat in capitalist countries.

In deciding the question of the possibility of the Russian commune becoming the starting point for Communist development, Marx attached extraordinary importance to the question of the general condition of the capitalist system. In the above-quoted draft of a letter to Vera Zasulitch he wrote on this issue:

"One circumstance extremely favourable from the historical aspect to the preservation of the "village commune" by the way of its further development, is that it is not only the contemporary of western capitalist production, which allows it to acquire the fruits of that production without subjecting itself to its *modus operandi*, but that it has also already lived through the epoch during which the capi-

talist system remained completely inviolate, and now, on the contrary, both in Western Europe and in the United States it finds itself engaged in a struggle with the toiling masses, and with the productive forces engendered by them—in a word, when it is suffering a crisis which will end with its elimination, and the return of the modern societies to the higher forms of "archaic" type, collective property and collective production." (Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. I.)

DURING the period which has elapsed since these words were written, the crisis of world capitalism has intensified, deepened and extended to an extraordinary extent. Capitalism has entered on the period of its decay; its productive forces, undermined by a most bloody and desolating war (which has again altered the economic and financial map of the world) are developing in a situation of increasingly tense and growing antagonisms, making still more exterminating wars inevitable; the proletariat has already taken from it one-sixth of the world by setting up the Soviet Union. Ths historical environment in which the colonial revolution is developing has changed in the direction of a swift growth of the forces which are opposed to capitalism. In the colonies and semi-colonies themselves imperialism has retained and has increased its destructive functions tenfold, whilst losing the remnants of its positive role. With every new rise the colonial revolutions fuse more and more with the main stream of the world revolution. It is now much more possible than in Marx's time to speak of the possibility of "taking possession of the fruits with which capitalist production has enriched humanity, without passing through the capitalist system, a system which from the aspect merely of its possible length of existence occupies so small a place in the history of society." (*Ibid.*)

All this is characteristic of a world situation which, given the presence of other favourable factors, renders possible a non-capitalist development of the colonies and semi-colonies after their revolutionary emancipation.

2. The second factor entering into the category of material conditions indicated by Marx is the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union.

What importance Marx and Engels attached to the existence of a model, an example for stimulation in the task of passing from the backward forms of economy to a higher social form, is evident from quite a number of their utterances.

Returning to the question of the fate of the Russian Commune ten years or more after Marx had formulated his answer to Vera Zasulitch, Engels wrote:

"I would go even farther, and say that neither in Russia nor in any other place is it possible to develop from a primitive land Communism to any higher social form, if that higher social form does not exist already in reality in some other country, and thus serves as a kind of prototype for imitation. As that higher form—everywhere where it is historically possible—is an indispensable consequence of the capitalist form of production and the social dualistic antagonism set up by that production, it cannot by any means develop directly from a primitive land commune except in the form of imitation of an example already existing in some other spot." (Marx-Engels Correspondence, Letter to Danielson, 17th October, 1893.)

ESSENTIALLY the same idea is expressed in Marx's and Engels' introduction to the Russian edition of the "Communist Manifesto," dated 21st January, 1882.

"If the Russian revolution serves as a signal to the workers' revolution in the West, so that they can complement each other, the present-day Russian land system may become a starting-point for Communist development. A victorious workers' revolution in the West, coinciding with a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia before the final dissolution of the Russian commune, might set up an 'example,' a prototype for imitation." As we know, these conditions did not mature, and this proved to be one of the causes of the different road of development taken by the pre-capitalist relationships which were dominant in the economy of Russia.

Finally, in the above-quoted letter of Engels on the inter-relationships between the countries of the victorious proletarian dictatorship and the former colonies, we find an indication of the possibility of socialist development, hav-

ing reference definitely and directly to colonies.

"Once Europe and North America are reorganised this will give such a colossal force and such an example that the half-civilised countries will themselves tend to follow us; the economic necessities are taking care of that. What social and political phases those countries will then have to pass through before they arrive at the socialist organisation we can, I think, only make rather useless hypothetical conjectures upon."

WE have seen above that the character of the colonial movement during the period when Engels wrote this letter was different from that of the present time. Imperialism, the world war and the October revolution have changed the character of the national emancipation movement in the colonies. Consequently at that time Engels talked of the reorganisation of Europe and of North America as a preliminary condition to the "half-civilised countries themselves tending to follow. . . . ." Now the colossal force of example can be given by socialist construction in part of reorganised Europe. It is true that now as before "we can make only rather useless hypothetical conjectures" in regard to how the colonies "will also arrive at socialist organisation." But we can talk with much more assurance than could Engels of the force of example of countries of proletarian dictatorship, as of a force which has already revealed its existence in all spheres and in all the directions of the world revolution. We cannot yet say how the colonies will arrive at socialist organisation, but we can much more definitely than before conceive how the aid of the countries of proletarian dictatorship will conduce to the colonies taking this road.

But from the aspect of the "force of the example and prototype" of socialist construction the importance of the Soviet Union has changed also since the Second Congress. The attacks of the armed forces of the foreign and native counter-revolution have been repulsed; methods of exploiting the market forms of economic link for the construction of planned socialist economy have been found and verified in practice—a matter which is of exceptional importance for the colonies and the semi-colonies first and foremost; the task of establishing and perfecting the link between nationalised industry and the individual peasant husbandry has been resolved; experience has demonstrated the possibility of a swift tempo of development of nationalised industry, exceeding capitalist scales, and guaranteeing its leading role in the general economy and the real industrialisation of the country; the whole world has been shown and demonstrated that it is possible under the guidance of socialistic industry to effect a transference of agriculture to higher forms both by way of the productive co-operation of peasant husbandry, and by way of its gradual unification in large-scale collective farms. . . . An example the stimulation of which will carry the colonies behind it along the socialistic road, already exists.

The third element indispensable to the socialist development of the colonies is their direct support by the countries of the victorious proletarian revolution. The possibility of the action of this condition is provided by the two preceding points: the growth of the crisis in the imperialist system, and the development of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. The transformation of this possibility into reality can be achieved only by struggle and in the process of struggle. Lenin's words uttered by him on the prospects of a victory of the proletarian revolution generally, have full application here: "The real demonstration in this and similar questions can be only practice."

But is it not "utopian" to assume the possible socialist road of development of the colonial revolution? From the philistine viewpoint for whom all revolution is utopian, or from the viewpoint of Menshevism, which lost sight of the "peculiarities" and "sectional novel features in the October revolution," and on that basis refused to "recognise" it, the answer is, of course, in the affirmative. But from this viewpoint the emancipation of the colonies generally is "utopian." Even in 1916 Lenin warned us that "the separation of the colonies is achievable as a general rule only with socialism, but under capitalism it is possible only as an exception, or at the cost of a number of revolutions both in the colonies and in the metropolises." Since then the question of holding the colonies has become a matter of life and death to imperialism. On the other hand, it has become still clearer that the combination

of the proletarian revolution and the colonial revolution is indispensable to the ultimate victory both of the one and of the other.

The proletariat of the capitalist countries will not achieve a final victory "without the aid of the toiling masses of the oppressed colonial peoples, and of the peoples of the East first and foremost."

Thus are defined the new forms of the fighting alliance of the industrial proletariat and the colonial masses, the indispensability of which is powerfully dictated by the present stage of the colonial revolution and its tasks.

BOTH Marx and Lenin checked the consciousness of the proletarian advance-guard of the oppressing countries by its attitude to the oppressed nations. But the extent of the demand which the national emancipation movement has made on the socialist proletariat is enlarging more and more.

"Marx was accustomed to 'gnash his teeth,' " as he expressed himself to his socialist friends, in testing their consciousness and conviction. After making the acquaintance of Lopatin, Marx wrote to Engels on May 15th, 1870 in terms highly flattering to the young Russian socialist, but added: "his weak point is Poland. On that subject Lopatin says exactly the same as an Englishman, a British Chartist of the old school, say, says about Ireland." (Lenin: "On the right of nations to self-determination," 1914.)

After the imperialist war and the October revolution, when the national emancipation movement in the colonies is becoming an important factor of the world revolution, Lenin demands of the Communists not only an understanding of their own obligations, not only the propaganda of the freedom of the oppressed nations to separate, but even more: genuinely revolutionary work and support of the colonial risings.

"The parties of the Second International," said Lenin at the Second Congress, "promised to act revolutionarily, but we cannot find any genuinely revolutionary work and aid to the exploited and oppressed peoples in their revolts against their oppressors among the parties of the Second International, nor, I suggest, among the majority of the parties which have left the Second and wish to enter the Third International. We must declare this fact for all to hear, and it cannot be denied. We shall see whether any attempt is made to deny it."

As we know, the "attempt to deny it" which was made at the Second Congress by the representatives of certain sections only confirmed Lenin's serious charges.

To-day, in summarising the result of the ten years' struggle of the Comintern, it is necessary to recall the decision of the Sixth Congress, which specially remarked that "in a number of cases, particularly in regard to the struggle against intervention in China, the sections of the Communist International did not display adequate mobilising ability." Meantime, the demands made by the colonial revolutions on the Comintern sections have greatly increased, even by comparison with those at the time of the Second Congress. We are on the eve of a new round of colonial revolutions and revolts. The genuinely revolutionary work and aid to the colonial movement on the part of the proletariat must take on definite organisational forms. A continually increasing part of the work of the sections must be transferred directly to the East for participation in the preparation and organisation of fresh resolute struggles of the enormous majority of humanity against imperialism.

On the Eve of Fresh Battles

S. Gussiev

1. THE CHIEF LESSONS OF 1918-20.

TEN years of the Third, Communist International, the staff of the world proletarian revolution! Ten years of the greatest, of universal historical importance!

The Communist International was organised during the period of the severe post-war revolutionary crisis, during the period of a "clearly developing proletarian revolution everywhere, not day by day but hour by hour." (Lenin, "Third International and its place in history.")

The tenth anniversary of the Communist International arrives at a moment when a number of signs point to the beginning of a new revolutionary rise with a sharp intensifications of class antagonisms as its basis.

Consequently the most important lessons of the period 1918-19, lessons formulated by Lenin in his speeches and articles, acquire a practical importance at the present juncture.

"The ice has broken," wrote Lenin in his article "Won and noted," ("Pravda," May 6th, 1919), in summarising the results of the First Congress of the Comintern.

"The ice has broken.

"The Soviets have conquered.

"They have conquered first and most of all in the sense that they have won the sympathy of the proletarian masses. That is the most important of all. No bestialities on the part of the imperialist bourgeoisie, no persecutions and murders of the Bolsheviks can deprive the masses of that victory. The more the 'democratic bourgeoisie' wages, the stronger will these conquests be in the spirit of the proletarian masses, in their mood, in their consciousness, in their heroic readiness for the struggle."

The question of the "swift dissemination of the idea of the Soviets," of a "mighty 'Soviet' movement" (as Lenin himself expressed it) becomes the central feature of all Lenin's public statements during the period from the First to the Second Congress of the Comintern. He continually returns to the Soviets, is continually seeking confirmation of the swift growth of the "Soviet" movement in the facts of development of the revolutionary crisis in all the European countries.

"The Soviet movement, comrades," he declared in a speech at the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies on March 6th, 1919, "that is the form which has been achieved in Russia, and which is now being disseminated throughout the world, and which by its very name provides the workers with a complete programme."

And he ended his speech with the following words:

"Now that the word 'Soviet' has become understandable to all, the victory of the Communist movement is ensured. The comrades present in this hall have seen how the Soviet Republic was founded; they now see how the Communist International was founded, they will all see how the World Soviet Federative Republic will be founded."

Lenin would not have escaped accusations of preaching "ultra-leftist" theories of "quick revolutionary prospects," of putschism, of a Ruth Fischer-Maslov attitude and so on if the Brandlers of that day had had their will.

And there were such sages even then. At the Party Congress of the German "independents," held at the beginning of March, 1918, one of its leaders, Däumig, spoke against the Communists, accusing them of putschism. Lenin gave him a vigorous reply.

"By accusing the Communists of putschism" (he wrote in "Heroes of the Berne International") Mr. Däumig only demonstrates his own servile subservience to the philistine prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie . . . A mighty wave of strike movement is rising in Germany. To talk of 'incendiarism' in face of such a movement is to reveal oneself as a bourgeois lackey to philistine prejudices."

By the first anniversary of the Comintern, Lenin had noted the decline in the revolutionary tempo and revealed the causes of that decline.

"If the (Second) International" (he said at a session of the Moscow Soviet) "were not in the hands of traitors, who saved the bourgeoisie at the critical moment, there would have been many chances that in a number of the warring countries, directly at the end of the war, and also in certain neutral countries where the people were armed, a revolution could have been accomplished swiftly, and then the result would have been different. It transpired that this was not so; revolution on such a swift scale did not occur."

And a little more than a year later, at the Third Comintern congress, Lenin stated "that in reality the movement did not proceed along such a straight line as we had expected." (Speech at the session for July 5th, 1921.)

The cause of this was that "in many Western European countries, where the broad masses of the working class, and quite possibly the enormous majority of the population are organised, the chief power of resistance of the bourgeoisie consists in those very organisations of the working class which are hostile and are attached to the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals."

Thus the reason for the decline in the tempo and for the zigzag course of development of the international revolution in 1919-20, Lenin saw in the force of reformism as underestimated by the Comintern.

But not only in that, but also in the condition of the Comintern and its constituent parties at that time. Lenin revealed their chief defects at the Second Congress. In the theses on the basic tasks of the Congress, in analysing the "errors or weaknesses of the extraordinarily swiftly growing international Communist movement," Lenin said: "One very serious danger, a danger presenting an enormous direct menace to the success of the work of emancipating the proletariat, consists in the fact that part of the old leaders and old parties of the Second International, in part half unconsciously yielding to the desires and pressure of the masses, in part deliberately deluding them in order to retain their previous role of agents and assistants of the bourgeoisie inside the workers' movement, are declaring their conditional and even their unconditional adhesion to the Third International, whilst in all their practice they retain their party and political work at the level of the Second International."

With a view to preventing the danger of the Comintern being flooded and captured by the parties and leaders of the Second International, the congress not only adopted the well-known resolution on "the conditions of admission into the Communist International" (21 points) and the resolution "on the role of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution," but in addition set the further task of "cleansing the Party from elements continuing to act in the spirit of the Second International"; and in his speech "On the role of the Communist Party," Lenin declared: "We need new parties, different parties. We need parties which will be continually in real touch with the masses and which have the ability to direct those masses."

Some three months after the Second Congress, in his article "Lying speeches on freedom," Lenin raised once more the question; and even more sharply: "Whilst we have reformists, mensheviks in our ranks, we cannot be victorious in the proletarian revolution, we cannot defend it."

And finally, in his "Letter to the German Communists," written soon after the Third Congress, Lenin gives the following characterisation of the Communist Parties.

"In the great majority of countries our parties are still far from being such as true Communist Parties ought to be, true advance-guards of the really revolutionary and the sole revolutionary class, with the participation of every member of the Party to the last man in the struggle, in the movement, in the daily life of the masses."

And Lenin set the task of "teaching the army of Communists throughout the world by all kinds of manœuvres, by different kinds of battles, by the operations of attack and retreat," for that army was "still poorly instructed, poorly organised."

What are the chief lessons which Lenin derived from the revolutionary experience of 1918-19? What are the basic conditions ensuring a swift and direct development of the international revolution during any further rise, whether it be as the result of a severe economic crisis in capitalist countries, or of war, or of the national-liberation revolution-

ary attacks of the colonies, or of a situation arising as the result of a sharply intensifying general crisis of capitalism plus the simultaneous existence of the proletarian dictatorship in Soviet form in the U.S.S.R. ?

There are three conditions. First, the proving of the Soviets as the practical form of the dictatorship of the proletariat in experience, for without experience the idea of the Soviets remains dead. Secondly, the winning of the widest sympathy of the masses for the Soviets. Thirdly, the maximum homogeneity of the Comintern and the parties constituting it (the cleansing from all unstable, vacillating, semi-Menshevik elements) and their maximum contact with the masses, as being conditions ensuring their leading role.

We will consider the prospects of the imminent new revolutionary wave from the aspects of these three conditions.

2. THE CHIEF FEATURES OF THE NEW REVOLUTIONARY WAVE.

In its Soviet form the dictatorship has stood the test of eleven years. It has overcome a number of extreme difficulties, and is now stronger than ever before. The eleven years' experience has proved that a workers' State, in an environment of hostile mighty imperialist powers either warring against it or maintaining a complete or partial blockade, a workers' State overcoming colossal internal difficulties arising out of its economic backwardness and the enormous preponderance of peasant ownership elementally engendering capitalism, can not only hold out, but can develop socialist industry at a swift rate, and can draw wider and wider masses of workers' and peasants into the administration of the State. That last factor is the basic reason for its continually increasing internal and external consolidation. The basic problem which Lenin put forward first and foremost at the First Comintern Congress, when contraposing the dictatorship of the proletariat to bourgeois democracy ("Theses on bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat") has now been finally resolved not by discussion, but by practice. The first dictatorship of the proletariat in history has risen higher and higher over the last decade, although it is still far from having reached its zenith; whilst during the same decade bourgeois democracy has declined all over the world.

That is the chief historical fact of the present epoch. Not only the proletariat but also the toiling masses of all countries are taking into account this greatest of lessons, are learning from this experience. But the bourgeoisie and its social-democratic and reformist agents in the workers' movement obstinately deny the fact, and are making convulsive efforts to find fresh false and hypocritical arguments in defence of the bourgeois democracy and to discredit the proletarian dictatorship.

By their vacillations and concessions to the social-democrats on the question of the dictatorship the right wing Communists and the conciliators assist them.

Take for example the "Austro-Marxist" Renner. In the social-democratic journal "Gesellschaft" for October, 1928, he put forward a remarkable formula which summarises the general results of the decisions of the Brussels Congress of the Second International, and briefly expresses the whole essence of the social-democrats' present policy.

"The State as it is," announces M. Renner, "the State which still rests on the antagonisms of classes, must be regarded as being an excellent handy means of socialisation, as a companion [literally "an assistant on the road"—S.G.] and not as an absolute hindrance which has to be eliminated before the social work begins."

The German social-democrat Klemens competes with Renner in his servility to the bourgeoisie, for at the August, 1928 congress of the German transport workers' union he developed the following idea: "I challenge the view that in the German republic we are still justified in talking of a capitalist and a bourgeois State. In such a country as Germany, which in so many ways is already organised in accordance with our desires, where we have comrades and colleagues in almost all the governmental and social organs, it is incoherent nonsense to talk of a capitalist bourgeois State which has to be struggled against. . . . I repeat that in my view we live in a German democratic republic, and not in a capitalist bourgeois State."

So in the sweat of their brow do the social-

democrats labour to confuse and dismay the workers and thus save bourgeois democracy.

And what do the right wingers, what do the conciliators say?

What other idea but that of Renner's bourgeois State "as it is," "accompanying" the proletariat on the road to socialism, is concealed in Brandler's and Thalheimer's muddled observations on "workers' control over production at the present time," without overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, which would in practice lead to a betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat or in the best case to a bloc of all the capitalist parties ("from the Communists to Christian and National-Socialists"), i.e., to a uniting of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with a dictatorship of the proletariat?

Brandler tries to draw distinctions between himself and Renner by all kinds of provisos, such as "in a situation which is not sharply revolutionary, one can talk only of propaganda, and not of introducing control over the State. The beginning of control over production can only be during the period of struggle for power."

But all the practice of the right wingers contradicts this interpretation. One of the chief leaders of the right wingers, Walcher, outlines that practice thus: according to Brandler's theories the Ruhr trade unions should have put forward the slogan of the State continuing to pay wages at the expense of the employers. Around this slogan the masses could have been mobilised and a further slogan could have been raised: "the restarting of the enterprises, their further management by the workers, and workers' control over production."

There was neither a severe nor a "not severe" revolutionary situation during the Ruhr lockout, and yet Walcher proposed to put forward the slogan of workers' control over production, and added to it the slogan of the organisation of workers' committees for the control of prices and the capitalists' profits.

Secondly, of what struggle for power is Brandler speaking? In his commentaries on the Comintern program Thalheimer explained that the slogan of workers' and peasants' Government is a transitional slogan for the struggle for power, is the rule of the Soviets or a Soviet State in a still imperfect transitional form. Thus the workers' and peasants' Government does not connote a dictatorship of the proletariat: it is possible to have a transitional Soviet State in which the dictatorship will remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Soviets are not the historically given practical form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Lenin taught, but a union of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As though in order to leave no doubt whatever on this ground, at the All-German conference of the right wingers, Thalheimer provided the following formula: "The workers' and peasants' government is not a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the preparation for that dictatorship within the framework of the capitalist State."

In what way is this theory of the "fusion" of the proletarian dictatorship with the bourgeois dictatorship distinct from the latest theories of Renner and Klemens? Essentially in no way whatever: it is the same theory, given a "left wing" air.

And what other idea than the same Brandler conception of the "revolutionary" (i.e., wrapped up in revolutionary phrases, but really opportunist) fusion of socialism with the bourgeois system is concealed behind the following muddle-headed observations of the most prominent conciliator in the German C.P., comrade Mayer, on the adoption of "slogans mobilising the working class in the struggle for power"? (Brandler also regards his slogan of "control over production now and immediately" as one mobilising the working class for the struggle for power.) In the draft resolution put forward by Mayer, Kurt and Eberlein at the last Plenum of the German C.P., Mayer wrote of these slogans: "Such revolutionary slogans as should be made the subject of propaganda in the present situation in all the mass struggles, in order to connect up the struggle for daily bread with the socialist ultimate aim, are the slogans of confiscation and nationalisation of the trusts, banks and the landed estates by way of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the achievement of a workers' and peasants' government."

"Confiscation by way of a revolutionary struggle of the proletariat "is first cousin to

Brandler's formula, which in turn, is closely related to Renner's formula.

Renner's "socialisation," Brandler's "control over production now and immediately," and Mayer's "confiscation by way of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat," all have as their common pre-requisite the retention of the dictatorship in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Meantime, there is only one way of control over production, of confiscation and socialisation, a way historically tested—it is the way of overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The fact that the right wingers and the conciliators deviate from this way and thus endeavour to draw the proletariat off it and to direct them along another, Renner road, connotes that all the confusion of the right wingers and conciliators on the dictatorship question is further aid to Renner.

The matter is not improved by the fact that comrade Mayer adds "and the achievement of a workers' and peasants' government." That involves a horrible confusion which leaves the door wide open for the Renner-Brandler formula. Confiscation by "way of a revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the achievement of a workers' and peasants' government" is confiscation under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and under the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is a union of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with that of the proletariat, i.e., in practice the preservation of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie inviolate, and consequently the rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is impossible to make any other deduction from these views of the open and secretly opportunist elements in the Comintern sections. They can swear their devotion to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. a thousand times over, but they have merely to make some slight reservation (such as for instance, the frequently repeated assertion that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the Russian form of the proletariat's conquest of power, whilst in the more advanced capitalist countries the affair will take different roads, pass through different stages, and so on), and they have entered upon a slippery inclined plane and begun to roll down to the rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The arguments of the right wingers and conciliators must be analysed in the most detailed fashion. Without such an analysis a sound estimate of the situation and prospects is impossible. A tiny, innocent-looking correction may conceal a whole line, a tendency, a deviation in the direction of reformism. Would anybody have paid any attention whatever fifteen years ago to comrade Mayer's formula: "Confiscation by way of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the achievement of a workers' and peasants' government"? But now, when on the one hand we have the proletarian dictatorship maintained and unbrokenly growing stronger for eleven years, and on the other the Renner-Klemens-Brandler theories, comrade Mayer's formula whether he likes it or not, represents a concession to the reformists on the basic question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a reservation on a question on which concessions and reservations are absolutely impermissible without betraying Leninism.

Ten years ago the verification of the dictatorship of the proletariat in practice had been of short duration. Now that verification has had ten years more. That is a great length of time. That verification is now so assured that we are right in drawing the deduction which the October revolution has made possible, as to the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in its historical dispute with the bourgeois democracy.

Not to see this simple fact, not to understand its importance, to close one's eyes to it, to pass it over in silence, to make reservations and to set up a reformist theory on the union of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the co-operation or "companionship" of two dictators, is not only to aid the enemies of the Comintern and the U.S.S.R., but to hinder the task of permeating the toiling masses with a clear understanding of the colossal fact of the eleven years' existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It means refusing to recognise the existence of an enormous historical forward movement in the conditions of a swift and direct development of the international revolution, in the practical verification of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Finally, it means being completely void of any understanding of the fact, it means a denial of the fact that from this aspect the imminent revolutionary

wave arrives under better conditions than those of 1918-19.

What clearer than all else reflects the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat over bourgeois democracy?

It is the boundless dissemination of the idea of the Soviets and of sympathy towards the U.S.S.R. Is there a corner of the globe where the masses have not heard of the Soviets, have not felt sympathy for them either consciously or half-consciously? Millions of facts, testify to the way in which the idea of the Soviets has captured the masses of all countries. And it is difficult to say which exactly of these facts are more expressive—whether the fact of the increase in votes cast for the C.P.'s in the French and German elections, or the fact of the joy of the Arabs at the sight of "Soviet" matches when brought for the first time to Arabia on a Soviet steamship.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat," said Lenin in his opening speech at the First Congress of the Comintern, "hitherto these words have been Greek to the masses. Owing to the distribution of the idea of the Soviet system throughout the world that Greek is being translated into ever fresh tongues."

The dictatorship of the proletariat arose before the masses in the simple, definite, practical form of the Soviet State, based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry, in which the proletariat plays the leading role. The conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat is now understood by all toilers.

Whilst in 1919 Lenin exclaimed that "the Soviets have conquered," that "they have conquered first and most of all in the sense that they have won themselves the sympathy of the proletarian masses," how much stronger is that victory now after ten years? Even although it does not emerge so clearly, owing to the absence of a direct revolutionary situation.

The sympathy for the U.S.S.R. finds its expression in the definite, practical, active slogan of the defence of the U.S.S.R. from imperialist attacks. Among toiling humanity there is no more popular slogan than is this. It politically unites a preponderant majority of the toilers, irrespective of their adherence to political parties and trade unions, or their religious convictions.

So the most bitter enemies of the U.S.S.R. are straining all their powers to shatter this unity of the masses on the question of the defence of the U.S.S.R. The chief role in this work falls naturally on the agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class, social-democrats and reformists. The social-democrats are putting in motion all possible methods through the Second International on the League of Nations to weaken the antagonisms between the imperialist Powers, to delay war between them, and so to create a single anti-Soviet front, so to accelerate war against the U.S.S.R. by all means. To this end they exploit the theory of ultra-imperialism invented by Kautsky, the theory of peaceful, warless development of imperialism, and they play on the "neutrality" of the attitude of some of the workers (Germany, Czecho-Slovakia). At the same time they carry on open propaganda for intervention in the U.S.S.R.

The imperialists' war against the U.S.S.R. is the basic political issue of the present period of the world revolution. In this war the basic political dispute between the dictatorship of the proletariat and bourgeois democracy will be decided by military methods.

It is impossible to establish a sound line on the anti-Soviet war issue without a thorough understanding of the decisive importance in that war of the great conquests which the U.S.S.R. has made among the toilers. Anyone who replaces the dictatorship of the proletariat by a "workers' and peasants' government in the framework of the capitalist system," puts forward the theory of the union of the two dictatorships in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat, who makes the very least concession to the Renners on the issue of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is inevitably bound to vacillate in one way or another over the question of the defence of the U.S.S.R.

And we do definitely see a small but noteworthy deviation among the right-wingers and the conciliators. The danger of war against the U.S.S.R. they have put into the background, and are raising to the forefront the danger of war among the imperialists. This is being done for various reasons by the sections of the Comintern involved. But the substance of the deviation is the same in every

case, since at its base is the idea of the possibility of prolonged peaceful co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist States, and that peaceful cohabitation is regarded as a practical form of the union or co-operation of the bourgeois dictatorship and the proletarian dictatorship. Thus the attention of the toiling masses is drawn away from the main war danger, from the war threat to the Soviet Union. A certain pre-requisite is set up for declaring with the social-democrats that the danger of the imperialists' making a military attack on the U.S.S.R. is exaggerated.

Where vacillations on the question of the defence of the U.S.S.R. can get one to we see from the case of Trotsky. He began with a conditional defence of the U.S.S.R., and then passed from that to putting forward a thesis concerning Clemenceau, and has now arrived at the preaching of preparation for civil war in the U.S.S.R. by putting forward the proposal for secret voting. One further little step and Trotsky will find himself safely arrived in the Menshevik nest, in the ranks of those who preach bourgeois democracy and war intervention in the U.S.S.R.

Trotsky has laid down the road, and anyone who vacillates on the question of defence of the U.S.S.R. will inevitably find himself on that road.

Why is it that the right-wingers and conciliators do not see the fact of the tremendous growth of sympathy towards the U.S.S.R. among the toiling masses, and do not understand that over the last ten years a profound change has taken place in the second condition of a swift and direct development of the revolution, which Lenin enunciated?

The right-wingers and the conciliators are crushed and blinded by the strength of the social-democrats and the growth of its influence among the masses of recent years. They do not see that the revival and rise of the workers' movement in a number of countries are harbingers of the coming revolutionary crisis, and are swiftly preparing the conditions for the bankruptcy and crash of social-democracy, the counter-revolutionary degeneration of which is becoming clearer and clearer to the masses. The right-wingers and the conciliators do not understand that on the question of the defence of the U.S.S.R. against intervention the toilers of the world will not be on the side of the Second International, but on the side of the Comintern and the U.S.S.R. It is on this issue that the social-democrats can go to pieces most easily of all. The peculiarity of the present situation consists in the fact that on the basic political problem of the whole epoch, and also on a number of other political problems of recent times, the toilers have followed the Comintern, the U.S.S.R., whilst at the same time they have remained in the organisations and parties hostile to Communism.

Let us see what the situation is in regard to the third condition of a swift and direct development of the revolution, as Lenin enunciated it. What are the C.P.'s like now?

During the ten years of its existence the Comintern has greatly enlarged the bounds of its influence, especially in the semi-colonial and colonial countries, has purged its ranks of the Trotskyists and other "left-wing" varieties of opportunism, and has grown stronger organisationally. Despite a number of defects and weaknesses, which must be critically analysed and made clear, the chief important sections of the Comintern and the Comintern itself have taken a big step forward in their development, and are now much closer to the point where they are capable of politically heading the new rise of the workers' movement and of directing it along a revolutionary road than they were ten years ago.

As in regard to the first two conditions, so here the question is not so much one of demonstrating the tremendous movements and successes which are creating a much more favourable situation for the coming revolutionary wave than that of 1918, as of repulsing the attacks of the right-wingers and conciliators on the organisational bases of the Comintern sections, and the attempts to substitute social-democratic for Leninist organisational principles. There have been a great number of such attempts in the Comintern.

The latest and most resolute is that of the German right-wingers. At the all-German conference of the right-wingers Thalheimer openly rejected the construction of the Party on the basis of the Bolshevik principle of democratic centralism, and hailed back to "democracy," which, in his words, "is the basic element of the Western-European workers'

movement." Thalheimer threatened to win the Comintern for democracy.

Undoubtedly if Thalheimer takes that road he can look forward to a pleasant meeting with Trotsky.

In essence the conciliators are effecting the same substitution of social-democratic for Bolshevik organisational principles, only they do so in a cowardly manner. They are willingly rejecting that section of the decisions of the Sixth Congress which talks of iron Party discipline, and are adopting only that section in which there is talk of internal-Party democracy. Thus they arrive at the same point as the right-wingers by a slightly different method.

Among the conciliators the retreat from the organisational principles of Leninism finds its expression also in their teaching on the "concentration of Party forces." They talk of "concentration generally," just as the social-democrats talk of "democracy generally." They do not and will not see that under the flag of "concentration generally" definitely anti-Comintern concentrations are being effected, such as the concentrations of the Brandlerists with the left social-democrats or the unprincipled concentrations of the Trotskyists, led by Cannon, with the extreme right-wingers excluded from the American C.P., such as Lore and others. Lenin thought of concentration as the "purging of the Party from elements continuing to act in the spirit of the Second International." And the decisions of the Sixth Comintern Congress, demanding a struggle against the right and the "left" wing deviations, refer to the same type of concentration.

On the Party question also the right-wingers' and conciliators' retreats from Leninism and their vacillations and deviations in the direction of social-democracy show that they fail to understand not only the significance of the leading role of the Party in the revolutionary demonstrations of the proletariat, but also the exceptional importance of that question with the approach of a new revolutionary wave, both because owing to its enormous dimensions that rise will present the Comintern sections with unprecedentedly tremendous demands, and also because by comparison with the two other conditions of a swift and direct course of the revolution (the verification of the dictatorship of the proletariat in practice and the dissemination of sympathy for the Soviets) this third condition undoubtedly lags in its development.

The new revolutionary wave will develop upon an incomparably broader basis than that of 1918-1919. It promises to bring colossal masses of the toilers in all the capitalist countries and in the majority of the colonies and semi-colonies into the struggle. It is the fact of the participation of the colonies, which fact ten years ago did not exist, which will extend extraordinarily the bounds of the new rise and will deepen it to an enormous extent. The defeated Chinese revolution is about to be replaced by the swiftly developing national-emancipation revolutionary movements in India and Latin America. The broad international nature of this new rise is one of its most important and most characteristic features.

A no less important feature of the new rise is that it is developing not as the result of war and the decline of capitalism evoked by war, but on the basis of capitalism's development and consolidation. The extreme intensification of all the antagonisms growing side by side with the further consolidation and development of capitalism, is leading to the shaking of stabilisation and the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. The present international situation is reminiscent of certain features of the situation existing before the war in 1914. It is a pre-war situation. But the fact of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., the fact of the growing revolutionary mood among the workers of the capitalist countries and among the toilers in the colonies and semi-colonies, is making the situation a highly tense one. The chief feature in that situation, one which, on the international scale at least, is unprecedented, is that a considerable part of the toiling masses will enter the coming war with revolutionary ideas—ideas drawn from the experience of the previous imperialist war, the proletarian revolution in Russia, and a number of revolutionary battles in Western Europe and in the East.

To attempt to guess what may be the con-

sequences of such a situation would be premature at the present moment.

It is much more important at the moment that we should obtain a sound view as to the nature of the class struggles now being waged and the new tasks which confront the Comintern and its sections with the approach of a new revolutionary rise.

3. THE CHARACTERISTIC PECULIARITIES OF THE PRESENT CLASS STRUGGLES.

At the beginning of the new revolutionary rise great class conflicts drawing hundreds of thousands and millions of workers into the struggle, are being waged. The Ruhr, Lodz, the strikes of the textile workers and miners in France, the strikes in India, the rising in Colombo, the strike in Columbia are a few of the great battles which are merely preliminary skirmishes in the historical prospect of the coming revolutionary crisis.

But taken by themselves these battles are already occasionally acquiring the character of widely extended battles, especially in Germany. The Lodz strike indicates that Poland also is beginning to be transformed into a field for class conflicts. France has become a country of incessant strikes. In the United States class conflicts are being waged which point to the development within the working class of revolutionary processes unprecedented by their profundity in that country. Consequently, even the present battles are to a certain extent revealing the characteristic features of the coming gigantic class wars.

What is the character of those battles? What is the direction of their development? And, first and foremost, are they defensive or offensive movements on the part of the proletariat?

The solution of this problem depends on one's estimate of the present stabilisation and the direction and character of its further development. Anyone who regards the present stabilisation as durable is bound to regard the present class battles as defensive ones. And on the other hand anyone who regards the present stabilisation as being shaken inevitably comes to the conclusion that they are in the nature of a counter-attack or even an offensive.

What do the social-democrats say of stabilisation? The "best" representatives of social-democracy, Hilferding and Otto Bauer, preach that capitalism is now at a period of development and that it is also a period of "maturity into socialism." What, according to Bauer and Hilferding, is the line along which that maturing process is proceeding? The line of transition of capitalist economy from "unplanned" to "organised economy," which in their view connotes the replacement of the capitalist principle of free competition by the socialist principle of planned economy."

Hence they draw the conclusion that the development of capitalist economy will in future proceed without crises ("planned production"—don't forget!) and that at the present time capitalism is not living through any crisis whatever ("flourishing").

From the social-democrats' example we see that the deduction that the stabilisation of capitalism is increasing is inevitably bound up with and inevitably in the present period of struggle between the capitalist and socialist systems of production, leads logically to a denial of the existence of a general crisis in capitalism, and of one of the basic factors of its sharp intensification—the severe competition among the imperialist Powers.

The German right wingers stand entirely by the point of view that the stabilisation is increasing. They have more than once openly said so. Böttcher, who was recently excluded from the German C.P., made in the Saxon Landtag an official declaration on behalf of the right wingers, in which was such criticism of the Comintern decisions in regard to stabilisation that they evoked the frantic approval of the entire social-democratic press, and gave the organ of the German social-democrats in Czecho-Slovakia the right to make the following declaration on the basis of his remarks:

"How frequently social-democracy both in Germany and here has declared against the non-Marxist estimate [i.e., that of the Communists—S.G.] of the political and economic inter-relationship of classes, against the nonsensicalp hrase of an offensive policy and the coming historical smash of capitalism, against illusions and fantasies!"

From the viewpoint of the Comintern the criticism of the right wingers is so close to that of the social-democrats that the latter have only now to dot the i's and cross the t's.

As for the conciliators, whilst they expound

essentially the same view of stabilisation as that which the right wingers hold, they timidly sweep away the traces and endeavour to confuse the whole matter by inserting provisos and reservations everywhere.

In the program recently published by the conciliators ("Memorandum on the differences of view in putting the Sixth Congress decisions into force" signed by Ewert, Dietrich and others), they, in unison with comrade Humbert-Droz, ardently attack the leadership of the German C.P. for its declaration that "the partial and temporary stabilisation of capitalism is not being consolidated, as the opportunists in our ranks affirm, but is becoming more and more rotten and unstable."

This and similar statements evoke the strong resistance of the conciliators and accusations that the present German leadership is getting away from the decisions of the Sixth Congress on the question of stabilisation and is passing to an ultra-left wing course.

What view of stabilisation do the conciliators put forward in opposition to this "ultra-left wing course"?

"Stabilisation," they state in their program, "viewed from the aspect of the process of capitalist development, is of course, unsteady and even 'rotten' if you like, and must inevitably lead to revolution and wars."

At first sight it may appear that this is the same formula as that of the German C.P. leadership. But such a deduction would be quite inaccurate. It is in reality the opposite formula. The whole secret of this formula is locked up in the words "from the aspect of the entire process of capitalist development."

The line of argument of the conciliators is roughly this: The C.C. of the German C.P. thinks that stabilisation is now rotten. That is absolutely incorrect. It is now strong and growing stronger. But in the indefinite future, of course, stabilisation will begin to flag, and it will lead inevitably to war and revolution. Consequently "from the viewpoint of the entire process of capitalist development" in the historical prospect, stabilisation is both insecure and rotten.

Renner, of course, will frown a little on this formula (war! revolution!), but will recognise the opinion on the stabilisation of capitalism therein expressed as a legal left wing shade inside social-democracy.

Only starting from a conception of stabilisation as a developing process can one wax indignant (as do the conciliators) over declarations in an article by comrade Thälmann that the workers are passing to a counter-attack and to a struggle for the breakdown "of the barrier of the reformist policy of sabotage," and can exclaim angrily: "And moreover he adds that this counter-attack is shaking capitalist stabilisation and setting up a revolutionary situation."

It is quite natural that both the right wingers and the conciliators who reject the shaking of stabilisation and the imminence of a new revolutionary rise and declare that stabilisation is growing stronger, should define the present class battles as defensive ones. The right wingers, however, are compelled to admit that in Germany, in 1928, the initiative in all the conflicts arose from the workers' side, whilst the conciliators as usual add a reservation to the word "defensive," adding the words "with certain offensive elements." But this reservation is quite meaningless: their entire position is in sharp contradiction to it, and although they use words concerning offensive elements they do not definitely specify those elements and cannot specify them.

The present class conflicts are arising because of a continual deterioration in the position of the working class, which deterioration is evoked by capitalist rationalisation. Capitalist rationalisation brings unemployment to the working class (unemployment which in association with other causes is acquiring the character of an enormous disaster in Germany, Britain and the United States), a contraction of the period during which the worker is employed at a factory and his earlier discharge into the ranks of the "used-up" slaves of capitalism, an extreme intensification of labour and an increase of exploitation. All this connotes an increase in insecurity for the working class. Hence arises the daily increasing discontent of the workers, discontent which has not transient, not conditional, but social economic roots. Capitalist rationalisation is driving the working class to a resolute protest, to a defensive struggle which is inevitably passing into an offensive.

What is at the root of this insecurity? It is the fact of the swift growth of the frantic

struggle among the imperialist Powers for markets both for disposal of commodities and for export of capital. That struggle is unavoidable within the framework of the capitalist system, and drives the capitalists to an increasingly ruthless exploitation of the proletariat. The continually developing attack of the capitalists on the proletariat is showing the latter the complete fruitlessness of a defensive tactics in face of such a mighty enemy as centralised, concentrated finance capital, and is compelling them to pass to an attack on the capitalist class. The proletariat responds to the capitalist attack with a counter-attack.

In consequence the present class struggles are more and more acquiring the character of reciprocal offensives.

In these factors are rooted the deep, continually intensifying, unavoidable conditions which are conferring on the proletariat's demonstrations a continually increasing offensive and continually intensifying character.

Germany, which more than any other capitalist State has during the past decade played the role of the classic country of large-scale class conflicts and revolutionary battles, provides the best example from which to study both the character of the present class conflicts (in particular the factor of their being reciprocal offensives), and also their ideological and political reflection.

In no other section of the Comintern in capitalist countries do we find such a perfectly expressed right wing deviation and conciliatory attitude towards it as in the German C.P. Nowhere are the opportunist tendencies inside the Comintern represented so richly by literature, documents, theoreticians and leaders, nowhere will you find such a social-democracy as in Germany.

The second characteristic feature of the present class struggles is the fact that the economic struggles grow into political ones, and the directly political, class nature of the economic struggles.

It might appear that there is nothing new in this, for every class struggle is a political struggle and consequently once an economic struggle takes on a broad class character it ipso facto becomes a political struggle. But the question at issue does not lie here, but in the new conditions which evoke such a quality in the economic struggles and which make those struggles class, political struggles. These new conditions are set up on the basis of the concentration and centralisation of capital, which have led to the formation of powerful monopolist federations, such as cartels, syndicates and trusts.

This process has got far ahead in the United States and in Germany. The attack of concentrated and centralised capital on the proletariat cannot be carried out otherwise than over a widely extended front, especially where the cartels, syndicates and trusts meet with the obstinate opposition of the proletariat, as is the case in Germany.

It is not at all an accident that on the eve of the Ruhr lock-out the town crier of capitalism proclaimed the slogan: "Class against class," and that the organisations of German capitalists demonstratively announced that they would support the struggle of their finest advance-guard, the Ruhr iron and coal barons, to the end, and that their platform ("not a pfennig on the pay," "not a second off the day," and "long-term collective agreements") is the platform of the entire capitalist class. In the struggle now being waged in the German textile industry, which threatens to embrace hundreds of thousands of workers, the same feature of an extensive, organised capitalist attack on the textile workers is to be observed. A similar kind of struggle is beginning in the mining industry. The conflicts between centralised and concentrated capital and the working class have a tendency at the present time to embrace entire spheres of industry (for instance the strike of the German ship construction workers).

The capitalists' extended attack on the basis of capitalist rationalisation carried through at the expense of the workers is forcing the proletariat to respond with an extended defensive, which passes into an extended counter-attack. There is no other way out for the proletariat. If the proletariat does not organise a widely developed counter-attack it will be beaten, as happened in the Ruhr. This idea is beginning to penetrate into the German proletariat, which, in the mining industry for instance, has organised in advance, a couple of months

before the beginning of the struggle, has thrown up organs of leadership, and is preparing for an extension of the struggle. This never occurred formerly.

The new feature in the present struggles is not that the economic conflicts are acquiring a broad class and consequently political nature, but that this form of struggle is becoming the dominant one, that it is evoked not by transient changes in the economic situation or by crises, but by the continually acting and continually intensifying, and consequently continually broadening and developing class struggles, by the general cause of the trustification and cartellisation of capitalist industry.

Consequently the political character of the present class conflicts is becoming their permanent, inseparable feature, which in turn involves the political unification of the proletariat in its attack on monopolist capital.

The epoch of finance capital is thus becoming an epoch of the colossal extension of the economic struggles, evoked by the intensifying antagonisms of capitalism, which in turn determine the continual intensification of those struggles. Such a growing intensification and extension of the class conflicts also determine their specific political feature of being reciprocal offensives, expressed in the formula "class against class."

The formula "class against class" is becoming a definite reality. The united capitalist front, composed of the capitalist class, its agents in the working class (all and every sort of socialists and reformists) and the organs of the State at the disposition of the capitalists, is becoming more and more openly inimical to the working class, which whilst continuing to be disunited, is beginning, partially quite elementally and partially deliberately, to pass to the organisation of its own united class front. Such is the tendency of development, which confers a continually increasing political character on the growing class battles.

The peculiarity of the present situation consists in the fact that on the international scale it is much easier for the proletariat to realise its united front, especially in regard to defence of the U.S.S.R., than it is to the international class of capitalists, who are rent asunder by continually intensifying internal antagonisms. But on the other hand, the united front of the capitalists in separate capitalist States is much easier of achievement (and is already achieved) than is the united front of the working class. In accordance with this, Communism is stronger than social-democracy on the international front, but weaker on the internal fronts.

The tendency towards a continual and steady extension of the class battles, which constitutes an inseparable peculiarity of the epoch of finance capital (imperialism) is leading to their transformation not only into practical but also into revolutionary struggles. In the present struggles this feature is in a still undeveloped state. Consequently we regard them as being only preliminary battles, presaging the beginning of a new revolutionary rise, when the formula "class against class" will more and more express the revolutionary struggle for power. But for the present day this formula expresses on the one hand the reciprocally offensive nature of the class conflicts, and on the other their broad class, political character. Both these features of the present mass attacks of the proletariat are bound closely one with the other.

We see that in the actual process of developing class struggle during the epoch of imperialism the classes are organising and consolidating themselves anew, by comparison with the epoch of industrial capital that they are extending the fronts widely in fighting order, that the forms of struggle are changing, the relations between classes are being modified, class stands against class in an almost pure, "theoretic," "scientific" form. On the broad arena of history the capitalist and proletarian fronts are being drawn up in fighting order.

But there is a modification in the relationships, not only between classes, but also inside the classes. The establishment of a united front of capitalists and a united front of the proletariat cannot but be accompanied by a change in relationships between separate sections of those classes.

What are the internal alterations which are occurring in the capitalist class? The essence of these changes amounts to a unification of separate sections of the bourgeoisie, the formation of sections which was evoked by different historical causes, economic, political, national, religious and so on, under the dic-

tatorship of monopolist capital. This unification finds its expression in the unification of the economic organisations of separate groups of capitalists, a process which is developing more and more as finance capitalism develops, and also in the increasing elimination of the distinctions and antagonisms among the political parties of the bourgeoisie, including all the socialistic parties, which are becoming more and more bourgeois parties, on the basis of their subordination to the large-scale bourgeoisie. One of the chief weapons of this process is the extraordinarily increased importance of heavy industry, which during the epoch of imperialism is playing a commanding role. We find the coalition of all the bourgeois parties, including the social-democratic and reformist parties in one form or another, more or less formulated or else not formulated at all, in all the imperialist countries. In France the governmental bloc includes all the bourgeois parties and the socialists; in Britain the Labour Party and the "second" bourgeois party co-operate with the governing party of the bourgeoisie; in the United States we observe the same picture as that in Britain. As the class struggle and its revolutionary manifestations grow, the tendency to an increasing levelling down of the bourgeois parties will increase.

In the proletariat we observe the same tendency, but so far it is in a weaker form and is retarded in its development.

Capitalism has divided the proletariat into sections by innumerable barriers: political, economic, national, religious, craft and others. These partitions, among which a big part is played by the wall between the organised and the unorganised, form an obstacle to the unification of the proletariat first and foremost within the framework of separate capitalist States, an obstacle to the establishment of a united front of the proletariat opposed to the capitalist class who have united and organised during the epoch of imperialism, and are carrying out attacks on the proletariat. The breaking down of these barriers is a basic condition without which the proletariat cannot withstand the pressure of the capitalist class and cannot pass to a resolute counter-attack. That is the basic problem, one which arises before all the working class as their situation grows worse owing to capitalist rationalisation at the present stage of the crisis in capitalism, and a problem which becomes clearer and clearer through the experience which that class obtains from the struggles already begun.

And in the present struggles we do observe growing attempts of the proletariat to set up its own united class front, and during these attempts the barriers between separate sections are broken down, the framework of the Party and trade union organisations is burst through, the obstacles are set aside. But this tendency is only of a temporary character. At the end of the mass attack all the previous divisions are restored. In Czecho-Slovakia, where the leadership of the mass attacks of the proletariat is a passive one so far as our Party is concerned, this striving for a united front has during the past year broken out in the form of an elemental formation of that front by the workers themselves from below, by the workers breaking through the limitations of their party and union organisations. In Germany (and in Lodz also) our Parties succeeded in taking control of this movement and in organising a united front of the unorganised and the organised workers (members of the unattached, the Hirsch-Dunker and Christian trade unions) breaking down the wall between these two sections.

The Ruhr experience in organising the workers around single militant committees is of enormous first-rate importance, and deserves the most attentive study. It also reveals one other new feature of the present class struggles—the growing tendency in the working masses to break down and destroy the innumerable barriers disintegrating the proletariat. This tendency connotes the beginning of political emancipation from the influence of the bourgeois parties and social-democracy of the workers who have hitherto followed them. Without this political emancipation there can be no talk of the creation of a single class front of the proletariat against a single-class front of the bourgeoisie. A tremendous change is beginning in the consciousness of these workers, a complete revolution which is destroying the parliamentary traditions which have been firmly rooted in them over decades. This is a real break-up of the political barriers which

will have its result in an organisational break-up.

There is no revolutionary crisis in Germany at present, there are only its precursors. Yet even in the preliminary struggles the proletariat is beginning to shake and break down the barriers hindering its unification. This reveals all the depths of the approaching revolutionary rise.

During the epoch of finance capital political unity becomes a matter of the most vital necessity. How does that unity occur? It occurs, as the experience of the present struggles shows, by putting forward a political platform common to all the participants in the particular class attack, and containing those basic political demands and slogans around which the workers can be united whilst remaining in various political parties and trade unions. In the Ruhr such slogans were: "Against compulsory arbitration," "Against the coalition," "Against the triple alliance of capitalists, government and trade union heirarchy." This is not yet the final break-up of the political barriers dividing the workers, it is only giving them a jolt. The workers succeed in doing this only temporarily, during the period of the joint struggle, against the frantic opposition of the social-democrats first and foremost, these latter struggling for the preservation and perpetuation of the disintegration of the proletariat, and, as the agents of capital among the working class, having the chief role to play in this business. As the struggle grows and develops the single political platform becomes wider and will approximate more and more to the Comintern platform. It would be erroneous to regard the destruction of the political barriers disintegrating the proletariat as an easy matter. On the contrary, it is a work demanding enormous efforts on the part of the Comintern sections. Only by way of repeated attempts at political unification of the workers belonging to various parties and organisations during their mass attacks shall we be successful in preparing the transfer from temporary political unification to a more permanent one. And to the same extent we shall be successful in preparing a more permanent organisational unification of the struggling workers by way of repeated attempts at their temporary unification in mass attacks.

We have reached the fourth and last characteristic feature of the present class struggles, the creation by the proletariat and in the actual process of struggle of temporary organisations uniting its heterogeneous sections and taking on themselves the leading role. It is not enough to break up the political and organisational frameworks of the social-democratic and bourgeois parties and reformist trade unions. It is necessary to organise the workers in their mass attacks, uniting in temporary organisations both the unorganised and the organised workers, who have broken away from their organisations. This is quite a new type of organisation for the western-European proletariat, a point which must on no account be forgotten. During long decades they have carried on their economic struggle exclusively under the leadership of the trade union organisations, which have also been followed in part by the unorganised workers, whilst the political struggle (almost exclusively parliamentary) has been carried on under the leadership of the political parties. Now the proletariat is beginning to enter the struggle under the leadership of quite new organs (single strike or anti-lockout committees, single committees of struggle) raised by the democratic method from the ranks of the struggling proletariat themselves and uniting the masses of unorganised together with the organised. During the very course of the struggle these organs put forward not only economic but political demands also, i.e., they unite the economic with the political struggle. The old "division of labour" between the political parties and the trade unions is beginning to take a back seat before the workers' eyes. Simultaneously with the fusion of the economic and the political struggle during the wide class attacks, new forms of political struggle are raised to the first place, and also new forms of organisation of the struggling proletariat, new organisational forms for the realisation of the united front. In the course of the development of the struggle the new organs of the united front are beginning to take on themselves a number of new functions as organs of wide mass movements of the proletariat. They work out a single political program, they extend the front of struggle, drawing in new divisions of workers, they carry on extensive agitation, organising large workers'

meetings, issuing flysheets, bulletins, newspapers, they organise pickets, self-defence, they set up auxiliary organisations, and so on.

The new organs for leadership of the workers' mass attacks (single committees of struggle, single committees of action) are developing in the direction of soviets. They are not soviets; without a directly revolutionary situation, without a militant attack of the largest masses they could not become soviets. But they are a preliminary school for the coming soviets.

We can find a certain analogy to the modern mass attacks and the organs thrown up by them in the enormous movement of the Russian workers in the south of Russia in 1903-4. There also were set up temporary broad unformulated organisations of workers who elected their deputies for the creation of the leading organs. These organs were precursors of the soviets.

We have traced the characteristic peculiarities of the present class struggles, and have revealed four main features which are new: the reciprocally offensive character, the tendency to a wide extension of the class front within certain limits, whilst giving these struggles a directly political, revolutionary quality: the shaking and breaking of all kinds of barriers, and first and foremost the party and trade union barriers dividing the proletariat into sections; and finally, new forms of organisation of the proletarian masses, thrown up during the class attacks on capital. All these features compose only different aspects of the one single process. And they all constitute a basis for the resolution of the new problems raised by the present class conflicts, as preliminary clashes of classes, during the intruction, preparation, mobilisation and deploying of forces in the coming class wars of the new revolutionary rise. These problems must not be invented in one's mind, they must be deduced from the reality, from an analysis of that reality. What during our analysis has appeared to us in the form of characteristic features of the modern struggles will be transformed into guiding indications when we work over the problems and determine the immediate tasks.

The most important problem thrown up by the present struggles of the proletariat, and the one in which all their most important features find a concentrated expression is the problem of the organisation of the unorganised.

The organisation of the unorganised is a new specific form of the mobilisation and organisation of the working class during this highest stage of development of finance capital, the stage it has reached in the foremost imperialist countries (the United States, Germany and France) and of organisation for the proletariat's attack on monopolist united capital. In this form proceeds the political and organisational emancipation of the proletariat from the influence of the reformists and bourgeoisie, the walls between the organised and unorganised are broken down, the proletariat learns by experience to mobilise swiftly and to organise its ranks, and also learns the art of flexible manœuvring whilst throwing up from its ranks the finest active elements who enter the struggle committees and are connected up with the Comintern sections. Thus the pre-requisites are set up for the organisation of more stable and more prolonged unifications of the broad worker masses, unifications which can only take the form of soviets.

The problem of organising the unorganised was formulated in the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the Profintern and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. The Comintern had also passed decisions on the organisation of the unorganised and committees of struggles previously to that congrees. But only now, as the result of the experience of the Ruhr and Lodz, as the result of the experience gained in the organisation of new revolutionary trade unions in the United States, are the really enormous historical dimensions of the problem of organising the unorganised beginning to emerge.

4. THE TASKS OF THE COMINTERN SECTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NEW PROBLEMS

It is difficult to convey any idea of the profound indignation and anger evoked among the social-democrats and also among the opportunist elements both inside the Comintern and those excluded, by this presentation of the problem of organising the unorganised.

"The splitting of the working class," "the splitting of the organised and the unorganised," "the splitting of the trade unions," "the transformation of the C.P. into the party of the unorganised"—these far from exhaust even the chief accusations. The Brand-

lerites worked themselves up into such a frenzy that to all these accusations they added the accusation that the German C.P. was counter-revolutionary, since owing to the new tactics of organising the unorganised it was becoming the "finest assistant to the social-democratic strategists of defeat."

In no other question is it possible to find such direct contradiction of views between the right wingers and the conciliators on the one hand and the Comintern on the other, and furthermore such a close approximation, an almost complete coincidence in views between the former and the social democrats, as on this question of organising the unorganised. On this question we are faced with a united intellectual bloc of the social-democrats, the right wingers and the conciliators.

What particularly annoys the social-democrats and the Communist opportunists is this desecration of two sacred and inviolable principles: the principle that the organised are more advanced and more militant than the unorganised, and secondly the principle of the unity of the trade unions.

Despite the evident facts which show that in the Ruhr and at Lodz the unorganised were in advance of the organised and held out firmly to the end, they all cry in one voice as to the necessity of maintaining the centre of gravity among the organised. The Brandlerite, Enderle, who during the Ruhr lockout went specially to the Ruhr in order to send back to the right wingers' organ ("Against the Current") the meanest of Menshevik slanderous correspondence against the Committees of struggle and against the C.P. (after which correspondence the reformists, who had completely lost their heads at first because of the successes of the committees of struggle, grew bolder and followed the example of Enderle and the other right wingers in a slanderous campaign against these committees) this Enderle asserts this view stubbornly.

The conciliators repeat what Enderle has said almost word for word. In their "platform" they write: "The leadership does not know how to distribute the striking forces of the attack in order to ensure that the centre of gravity should pass to the ranks of the organised." The assertion that the "unorganised are a more revolutionary factor than the organised" is in their view "a leftward deviation." (The already quoted resolution of Mayer and the "Vorwaerts" contemptuously treats the unorganised as blind, backward misers merely because they do not join the union owing to the necessity of paying membership contributions.)

The problem of organising the unorganised is represented by both the right wingers and the conciliators as secondary and subsidiary to the attacks of the workers organised in trade unions, and as realisable only through the trade unions. "The mass of unorganised can be drawn into the fighting front," write the conciliators, "only if the party has its feet firmly planted in the ranks of the organised." In practice this would connote the postponement of the problem of organising the unorganised until the party had won the trade unions. And when that will happen, or whether it will ever happen, no one states, or could state.

To the right wingers and the conciliators the idea that at the present stage of the development of world revolution there are deep springs for the revolutionising of the most backward masses of the proletariat is quite alien. They do not understand that the international proletarian revolution is impossible without an extensive rise of the revolutionary movement of the unorganised. The whole enormous historical problem of organising the unorganised simply does not exist so far as they are concerned. Nothing fresh whatever has happened, they maintain, everything is going on as before. Trade unions, the form of organisation which from time immemorial has directed the economic struggle of the proletariat, are in existence. It is necessary to bring the unorganised into the trade unions. That is the organisation of the unorganised. That is how the right-wingers and conciliators (jointly with the social-democrats) interpret this problem.

On the basic question, the question of organising the unorganised, the viewpoint of the right-wingers and the conciliators is diametrically contrary to that of the Comintern. It could not be otherwise: anyone who regards the stabilisation of capitalism as becoming stronger, anyone who does not see an intensification in the general crisis of capitalism and the approach of a fresh revolutionary rise, cannot understand the decisive importance of

the problem of organising the unorganised, will preach a social-democratic viewpoint on this problem.

How does the "Vorwaerts" regard this question?

"We do not wish to deprive the Muscovites," it ironically writes, "of their faith in the revolutionary unorganised, which after the war flooded the trade unions, and then left them when the question of paying membership contributions arose." (What biting irony! And what a Marxist profundity in giving a "materialistic" explanation of the reasons for workers leaving the trade unions! Truly it would be difficult to imagine more dull-witted vulgarity.) "All the more should we work against the Communist slogan: 'With the unorganised against the unions!' doing everything possible to draw the unorganised into the unions."

The "Vorwaerts" threats to draw the unorganised into the trade unions are ludicrous. Why did they not do so in the Ruhr? Why, on the contrary, were the doors of the trade unions closed fast there? The fly-blown social-democratic politicians realise very well that to draw the unorganised into the trade unions at the present time would be tantamount to strengthening the left-wing revolutionary opposition in the unions, the opposition which they are now preparing to throw out of the unions entirely.

It is impossible to understand either the cardinal importance of the problem or organising the unorganised, as a basis for the political and organisational unification of the proletariat with a view to opening an attack on capital, or the difficulties which will lie inevitably along the road of realising this problem, if we leave out of account for one moment the fact that the organisation of the unorganised by the Communists will have to maintain a most desperate, a most ruthless struggle against the social-democrats and their assistants in the right-wing Communists and conciliators. The organisation of the unorganised undermines the basis on which social-democracy still maintains its position. That is why the first attempts to organse the unorganised are evoking a frantic exasperation among the social-democrats. That exasperation was particularly strongly expressed recently in connection with the organisation of committees of struggle among the German textile workers and miners, and also in connection with the new tactic of the German C.P. at the election of factory committees, a tactic based on the mobilisation and organisation of the unorganised. The social-democrats foam at the mouth and threaten to throw out of the unions all who take the very least part in the committees of struggle, or in the election committees organising the unorganised for the elections to the factory committees, or in the independent lists of candidates set up in opposition to the trade union monopolistic lists.

The right-wingers and conciliators absolutely fail to realise the decisive importance of organising the unorganised in the task of wresting the workers from the influence of the reformists. For instance, the conciliators talk thus of the struggle against reformism (Mayer's resolution, etc.). "The most important front of this work remains, as before, revolutionary work in the unattached trade unions, in the large trade union mass organisations of the German proletariat. Without the general strengthening of this work all the attempts to establish a united front in order to overcome reformism are foredoomed to failure."

In other words, a complete rejection of the Ruhr experience of organising the unorganised and the practical renunciation of that problem, and so a complete stultification of all the fine talk about the necessity to struggle "against the rightward deviation, which in practice is a denial in true social-democratic spirit of the importance of the unorganised."

Against whom do the conciliators direct these words? Against themselves.

No less frenzy and indignation are aroused among the social-democrats and the Communist opportunists by the desecration of the greatest of the reformist sanctums, the trade unions. They go into a sacred trepidation over the idea expressed by Stalin, that "a situation is quite conceivable in which it may prove necessary to set up parallel mass unions of the working class despite the will of the trade union hierarchy who have sold themselves to the capitalists. We have already had such a situation in America. It is quite possible that

the situation in Germany may arrive at this stage."

Not a day passes in Germany now without all the trade union hierarchy, all the social-democratic politicians, all the Brandlerites shouting the roof off over the immediate split of the trade unions being preached by Moscow, by the Comintern, by Stalin.

"Senseless, a mere phrase, a harlequinade," the "Vorwaerts" screams on every page.

"An open proclamation of a course for the splitting of the trade unions," the Brandlerites take up the strain. "It is not a question of the 'conceivability' or the 'possibility' of a split of the German trade unions in a more or less distant future, but of the proclamation of a split as soon as possible, at once." ("Against the Stream," No. 2.)

"The line of the Comintern Sixth Congress," the conciliators chorus, "completely excludes any play with the idea of creating parallel mass organisations in Germany." (Mayer's resolution, etc.)

Audacity in a direct, open, resolute setting of tasks was never lacking to the Bolsheviks. Consequently all the noise and hurly-burly over the immediate organisation of parallel mass organisations by the German C.P. as raised by the social-democrats, reformists and right-wingers in connection with comrade Stalin's declaration, have no real bases for existence. In no country except the United States has the Comintern yet set the task of organising new trade unions. When the situation brings this task to the forefront as ready for handling it will be set by the Comintern with all Bolshevik resolution and definiteness.

See how Lenin raised the question of the trade unions in his polemic against Serrati, whose argument was closely akin to that of the present right wingers (see Lenin's article "Lying talk of freedom"). "Serrati is afraid of a split, which would weaken the party and in particular the trade unions, the co-operatives, the municipalities. Don't destroy these institutions, necessary as they are to the construction of socialism—such is Serrati's chief thought. There is the same idea in the journal 'Communism,' No. 24 for 1927, edited by Serrati, in his article on the Second Congress of the Third International: 'Imagine the Milan commune (i.e., the town municipality of Milan), directed not by competent men, but by upstarts, who from yesterday merely have passed themselves off as ardent Communists.' Serrati is afraid of the break-up of the trade unions, the co-operatives, the municipalities, of the incapability and mistakes of the newcomers. The Communists are afraid of the sabotage of the revolution by the reformists. . . To compare with this danger the danger of 'loss' or failure, of errors, of the smashing of the trade unions, co-operatives, municipalities, and so on is simply ludicrous, and not only ludicrous but criminal. To risk all the fate of the revolution out of the idea that there may be failure in regard to the urban council of Milan and so on is to reveal a complete confusion, to reveal a complete lack of understanding of the radical task of the revolution, is to be completely incapable of preparing its victory."

As you see, Lenin did not stop before any obstacles interfering with the preparation of a victorious revolution, he took the road of splits, the shattering of the trade unions, co-operatives and so on for the sake of the interests of the revolution. The well-being of the revolution is the highest law (one of Plekhanov's favourite utterances when he was still a revolutionary). It is quite useful to recall how Lenin put the issue of trade unions to those who, whilst calling themselves Leninists, regarded the unity of the trade unions as the highest law, men like the right wing Melcher, for instance, who in his memorandum to the Profintern Fourth Congress called for a fusion of the red trade unions with the Amsterdam International, and declared that if they did so the "fighting power of the international trade union movement would be increased to an enormous extent."

Both the Fourth Congress of the Profintern and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern strongly emphasised the necessity for further work inside the trade unions with a view to their being won. It is possible even that a partial conquest of individual trade union organisations may be achieved by resort definitely to the movement of the unorganised, by introducing the unorganised in masses into the trade unions, especially on the basis of a sound leadership of the strike struggles. That is a plan which is in diametrical opposition to the

plan put forward by the conciliators, which proposes to win the unorganised on the basis of the reformist unions.

But it must not be forgotten that the reformist trade union machinery and especially its bourgeois upper ranks stand resolutely athwart the road of the movement and organisation of the unorganised. Consequently the Comintern may be faced with the necessity in a revolutionary situation of creating parallel mass organisations.

At the moment this question arises in a practical form nowhere except in America. Nor could it arise in a practical form at the moment. It may seem to some that it is delusive to organise a new mass organisation from those workers who have entered a mass strike or lock-out under the leadership of a committee of struggle, who would thus be temporarily united in one organisation, and afterwards, when the struggle was ended for organisation to cease existence. The question may arise in some comrades' minds, why not maintain that organisation and develop it further?

Such an approach to the problem of organising the unorganised is a bureaucratic, narrow, organisational approach. To put the issue thus is to reveal a lack of understanding of all the social profundity and all the political importance of organising of the unorganised, as being at the present period a main method of creating the pre-requisites for a united revolutionary attack of the proletariat on the capitalist class, with a view to overthrowing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. If the creation of new mass revolutionary organisations were such an easy task the socialist revolution would have been accomplished long since.

It is a question of organising the class in its attacks (of course, not the whole class, which under capitalism is impossible) and this kind of broad organisation cannot be permanent. It inevitably has a temporary quality, it is set up for the purpose of the mass attack and with its close it inevitably dissolves. To think that these organisations can become permanent is to reveal a lack of understanding of their essence and character, and also of the conditions of their development. It is to confuse the trade unions and the soviets.

Such do not understand that in order to create new mass revolutionary oragnisations it is necessary that the masses themselves should be re-educated through their own experience of mass attacks, that they should abandon the firmly held and previously developed opinions, prejudices, traditions, that they should pass the bounds of the social-democratic and bourgeois political and reformist trade union organisations, to which they have belonged sometimes for decades, that they should become convinced through their own experience in mass attacks that the new organisational forms (the temporary unformulated organisations around the committees of struggle) have advantages over the old customary organisations which have led them for decades, and finally that they should throw up new active elements which under the leadership of the C.P. should take on themselves the execution of the difficult task of organising new mass associations of the proletariat.

Without passing through this school of mobilisation, organisation and struggle the new mass organisations cannot be set up, irrespective of whether they are trade unions or soviets.

We have just said "under the leadership of the C.P." But it is permissible to ask the question whether the Comintern sections would be able to handle the task of creating new permanent mass workers' organisations, if that task were regarded by them as an immediate task of the present day. Are the Comintern sections ready for that work to-day?

It is necessary to give an exact and clear answer to this question.

What has been the course of development of the Comintern sections? Under what conditions have these sections developed?

The majority of the sections have developed under legal conditions. Secondly, of all the legal sections only the German C.P. has really been under fire in revolutionary battles. Thirdly, in the work of the Comintern legal sections the practical leadership of the masses, in their everyday struggle and in their attacks, has lagged extraordinarily behind their propagandist work.

Have such conditions been sufficient to en-

sure the Bolshevisation of the parties? They have not. That is quite clear if we remember how, under what conditions, through what ruthless struggle, in what a militant atmosphere the first Bolshevik Party, the C.P.S.U. grew and strengthened.

Without such a militant school there cannot be a genuinely Bolshevik party. And without the "war baptism" the Comintern sections which have not yet "smelt powder" cannot free themselves wholly from the still strong traditions of legalism, which bind them hand and foot and put their representatives sometimes into the almost uncontrolled disposition of the reformists. Even in the German C.P. these legalist traditions still exist.

The Comintern sections must themselves learn by experience, in the practice of mass attacks, in the practice of the creation of temporary mass organisations, must re-educate their old ranks, must draw in new, driving out all the social-democratic, right wing and conciliatory vestiges and traditions. The party cannot give the solution of the problem of organising the unorganised any practical basis if that problem is not raised by the party in all its social profundity and in all its political significance, as a struggle for the organisation of the proletariat on new bases ensuring its victory, and if that problem is not raised in all its dimensions, in its connection with the characteristic peculiarities and distinguishing features of the growing revolutionary rise and the battles now taking place.

The developing revolutionary prospect faces the Comintern sections with the central task of transforming themselves from preponderantly propagandist organisations into revolutionary staffs of the millions of proletariat and toilers entering into struggle, i.e., of transforming themselves into Bolshevik parties. And this can be achieved only under two conditions: first of their permanent close contact with the masses and their practical leadership in their everyday struggles and their wide-flung attacks, and second of a resolute, incessant unswerving struggle against all deviations from Leninism, and especially against the rightward deviation and a conciliatory attitude towards it, which at the present time constitutes the chief obstacle on the road of the speedy Bolshevisation of the Comintern sections.

During the period which has elapsed since the decline of the first revolutionary wave of 1918-19, during the period of "breathing-space" now drawing to a close, opportunist elements have accumulated in the ranks of the Comintern, and have worked out a philosophy of the "breathing-space," not yet openly proclaimed and not completely formulated. The fundamental idea of this philosophy consists in the conception of the possibility of a protracted peaceful cohabitation of the U.S.S.R. with the capitalist world, (and inside the U.S.S.R., with the new bourgeoisie, and even of a stable peace between the two "protagonists"). Theoretically this philosophy seeks to find bases for support in attempts to reconcile Lenin with Kautsky and to unite the bourgeois dictatorship with the proletarian dictatorship. Practically the unification of the two dictatorships has to proceed by way of "corresponding" concessions on the part of the U.S.S.R. The first step along the road of concessions has to be the cessation of the forcing of socialist construction inside the U.S.S.R. and of forcing the international revolution outside its boundaries.

This is the essence of the rightward deviation, its social-democratic essence, which, on the eve of new struggles, before the prospect of a new revolutionary rise is desperately resisting the transformation of the Comintern sections into the staff of the revolution.

The opportunist elements in the ranks of the Comintern have lost all taste for revolutionary storms, which bring with them dangers, difficulties, disturbances, convlusions. An invisible power is drawing them into the quiet harbours of reformism.

Their road is not ours.

Our road, the road of the Leninist Communist International, is forward to meet the revolutionary storms.

Marx and Lenin in the Proletarian Revolution

E. Yaroslavsky

The service of Marx and Engels to the working class may be expressed in a few words as follows: they taught the working class self-reliance and consciousness and put science in the place of visioning.—(Lenin: "F. Engels.")

The greatest emancipating movement of an oppressed class in the world, the most revolutionary of classes in history, is impossible without a revolutionary theory. This theory cannot be fabricated, it grows out of the accumulated revolutionary experience and thought of all the countries of the world. Such a theory developed in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is called Marxism.—(Lenin: "Against the Stream.")

Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. More exactly: Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. —(Stalin: "Theory and Practice of Leninism," p. 10.)

ON the eve of the stormy period of revolution in Western Europe, in a period of storm and stress, arose the revolutionary thought of Karl Marx. Marx assimilated greedily what could be "smelt in the air," he filled himself with the spirit of the age, deeply laboured, analysed it with painstaking care, formulated conclusions which unfailingly served centuries, defining the revolutionary tactics of the workers' parties for whole decades, extending over all epochs of the organisation of workers' parties and their first class-struggles.

Marx was, together with Engels, one of the organisers of these parties.

Already in 1844, Marx was in close touch with the first workers' organisations arising at that time in Switzerland, Germany, London and Paris. In the introduction to the brochure of Marx "The Communist Trial at Cologne," Engels recounts how in 1844 he visited Marx in Paris and expressed full agreement with Marx in all theoretical questions, as also in 1845, "when we . . . . again met in Brussels, Marx, proceeding from the above fundamental principles, had already worked out the main lines of his materialist theory of history, and we accepted this newly-discovered method of research for detailed working out in the most diverse fields." From the field of Utopian dreamings Communism became a scientifically grounded theory, with a programme of action, "Communism no longer remained a fantastic visioning of all possible more complete ideal societies, but the definition of the origins and conditions of proletarian struggle and its objectives developing from them." (F. Engels.)

It is well known, that Marx and Engels working on the theory of historical materialism, did not for one moment stand apart from the proletarian movement at that time developing. "We by no means intended to achieve new scientific results available exclusively to the 'educated' world, recording them in bulky tomes; on the contrary, we went deeply into the political movement, we gathered a goodly number of followers in the cultured world, especially in Western Germany and had sufficient contact with the organised proletarians. We were duty bound to scientifically ground our views, but no less important was for us the rallying of the European and, above all, the German proletariat to the side of our standpoint."

In Brussels Marx and Engels organised the Society of German Workers (Deutsche Arbeiterbund) which issued the "German Brussels News" ("Deutsche-Brüsseler Zeitung"), and maintained contact with the revolutionary section of the English Chartists through the editor of the Chartist organ "Northern Star," Julian Harney,

Marx was vice-president of the Democratic Society in Brussels and at the same time in close touch with the French social-democrats of "La Réforme."

In 1846 and 1847 Marx and Engels organised the Committee of Communist Correspondence, which was connected with the workers' organisations of France, Switzerland and England, and endeavoured to guide their activities by sending out special circular letters.

In the revolution of 1848 Marx already appeared as a Communist, giving as the joint author with Engels, the "Programme of Action for Communist Parties of All Countries."

The "Federation of the Just" at its Congress in the summer of 1847 in London, changed its name to the Communist League, and the programme of this League was based on the views of the Communist Manifesto, drafted by Marx and Engels. The first paragraph of the Statutes of the Communist League was formulated completely in the spirit of the Communist Manifesto. "The object of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the destruction of the old bourgeois society based on the antagonism of classes, and the foundation of a new society without classes and private property."

We dealt somewhat in detail with the foregoing because it is in this period that the basic teaching of Marx on the class struggle and the role of the proletariat was worked out, which serves as the basis for the entire further practice of the Communist movement of the working class. Marx was not a passive spectator of great events, he was a militant participant in these events. To him belongs the leading role in the creation of the First International. He took an enthusiastic part in the first steps of the social-democratic movement, followed the developed of this movement and helped it by fighting all opportunist movements of his time.

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx considered it necessary to attack decisively such theories as "feudal socialism"—half echo of the past, half menace of the future, at times, by its bitter witty and incisive criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core, but always ludicrous in its effect, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of history."

Marx sharply criticises "petty bourgeois socialism" (at the head of which stood Sismondi), which "dissected with great acuteness the contradiction in the conditions of modern production . . . . laid bare the hypocritical apologies of economists," but which "aspired either to restoring the old means of production and exchange, and with them the old property relations, and the old society, or to cramping the modern means of production and of exchange within the framework of the old property relations that have been and were bound to be exploded by these means," which, therefore is "both reactionary and Utopian."

Just as ruthlessly Marx criticised German or "true" socialism. "The role of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in the dew of sickly sentiment"; against the Conservative or bourgeois socialism to which school belong "economists, philantrophists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every kind," the entire wisdom of whom is summed up in the fact that: "the bourgeois is a bourgeois—for the benefit of the working class." Marx criticised, although less sharply, the critical utopian socialism and Communism of St. Simon, Fourier, Owen, Babeuf, Truly, "The founders of these systems see, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But the proletariat, as yet in its infancy, offers to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement."

Some were displeased by the criticism of Marx and Engels of those theories in such an important document as the Communist Manifesto, just as in the period of the Third International for example the Trotskyists are displeased that the programme of the Communist International devotes attention to such theories as the theory of Guild Socialism of Hobson, the Austro-Marxism of Otto Bauer, the Constructive socialism of MacDonald, and co-operative socialism, etc., that the programme of the Communist International explains the reactionary role of anarchism and "revolutionary" syndicalism, that in regard to the colonial countries the programme of the Communist International points out the especially harmful role of such theories as Sun-Yat-Senism in China, Gandhism in India, or Garveyism among the negro masses in the present period.

These people forget that the all-sufficing theory of the workers' movement demands the relentless exposure of such theories, which endeavour to establish influence over the working class, and which have nothing in common with the revolutionary movement of the working class.

In the article "Marxism and Revisionism" Lenin gives such an estimation of the struggle Marx and Engels waged against all opportunist and revisionist tendencies :

"For the first half-century of its existence (from the forties of the nineteenth century) Marxism fought the theories which were naturally opposed to it.

"In the first half of the forties Marx and Engels squared accounts with the radical young Hegelians, who stood for philosophic idealism. At the end of the forties they led the struggle in the economic field—against Proudhonism : the fifties completed this struggle : the criticism of parties and doctrines transformed into the storm of 1848. In the sixties the struggle is carried from the field of general theory to questions nearer and more immediate to the workers' movement : the exclusion of Bakuninism from the First International. At the commencement of the seventies in Germany there arose for a short time the Proudhonist Mulberger ; at the end of the seventies, the positivist Dühring. But the influence of one or the other on the proletariat was completely destroyed. Marxism already conquered indisputably all other ideas of the workers' movement.

"With the nineties of the last century this victory was, on main issues, complete.

"Nevertheless, this did not mean that the struggle against the teachings of Marx was concluded, often among the Marxists themselves.

"When Marxism exploded all those teachings wholly opposed to itself, those tendencies, which had found expression in such teachings, sought new means of expression. The form and means of struggle changed, but the struggle continued. The second half century of the existence of Marxism commenced (nineties) with the struggle of the anti-Marxist tendencies within Marxism. Pre-Marxist socialism is exploded, it now continues the struggle not on its own independent basis, but on the general basis of Marxism, as revisionism."

Lenin analyses exactly how revisionism attempted to give battle to the revolutionary Marxist theory in various fields.

In what consisted this revisionism ?

"It determined its activities from case to case, adjusted itself to the events of the day, to somersaults in political details, forgetting the root interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the entire capitalist structure, all capitalist evolution, sacrificing these root interests for real or fancied gains of the moment—such is the revisionist policy."

Lenin prefaced this by saying that for the revisionists, for those "fellow-travellers," of whom there are not few in our workers' movement, "every somewhat 'new' question, somewhat unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, although perhaps this changes the basic line of development in only a miniature degree and for a very short time—unavoidably will always call forth this or the other aspect of revisionism." How correct Lenin has proved to be in his prognosis ! How many times since those lines were written during the last twenty years have unexpected and unforeseen turns of events brought forward different aspects of revisionism !

What is the class content of this revisionism ? What explains its inevitable appearance in different countries ? Lenin explains this, "that in all capitalist countries, side by side with the proletariat, are always large strata of petty bourgeoisie, small master men." Capitalism was born and permanently generates from small production. Whole groups of "middle strata" are inevitably created by capitalism (small workshops, accessory factories, "out-work" at home), thrown up in all countries by the demands of big industry (*e.g.*, bicycle and motor industry, etc.).

These new small producers are just as inevitably again thrown down into the ranks of the proletariat.

Small wonder that the petty bourgeois outlook breaks out again and again in the ranks of all big workers' parties.

It is perfectly natural that it must be so and will remain so right up to the advent of the proletarian revolution, for it would be a serious mistake to imagine that it is necessary

to "completely" proletarianise a majority of the population for the realisation of such a revolution.

"That which we now experience, partially only ideologically : differences with theoretical corrections of Marx—that which now breaks forth merely in separate partial questions of the workers' movement in practical work, as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on these grounds—will be certainly undergone by the working class again under indisputably greater dimensions, when the proletarian revolution sharpens all questions of differences, concentrates all disagreements on those points of the most immediate significance for the determination of the leadership of the mass, and in the dust of battle compel the separation of enemies from friends and discards bad allies for the heaping of decisive blows to the enemy." (Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism.")

* * * * *

Lenin was an immediate continuator of the work of Marx. Lenin commences his revolutionary activity approximately when Marx concludes. If the views of Marx ripened on the eve of the revolutionary storm of 1848, then the ideas of Lenin formulated on the eve of the first Russian revolution, 1905-07. Marx actively participated in the organisation of the first Communist League and the first International Workingmen's Association—the First International.

He worked out together with Engels the most important documents which have led the whole workers' movement. He gave a deep fundamental theory to the workers' movement of whole epochs.

Lenin continues the work of Marx. He was the organiser of the workers' party, a party which became the advance-guard of the revolutionary socialist movement of the whole world. Lenin worked out the fundamental directives which laid the basis of the practice of the workers' movement not only of Russia, but also other countries for whole epochs, epochs of war and revolution, the last stage of capitalist development—the epoch of imperialism.

Lenin was the organiser of that movement, the organiser of the Communist International, he worked out the most important questions connected with the practice of that movement. Marx gave a deep analysis of the capitalist development in concise form, filled with the whole ardour of the proletarian revolution; "The capitalist fabric is shattered, the knell of capitalist private property is sounding—the expropriation of the expropriators."

Lenin in the new epoch, in the epoch of imperialism developed the teaching of Marx, showed how in that stage the development of capitalism was of a jumpy, unequal, character, and that the unequal development of the different imperialist countries leads to inevitable social revolutions in separate countries and the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country or a number of countries

Marx lived through the epoch of the Commune, he made forceful revolutionary conclusions from that great effort to create a new type of State. Lenin lives through the epoch of three consecutive liberating revolutions in Russia : he leads these revolutions; before his eyes already in 1905 the Soviets were born, and Lenin systematised everything said by Marx and Engels on the question of the State, and on the basis of the experience of two revolutions—1905 and February, 1917, and this study gives on the eve of the October revolution 1917, his teachings on State and revolution. The experience of the Paris Commune proves how the proletariat, capturing the State power and smashing the old State machine, may build a new type of State.

This new type of State is the republic of Soviets.

Lenin wrote his work, "State and Revolution" on the eve of the October battles. In the foreword of the 30th November, 1917, Lenin wrote: "This little book was written in August and September, 1917. I had already drawn up the plan for the next, the seventh, chapter, on the experiences of the Russian revolutions of 1905 to 1917.

"But, apart from the title, I had not succeeded in writing a single line of the chapter, being presented therefrom by a political crisis—the eve of the November revolution of 1917. Such a hindrance can only be welcomed. However, this final part of the book devoted to the lessons of the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, will probably have to be put off for a long time. It is more pleasant and

more useful to live through the experience of a revolution than to write about it."

Marx, at the first sign of the awakening of revolutionary consciousness in the masses of China and India, made bold prophecies of the future revolutionary events in those countries. Lenin lives in the epoch of the rising mass revolutionary movement in these countries—China, India, Turkey, Persia and others, the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Lenin had already not merely prophesised the development of revolutionary events, he participated in them, he gives them clear and concise formulations, he gives them revolutionary slogans, he outlines the basis of revolutionary tactics—the tactics of the Communists of these countries. Lenin lives in the period prophesied by Marx, the epoch of war and revolution, and in the epoch when the bourgeoisie subjects the social-democratic parties to its influence, and makes them weapons of its policy; Lenin boldly and unhesitatingly breaks with the Second International and organises the new International Workingmen's Association—the Third International. He creates the revolutionary tactics of the working class in this epoch of war and revolution. He shows the way, how the working class must conduct the war against war, how to convert the war, war for the division of the earth, war for annexations and contributions, plunder and loot, into war against the bourgeoisie, into socialist revolution.

Marx, on the basis of the great experience of the European revolution gives his immortal laws and rules of armed insurrection. For Marx the armed insurrection, as war, is an art. He studies the tactics of war; the military works of Klauser and other authorities on military affairs were carefully remarked and pencilled by Lenin, and on the eve of the October battles Lenin issues (8-10-17) his "Advice from One Absent."

"Armed insurrection is a special form of political struggle, subject to special rules which must be deeply reflected upon.

"Karl Marx expressed this thought with particular clearness when he said that 'Armed insurrection like warfare, is an art.'

"The principal rules of this art, as laid down by Marx, are as follows:

"(1) Never play with insurrection, and, when it is once begun, understand clearly that it must be carried through to the end.

"(2) Collect, at the decisive place and time, forces which are greatly superior to those of the enemy, otherwise the latter, better prepared and organised, will annihilate the insurgents.

"(3) Once the insurrection has begun, it is necessary to act with the utmost vigour and to wage at all costs the offensive. 'The defensive is death to the insurrection.'

"(4) Make sure of taking the enemy by surprise, and take advantage of the moment when his troops are scattered.

"(5) Win successes each day even small ones (one might say 'each hour' in the case of a small town) and at all costs keep the 'moral superiority.'

"Marx has summarised the lessons of all revolutions or armed insurrections in the words of the greatest master of revolutionary tactics known to history, Danton: 'Be daring, be still more daring, be daring always.'"

As it is impossible to conceive of the Communist League and the First International without Marx and Engels, so the Communist International is inconceivable without Lenin.

* * * * *

Even in his very earliest works Lenin displays a deep acquaintance with the works of Marx. Already in his work on the economic contents of Narodnikism and the criticism of them in the work of Struve in 1894, Lenin expresses philosophical views in complete accord with those of Marx and Engels. Marx was compelled to overcome various forms of anti-Marxist or revisionist theory for the triumph of his theory and to ensure the success of the workers' movement. Lenin in the first steps of his political activity attacks "the powers of thought" of his time—the "Narodniki" and the "Narodnikist" teachings, but at the same time in the ranks of the Marxists Lenin fights falsifications of Marxism, against the attempt to transform Marxism for the uses of bourgeois Liberalism.

He fights with the legal Marxists, with the "Economists," the "worker leaders" and in this is the great service of Lenin. Fulfilling this work he continued the work of Marx.

"The ideological struggle of revolutionary Marxism with revisionism at the end of the 19th century is only the presage of the mighty revolutionary battles of the proletariat, going forward to political victory in its fight. despite all vacillations and weaknesses of petty bourgeois outlook."

Lenin was completely justified in regarding his struggle against revisionist tendencies as the presage of the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat, and we, the followers of Lenin and those who continue his work, cannot regard otherwise our struggle against all attempts to revise the teachings of Lenin than as a necessary component part of those "great revolutionary struggles of the proletariat," cannot regard them otherwise than as struggles against vacillations and petty bourgeois outlook.

So Lenin regarded also his struggle against those philosophic tendencies directed against dialectic materialism.

"The new philosophy," wrote Lenin, "is just as partisan as that of two thousand years ago." In the struggle of philosophical tendencies Lenin perceived the "struggle of parties in philosophy," a struggle, "which, in the last resort expresses the tendencies and ideologies of the conflicting classes of modern society."

"The contending parties are in the main materialism and idealism, although their nature may be concealed under a pseudo-erudite verbal charlatanry or beneath the guise of a non-partisanship. Idealism is merely a cunning and refined form of fideism which, being fully armoured, has great organisations under its control and invariably continues to influence the masses, taking advantage of the least vacillation in philosophical thought."

So concluded Lenin his work on "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," which he wrote in the period of the decline of the revolution, in the period between two revolutions, when the liquidators increased their activities against the Bolshevik Party, and when among the Bolsheviks themselves serious confusion and vacillation were in evidence.

In this part of his works on philosophy, Lenin also continued the work of Marx and Engels, the donors of the foundations of the theory of historical materialism as a philosophical system, which not merely explains the world, but teaches how to transform that world in the interests of the working class.

For Lenin, however, theoretical work must above all lead to the concrete study of the form of antagonism between classes, the study of their connections, and of the outcome of development: "It must reveal this antagonism everywhere, where it is hidden by political history, the peculiarities of the systems of jurisprudence, or instituted by theoretical prejudices. It must give a complete picture of our real surroundings, as a definite system of productive relationships, showing the necessity of exploitation and the expropriation of the labouring mass under that system, and show the way out from this order of things indicated by economic development."

So Lenin already in 1894 in his work "Who are the Friends of the People?" defined the theoretical tasks.

It is necessary also to add that just as the analysis of the capitalist epoch by Marx is unequalled—so the analysis of Lenin of the last epoch of capitalism—the imperialist epoch—is unequalled. Whole volumes have been written on the epoch of imperialism—it suffices but to mention such work as that of Hilferding—and not one of these theoreticians possessed the boldness of thought to form such conclusions which to-day our workers' parties draw their revolutionary practice, from which develops the inevitability of socialist revolution. For that was necessary the deep devotion to the revolution which was incarnate in Lenin.

He as no other of our time completely mastered the dialectical method of Marx.

The achievement of Lenin consists in the fact that Lenin not merely was able to show the correctness of that method, in all the most important events of the epoch, but he also taught this and hundreds of thousands of his Leninist disciples to master this method.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to think, that Lenin only taught how to apply the laws of Marxism in practical work—Lenin not merely deeply valued the great significance of theory, he considered that "without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."

* * * * *

Lenin worked out the revolutionary tactics of Marxism during the epoch of proletarian revolution. Marx showed the irreconcilable contradictions between bourgeoisie and proletariat, which unavoidably lead to clashes and revolutionary struggles.

The aim of that struggle is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the setting up of the proletarian dictatorship.

In what must consist the tactics of the proletariat, the tactics of the proletarian party? It must clearly perceive the contradictions, and permanently raise and utilise them as the source of the development of revolutionary struggle. "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." (Communist Manifesto). The revolutionary tactics must consist in the rallying of masses for the realisation of these aims.

The masses cannot be rallied without distributing correct conceptions of revolutionary struggle and the class struggles amongst them about the aims of the movement, or without a great deal of propaganda work. Therefore the Communist Party "never ceases for a single instant to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat." (Communist Manifesto.)

Marx placed before the working class a revolutionary task: "Raise the proletariat to the position of a ruling class, to win the battle (of democracy)."

But it was necessary to show how to do this, and win the working class to believe in the possibility of the realisation of this task. The great achievement of Lenin consists in the fact that he was able to arm tens of thousands of leading workers in such a backward country as Russia with the teachings of Marxism and teach them how to do this, how "to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible." (Communist Manifesto.)

Marx advised the proletariat to bring to the front "as the leading question . . . . in all these movements . . . . the property question no matter what its degree of development," to support at the same time "every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things." (Communist Manifesto.) Marx advised the proletariat where necessary to labour "for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries." In this Marx placed before the proletariat the task of attaining the hegemony of the revolutionary movement. Lenin showed how this must be done, and despite all parties and groups, which tried to restrict the proletariat during mighty revolutionary events to an opposition role, to being mere accessories of the bourgeois movement, Lenin formulated the tasks of the proletariat with his Bolshevik Party, as the tasks of the leader of the proletarian revolution.

Lenin held, as Marx, that the success of the movement of the revolutionary proletariat depended on the degree to which the Communist Party could rally the masses to itself.

The idea itself could become a colossal material force if it dominates the masses.

"Our teaching is no dogma—but a guide to action," said Lenin. "We do not pretend that Marx or the Marxists know the way to socialism in all its concrete developments. That is nonsense. We know the direction of the road, we know which class forces lead to socialism, but concretely this will only be practically shown in the experience of millions, when they take action."

This is the chief task of the Bolshevik Party, as concisely formulated by Lenin and consists in attracting millions into politics. Only when it is a question of millions of masses can we speak of real politics. This is why, in April-July, 1917, when the masses of peasantry were still not implicated in the movement to the full, when among the soldier masses a defensive mood still hovered, Lenin considered the armed insurrection premature, even considered that particular moment fatal, and on the contrary, when things had completely reached the stage, where the million masses could be drawn in to the movement, Lenin held that delay meant death.

* * * *

The colossal service of Lenin, as also Marx lies in the fact that he defined the relationship of the proletariat and peasantry in the socialist revolution.

In his remarkable work, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," which Lenin wrote on the eve of the Russian revolution, during a period of comparative calm, which occurred after the outbreak of the big strikes of 1895-1896, Lenin gave an analysis of social and class structure which was fully endorsed by "the open political appearance of all classes in the course of the revolution." (Foreword to Second Edition, July, 1907.) That was a brilliant analysis of pre-revolutionary Russian economy, and this analysis, like the analysis of Marx of the development of classes in capitalist society, was magnificently upheld in the entire course of further development of class struggle in Russia and the entire world. It was important not merely to designate various strata of peasants, and the tendencies of their further development, but more important to show how the proletariat could react in the process of class struggle to separate strata of peasantry as allies, to show, that it must perceive in the poor and middle peasant strata such allies, and attract these strata to the side of the proletarian revolution.

The happy coincidence of the peasant revolution with the proletarian, under the leadership of the proletariat, led to the victory of the latter. Had the Bolshevik Party not been able, however, under Lenin's leadership, to define the correct relationships of the proletariat to the peasantry during and on the morrow of the revolution, to define the correct tactics in regard to the peasantry, the revolution would not have maintained victory over the bourgeoisie or landlords.

Lenin, as Marx, worked out the tactics of the proletariat up to the revolution in the period of unfolding revolutionary events and on the morrow of the revolution—in the period of capture of power. Already in his early work "Who are the Friends of the People?" Lenin outlined a plan of action and Marxist tactics, the tactics of the leading workers in the period of preparation of the revolution. This is the work of propaganda and organisation of the leading strata of the workers, creation of the workers' party, establishing opponents and allies, organisation of connections with these allies, studying and mastering the political experience of other revolutions, educating and tempering the proletariat and the strata of petty bourgeoisie allied with it, in revolutionary skirmishes with the class enemy, posing of such political tasks calculated to attract broader democratic forces to the side of the proletariat, learning and acquiring different methods of revolutionary struggle, demonstrations, strikes, general strikes, armed uprisings, and the permissibility under given circumstances of agreements with the revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Lenin was more than once—as Marx called a revolutionary romancer—a dreamer. Lenin answered the philistines and cowardly small bourgeois, who could not even dream of a revolutionary outcome, and were frightened by it:

"A revolutionary social-democrat spurns such theories with contempt. On the eve of the revolution he will not content himself with prophesying its 'bad end.' No, he will indicate the possibilities of a better conclusion. He will dream, he is duty bound to dream, unless he is a miserably hopeless philistine, that after the gigantic experience of Europe, after the unprecedented display of energy of the working class of Russia, we will be successful, as never before, in kindling the first small flame of the beacon of revolution before the dark and crushed masses, that we will succeed, thanks to the fact that we stand on the shoulders of a whole series of the revolutionary generations of Europe—to realise, in hitherto inconceivable magnitude, all democratic reforms, our entire minimum programme; that we will succeed to attain the stage where the Russian revolution will not be a movement of a few months but many years, that the revolution will not lead merely to a few concessions on the part of the powers that be but to the complete extirpation of those powers. If we succeed then . . . then the revolutionary flames will ignite Europe. In their turn the European workers, exasperated with bourgeois reaction, will rise and show us 'how it is done'; then the revolutionary upheaval of Europe will react on Russia, and the epoch of a few revolutionary years will become an epoch of a number of revolutionary decades, then . . . but we have time yet to speak of what we will do 'then,' we will speak not from the accursed distant Geneva, but before thousands of workers assembled on the

streets of Moscow and Petersburg, before the marching emancipated Russian moujiks."

Lenin not merely dreamed of that great swing of revolutionary energy of the working class, however. He was capable of building such a Bolshevik Party, which drew into the movement all forces, suitable to the ensuring of the strength of that revolutionary swing.

In the differences which were fought out between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and other political parties in the period of the first revolution on the question of the arming of the workers, the question of the organisation of uprisings (the arming of the workers, the relationship to the army, the creation of means of revolutionary power and the participation in temporary revolutionary governments), the question of relations to the peasantry, relations to bourgeois parties, Lenin always acted upon the precepts of Marxist theory. The Marxist theory was for him, as for all Bolsheviks, a guide to action.

In the period of the first revolution when the difference on guerrilla warfare took place, Lenin asks: "Which fundamental demands must all Marxists observe in the review of the question of forms of struggle?" and answers, "In the first place Marxism differs from all primitive forms of socialism inasmuch as it does not connect the movement with any one definite form of struggle. Marxism recognises the most varied forms of struggle, but does not fabricate them, but only organises, nurtures, and gives consciousness to all forms of struggle of revolutionary classes which arise naturally in the course of the movement. Unconditionally antagonistic to all ready-made formulæ, all doctrinaire recipes, Marxism demands an attentive attitude to the mass struggles in progress, which in the development of the movement, and with the growth of consciousness of the masses, with the sharpening of economic and political crises, produce newer and more variform means of defence and attack. Therefore Marxism does not refrain from any form of struggle whatsoever. . . .

"In the second place, Marxism demands unconditionally an historical review of the question of forms of struggle. To pose this question outside its concrete historical situation is to fail to understand the A B C of dialectical materialism. In various periods of economic evolution, in dependence on different political, national-cultural and traditional conditions, etc. different forms of struggle become uppermost, and in connection therewith, in their turn, change the secondary accessory forms of struggle." (Lenin, "Guerrilla Warfare.")

Here Lenin, as in other cases, in this tactical question develops and expounds Marxian views. He constantly raises tactical questions from the viewpoint of the logical application of Marxism. But Lenin does not merely expound Marx, he adds always his own, Leninist, new contribution founded on the latest experience of the revolutionary struggle, and the modern conditions of the revolutionary movement.

Examining the results and forming conclusions on the lessons of the Moscow insurrection, Lenin says: "The general course of the Russian revolution after October and the sequence of events in Moscow in the December days have strikingly confirmed one of the most profound principles of Marx: The revolution goes ahead of that which the strong concentrated counter-revolution is able to create, *i.e.*, forces the enemy to recourse to constantly diminishing means of defence and creates therefore constantly increasing means of attack." (Lenin.)

December, for Lenin, confirmed another of Marx's principles, namely, that "insurrection is an art," and the chief rule of this art is the daring, bold and unhesitatingly decisive attack. Lenin analysed the reasons of the defeat. But for him the defeat of to-day is no source of despair and inaction, it must be for every Bolshevik, for every Communist, the stimulus to new, still more decisive, revolutionary struggle.

"We will remember," concludes Lenin in his article on the lessons of the Moscow insurrection, "that the hour of great mass struggle is at hand. It will be armed uprising. It must be, as far as possible, simultaneous. The masses must know that they go into an armed, bloody and desperate struggle. Contempt for death must animate the masses and ensure the victory. The attack against the enemy must be carried out with the acme of energy; attack, not defence, must be the slogan of the masses, ruthless extirpation of the enemy is their

task; the fighting organisation must be mobile and flexible: the hesitant elements of the troops will be drawn into actual struggle. The party of the class-conscious proletariat must fulfil its duty in this great struggle." (Lenin.)

Elsewhere, in 1917, Lenin speaks of the fact that in the near future we will have to distinguish between enemies and friends according to their attitude to the question of armed uprising.

* * * * *

Marx indicated not merely the tactics of the proletariat in the pre-revolutionary period and during the revolution—Marx indicated the tactics after the conquest of power. The basis of these tactics is given at the end of the chapter on Proletarians and Communists in the Communist Manifesto. Marx foresees that dispossession of the bourgeoisie of all capital and concentration of all means of production in the hands of the proletariat State, from the commencement, would only be possible "by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production, by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production."

Marx and Engels show in the Communist Manifesto the concrete measures which will be taken in different countries according to varying conditions. Marx indicates the objective of these measures after the capture of power. They must lead in the last resort to the withering away of the State and the destruction of class society, to the establishment of an association "in which the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all."

If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled by the force of circumstances to organise itself as a class, if by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class."

Marx had before him the experience of the Commune of Paris. Lenin had to stand at the head of the proletarian State organised on the morrow of the October revolution. He led the creation of that Government, he elaborated the chief edicts and fundamental decrees of that Government, he "roughed-out" the entire plan of all our future work. This plan consists in the organisation of powers which realise the socialist tasks of the proletariat in union or alliance with the great masses of the peasantry.

This proletarian State encounters on the following day the resistance of the counter-revolution, the proletarian State can realise its tasks only by ruthlessly crushing the counter-revolutionary movement, and crushing the counter-revolutionary class.

Lenin said even in 1905 that if "a decisive success of the revolution is achieved then we will settle with Tsarism in the Jacobin, or, if you prefer it, the plebeian manner." Lenin quoted the words of Marx: "The whole of French terrorism," wrote Marx in the remarkable "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" in 1848, "was nothing else but a new plebeian method of settling with the enemy—with the bourgeoisie absolutism, feudalism."

Lenin asked: "Have those people who try to frighten the Russian social-democratic workers with scare-cries of Jacobinism pondered at any time the significance of those words of Marx in the epoch of the Russian revolution?"

This bogey of Jacobinism stood before a handful of opportunists in 1917; unfortunately it stands to-day before certain de-classed elements of the workers of Western Europe, and prevents them taking the road of decisive revolutionary struggles.

They still dream of a peaceful arrival at socialism, of the possibilities of winning socialism without a bloody overthrow, without the ruthless plebeian settlement with the class enemies of the proletariat and the reactionary forces of the bourgeois State. When one of these philistines, Trotsky, called Lenin a "Jacobinist," Lenin replied that a revolutionary Jacobin, armed with the Marxist

theory, is a Bolshevik, and that there is nothing to fear in the epithet "Jacobinist."

If Marx, on the basis of his study of the Paris Commune, outlined the general aspects of those tasks which arise before the proletarian State after the capture of power, then it fell to Lenin's lot to elaborate the concrete plan of organisation of that State. Here arise the questions of the organisation of production, questions of the socialist reconstruction, of industry ("socialism—that is, Soviet power plus electrification").

Here arise the questions of the socialist reconstruction of agriculture ("The Co-operative Plan of Lenin"). Lenin considered that in a certain sense it was possible to term the Soviet structure, co-operative structure, because with co-operation under the proletarian dictatorship all the necessaries for the complete building of socialism are to hand. It was Lenin's lot to lead over a period of years a proletarian party, which built socialism, and not merely dreamt of the building of a socialist society.

* * * * *

Lenin held one of the certain conditions of the victory of socialism to be correct policy on the national question. and he was in this regard a close and orthodox pupil of Marx, who allocated particularly great significance to the national question.

But Lenin was not merely the pupil of Marx, he introduced much that is new into the national question, as conditions, without the fulfilment of which it is impossible to solve questions of the world movement.

The national question has significance not merely because it is the greatest motive power in the modern revolutionary movement, the national question is the most important question of the world movement, because the success of the movement is dependent to a pronounced degree on whether and to what extent the proletariat can establish the united front of struggle with the national liberating movement of colonial and semi-colonial countries. *This* is why Lenin accorded such colossal significance to the solution of such questions as that of the right of nations to self-determination. *This* is why he proposed and defended this right of nations to self-determination right up to separation against all, who were incapable of carrying the Marxist thought in this question to its logical conclusion, against the leader of the Austrian school of Marxists, Otto Bauer, against Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Radek, G. Piatakov, N. Bukharin and others, who also commenced from the Marxist theory, but who, nevertheless, could not understand that self-determination in the Marxist programme could not have, from an historico-economic viewpoint, any other meaning outside of the political self-determination of State independence, the creation of the national State.

Marx wrote in the sixties in connection with the Taiping insurrection: "We may boldly prophesy that the Chinese revolution flings a spark into the powder magazine of the modern productive system and precipitates the long-preparing general crisis, which will be immediately followed, when it spreads across the frontiers, by a political revolution on the Continent."

That which Marx foresaw in the sixties occurred, naturally in somewhat narrow forms, during the life of Lenin. Lenin was a witness and participant in the growing revolutionary blaze of the East, which the introduction of capitalism and the feudal and semi-feudal relations still maintained by the people of the East awakening to revolutionary struggle, placed the Communist advance-guard at the head of this movement, as a composite part of the advance-guard of the world revolutionary movement—the Communist International.

It fell to Lenin's lot in the Communist International to work out the most important document on the national and colonial question. Understanding the great part which would still be played by the bourgeois democratic parties in the national and colonial movements, Lenin sketched the main lines of the tactics of the proletariat in regard to these bourgeois democratic parties.

"The Communist International," said Lenin, "must support the bourgeois-democratic movements in the colonies and backward countries on the sole condition that the elements of the future proletarian party, not merely Communist in name, shall be in all backward countries grouped together and educated in the consciousness of their main task, the task of struggle with the bourgeois-democratic movements within those nations.

The Communist International must enter into temporary alliances with the bourgeois-democracy of colonial and backward countries, but not fuse with it, and in any case protect the independence of the proletarian movement even in its most pronounced forms."

The colossal significance accorded the national question by Lenin is observable in the fact that in those notes which he wrote shortly before his death, he made the central point the growing movement of the East. "The fate of the struggle depends in the last resort on the fact that India, China, etc. constitute a gigantic majority of the population. This majority of the population has flung itself with unwonted vigour into the struggle for its emancipation during the last years.

In this sense there cannot be the shadow of a doubt of the final result of the world struggle. In this sense the final victory of the nations is fully and unconditionally guaranteed."

* * * * *

Marx as also Lenin had not a few enemies whilst neither of them spared any of their previous associates should these betray the proletariat and desert the true road. Lenin underwent a very difficult break with Plekhanov, but he broke with him when it was necessary to the workers' cause. Lenin could stigmatise his best friends of yesterday in the most merciless terms if they betrayed the cause of the proletariat. Lenin was *proud* of the hatred accorded him by the opportunists of all shades, as also was Marx.

Marx wrote to Engels on the 18th May, 1859: "Our title of representatives of the proletarian party we receive from ourselves and from nobody else, but our right to this title is fully substantiated by the exclusive and general hatred accorded us by all fractions and parties of the old world."

Lenin could have spoken of himself somewhat more strongly. When Marx wrote the above-quoted words to Engels there was no mighty proletarian movement, such as that led by Lenin, and no mighty proletarian party, at the head of which stood Lenin. Lenin could have said that we receive our title as representatives of the proletarian Party from millions of workers and tens of millions of toilers who follow the slogans of our Party. But together with this his right to the title of representative of the proletarian Party was fully substantiated by the "exclusive and general hatred" accorded him by "all fractions and parties of the old world."

Lenin was born—and died— in the struggle. He bequeathed us the greatest ideological heritage. In our day Leninism has become a theory, without the mastery of which it is already impossible to call oneself a logical and consistent Marxist, because it is impossible to be a consistent Marxist, if ignorant of the colossal ideological heritage, which constitutes a development and elaboration of the doctrines of Marx.

Unfortunately we have such "monsters" who consider it beneath their dignity to call themselves Leninists, fondly imagining that it is possible at the present time to be a Marxist without being a Leninist.

Lenin bequeathed us the Communist International. We, his pupils and associates, must just as attentively treat the further elaboration of the revolutionary theory of the proletarian movement, as did Marx and Lenin throughout all the vicissitudes of their glorious lives.

We must participate in all the developments of proletarian struggle with that passion and earnestness with which Marx and Lenin approach the proletarian revolution.

Our duty is to devote all our strength to the ensurance of the final victory of Communism throughout the world.

Without we do this we should have no right to call ourselves Marxists or Leninists.

The C.P. of the Soviet Union and the Communist International

Bela Kun

ONLY great conditions give rise to great ideas. The capacity to think in terms of the universe, to lead the revolutionary working class movement of the world, to arouse whole nations to the struggle for the emancipation of the oppressed—such capacity could only develop in the revolutionary party which took the lead in three events of world importance. It was this which determined the part played by the C.P.S.U. in the foundation and management of the C.I. The philistine, though he may wear a revolutionary cloak on Sundays, does not understand this fact. From the "western heights" of his petty bourgeois culture, he looks down upon the working class movement of backward countries. From the beginning of the revolution, every philistine felt hurt by the fact that the revolution did not begin in England, then in the vanguard of capitalist development, and still more hurt by the Bolsheviks becoming the leading party in the international working class movement. And to-day, on the tenth anniversary of the C.I., when the revolutionary international of the working class has embodied its principles, strategy and tactics in a programme, the concentrated fire of the reformists and the traitors to Communism is directed on the C.P. of the Soviet Union. The troglodytes of socialist treachery, Kautsky, Potressov and Co., foaming wildly at the mouth, are again trying to instil into the workers a fear of "Russian disorganisation and splitting." The front-line trenches are supplied by newspapers of the Trotsky adherents and Brandler, which form the arsenal of anti-Bolshevik munitions. From these quarters, for more than ten years, time and again attacks have been launched on the C.P.S.U., only to rebound each time from its granite walls. The most recent of the renegades cannot boast of having enriched the anti-Bolshevik arsenal by a single new weapon. In essentials, these weapons do not differ from those used, on innumerable infamous occasions, by Kautsky, Bauer, the Russian Mensheviks, Levi and Frossard, Hoeglund and Souvarine. They seized the weapons of the old deserters from Communism when, because of new struggles, after a defeat, or on account of a retreat forced on the revolutionary vanguard, they fled from the revolutionary working class into the camp of the enemy.

The Trotskyists and Brandlerites have gone back to the old war-cry of the "mechanical application of experiences in Russia to the advanced countries of the West." Within the narrow circle of the National Right Wing Conference, this thesis, held by all the Levi's and Friedrich Adler's, was laboriously raised by Thalheimer to the status of a theory. In the Saxon Parliament, Böttcher publicly transformed the theory into a battle-cry. Listened to by Urbahns and Maslov, Brandler makes murderous speeches against the leadership of the C.P.S.U. in the International. These "honest revolutionaries" have replaced Marxian dialectic by Friderizian liberalism: "Let everybody be happy in their own way." A good dozen renegade sects join with Brandler in maintaining that the leading role of the C.P.S.U. is "fatal to the international revolution." They do not yet all agree with Kautsky and the Russian Mensheviks that Bolshevism is "Asiatic socialism," there are still some like Renner, who must graciously admit that Bolshevism in Russia is, perhaps, representative of some sort of socialism.

The denial of the international validity of Bolshevism and, what in practice amounts to the same thing, the ferocious attacks on the leading position of the C.P.S.U., were the methods always used by the renegades to disguise their flight into the enemy camp. It is no accident that Trotskyism and Brandlerism do the same. It is no accident, because ideological, political and organisational unity has been objectively based for many years on the leading position of the C.P.S.U. When,

therefore, the renegades, and often, too, the irresolute, disguise their opportunism by appealing to the "objective conditions" of their countries, when they combat the historically necessary leadership of the international revolution, they are actually fighting the revolution itself. And so, of the "objectivity" of the renegades, one can only say with Engels that such "objectivity" doesn't see farther than its own nose, and is consequently the most limited sort of subjectivity, although it may be shared by thousands of subjects. (Engels' letters to Bernstein, p. 50.) Fortunately, the number of such subjects does not exceed a very few thousand.

THE INTERNATIONAL HEGEMONY OF THE PARTY OF A BACKWARD COUNTRY

"It is fatal," said Brandler at Offenbach, "that there is no party in the C.I. of equal importance to the C.P.S.U.

"Thalheimer declared that the Russian comrades would not see them [i.e., the leaders of the Brandler group—B.K.] again until they could speak on equal terms as one power to another." ("Rote Fahne," 3-1-29.)

Brandler's problem of leadership in the C.I. has thus been solved by Thalheimer. The work to be done is not that of strengthening and improving the collective leadership of the C.I. by sending better representatives from the sections, not that of Bolshevising so that the leading bodies of the sections shall become more capable and efficient, not that of the struggle against provincialism—no, what must be done is the "creation" of one power as against another.

"Power against power"—in a revolutionary movement this is the language of men standing behind one of two hostile barricades. Thalheimer and Brandler are confronted by barricades as little as they are supported by the masses. These statements have to be considered rather as "theoretical proclamations," and it will be a long time before they materialise. Taken in their real context, they embody the following wisdom: the Communist movement in the West cannot recognise the leading position of the C.P.S.U. The C.P.S.U. is the workers' party of an economically and socially backward country. Its experiences can, therefore, arise only from such undeveloped conditions, etc. This was practically the same attitude adopted by Bordiga at the Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I. And Frossard and Hoeglund, Levi and Maslov, said the same. Bordiga said it frankly and openly when he declared that the term "Leninism" was false, and unacceptable by him. Maslov did the same in the name of "orthodox Marxism-Leninism." Levi referred to the authority of Rosa Luxemburg, Hoeglund to Zimmerwald, when he joined the social-democrats, when he entered the camp of Rosa Luxemburg's murderers and the enemies of Zimmerwald. Thalheimer and Brandler are doubtful as to whether their desertion is that of "true Leninists" or of "guardians of the traditions of the Spartakus Bund." Thus the common feature of all of them is the protest against the "international hegemony of the party of a backward country."

This attitude has its real origin in the Kautskian theory which could not join with the Russian revolution, could not "approve" it, because the Russian proletariat, led by the Bolshevik Party, were courageous enough to carry out their work of emancipation before the proletarian revolution, in accordance with Kautsky's scheme, had begun in England, the most highly developed of capitalist countries. For its foolhardiness, the C.P.S.U. has been repaid by Kautsky with ten years of assistance to international imperialism in its hostility towards the C.P.S.U. and with support for all those renegades of Communism who have protested against the leadership of the Communist Party of a backward country. The renegades, a great number of whom state that in themselves they embody a whole period of the international working class movement, forget some elementary facts in the history of that movement. The history of the working class movement shows that this is not the first time in which the Communist Party of a "backward" country has played the leading role. Rather can it be said that, with but one exception, it was always the workers' party of a country backward both in economic and social development, which took the leading part in the workers' international. Marx himself stated that in his letters to Bracke referring to the future of the workers' party

of Germany—at that time a country backward in every respect—Marx says:

". . . . this war, in which Germany has shown that, even with the exclusion of German Austria, it is capable of going its own way independently of foreign countries, will move the centre of gravity of the Continental Labour movement from France to Germany." (Manifesto of the Brunswick Committee, 5-9-1870.)

Nowadays, it only occurs to the anarchists to accuse Marx of pan-Germanism because he believed it possible that the lead in the international working class movement could be taken by the workers of a country whose economic, social and political structure was far less advanced than that of France or England.

Lenin—as though he had really foreseen this "theory" of the latest renegades—studied the question of which countries, which workers' parties, had played and would play a leading role in the international working class movement. Shortly after the foundation of the International, Lenin wrote. "England affords the example of a country in which, as Engels says, the bourgeoisie has created not merely an aristocracy, but also an upper section of the proletariat permeated by and holding bourgeois ideas. In the proletarian struggle, the most advanced capitalist country was, for many decades, left far behind." (This was the case after England, at the time of the Chartist movement, had stood at the head of the international Labour movement.)

"In the two heroic revolutions of 1848 and 1871, France exhausted her proletarian forces. The leadership of the international movement passed to Germany in the seventies of the last century, when Germany was, economically, behind both France and England. But when Germany caught up, towards the second decade of the present century, the exemplary Marxist German workers' party was led by a handful of arch-ruffians, the same vile mob which sold itself to capitalism . . . . So it happened—for a time only, of course—that leadership in the international movement was taken by the Russians, while during the 19th century it had been held at various times by the English, French and Germans." (Lenin: "The struggle for the social revolution," German edition, p. 546.)

We can add to the above that when, before the war, Germany reached the top of capitalist development, and so ceased to be a backward country, and when, at about the time of Bebel's death, the Second International, in theory and practice, entered on the road of opportunism and reformism, the German party almost entirely lost its leadership of the international movement. In any case, that leadership was shared with the social-democrats of Austria, a country far behind in development, and of France. This state of affairs was expressed in the triumvirate of Bebel, Victor Adler and Jaurès, who, in the years preceding the war, were the real leaders of the Second International.

In their blindness, the renegades, of course, lose their logic completely. When they speak of a backward country, they fail to mention in what respect the country is behindhand. Backwardness in capitalist development is, as history shows, a different thing from backwardness in revolutionary development. It is beyond all question that the C.P.S.U. is the leading party of an economically backward country. But this economically backward country was, not only now, but before the building up of socialism began under the Soviet State, advanced in the revolutionary sense, and its Bolshevik Party was an advanced revolutionary party. For this very reason, the Bolshevik party could not take the lead in the Second International. But the existence of this revolutionary party and the existence of this revolutionary workers' state were the pre-requisites for the establishment of a revolutionary international. Their existence was again essential, firstly because the experiences of Bolshevism were necessary for the establishment of the third revolutionary workers' international after the collapse of the Second, and secondly because they afforded a basis, a central staff around which the new revolutionary international could be built. At the time of the foundation of the C.I., the Spartakists did not recognise this, and they opposed its formation. Although many, even to-day, fail to understand this, Marx foresaw it in 1881. In a letter dated 22nd February of that year, and addressed to Domela Nieuwenhuis, the Dutch socialist pastor who afterwards turned anarchist, Marx wrote:

"I am convinced that the correct, the critical time for a new international workingmen's association is not yet at hand. I think, therefore, that all workers' congresses, in so far as they do not deal with the immediate given conditions in this or that definite country, are not useless, but harmful. They will always blunder out numberless, endlessly repeated, banal generalities."

Marx wrote this in connection with a plan for a Zurich Congress, at which questions of the revolutionary measures of a socialist government were to be discussed.

It is obvious that "the correct, the critical time for a 'new international workingmen's association' " had been brought about by the revolutionary activity of the C.P.S.U. Not only in the sense that it had created the basis of the international in the form of the Soviet Republic, but also in that it had lived through events which made it possible for the new international to be one of revolutionary action, and not one condemned to turn out "numberless, endlessly repeated, banal generalities," to which status the renegades would wish to limit it.

THE INTERNATIONALITY OF BOLSHEVISM

The leading position of the C.P.S.U. arises from Bolshevik ideology. The ideological foundation of this position is Leninism, that is, Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. But the internationality of Bolshevism is by no means of the same age as the leading international position of the C.P.S.U., as the Russian revolution or as the foundation of the C.I. Bolshevism at its very beginning was, as Lenin used to say, the last word in socialism, and this it has always remained. It is no accident that almost all the parties and leaders of the Second International, definitely national, practising mutual "non-interference," grown conservative, considered Bolshevism—as described by the Russian Mensheviks—as a sort of "native Russian socialism." For them, Menshevism and its Trotskyist variation were the real representatives of "European socialism" within the Russian labour movement. This conception, long before actual disagreement arose, changed among Ebert and Co., into hatred of the revolutionary tendencies, and this hatred was expressed in the attitude adopted towards the Bolsheviks as towards a sect, one of a dozen "groups of emigrants." And as reformism developed within the Second International, the Bolsheviks drew closer to the masses, and felt themselves an alien body in this international association. Their appearance was of a rather episodic character, although these episodes were actually the only expressions of a revolutionary spirit in the Second International (Stuttgart, Copenhagen, the war and trade union questions). Because of its real internationality Bolshevism caused extreme surprise in the Second International. From the very outset, Lenin took up a different attitude towards the internationalism of socialism from that of 99 per cent. of the leaders of the Second International. According to him, internationalism was not merely "the organisation of mutual support on an international scale," or "the struggle against nationalism." The essential content of internationalism, according to Lenin, is that the strategic, tactical and organisational experience of the working class movement should have international significance and application. In stating the principles of Bolshevism, Lenin wrote in 1902, on the importance of the theoretical struggle as the third form of the class struggle:

"The social-democratic movement is, in its very nature, international. This means that we have not only to fight national chauvinism, but also that a movement starting in a young country can only be successful if it works out the experiences of other countries. This requires more than a knowledge of those experiences, more than a simple repetition of the most recent resolutions. It is necessary to understand them, to consider them critically, to re-examine them continuously." (Lenin: "The Struggle for the Social Revolution," p. 39.)

This shows that Bolshevism began as a movement based on the experiences of the international working class. It also shows that Lenin, at the very beginning, had thoroughly grasped the method to be adopted by the C.I. in the sphere of international exchange and application of revolutionary experience.

In spite of its internationalism, Bolshevism had no chance of finding international acceptance in the Second International, where the

militant left-radical groups—otherwise so bold and heroic—never once put forward a revolutionary policy as against opportunism. Within the period of the Second International, Bolshevism developed its capacities for international leadership. Whatever was Marxist, revolutionary in the theory and practice of the working-class movement from its very beginnings, was accepted and assimulated by the C.P.S.U., under Lenin's leadership, in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the remains of feudalism and against the opportunist wing in the working-class movement. It is true that the C.P.S.U. applied the science of leadership in the revolutionary class struggle, a science which grew out of the study of the economy and of the class relations of the most highly developed capitalist countries, and applied it to a less developed country; but it was this low level of development which helped the Russian Party to work out those methods of class struggle which banished the reformism of the Second International to the lumber-room, Menshevism, hailed as "European socialism," and its Trotskyist variety were European in so far as they signified the uncritical application to Russian society of the opportunism practised in the Second International. And so it happened that during the war the so-called "international" section, the Mensheviks, together with the Second International, drowned in a sea of social chauvinism, while the native "Russian" Bolshevism not only remained international, but took the lead of all the groups which remained more or less consistently international during the war. This sudden advance of Bolshevism, of the C.P.S.U. of to-day, to the leadership of the revolutionary wing in the international working-class movement was possible because, even at that time, it contained all the elements of an internationally valid revolutionary theory, and particularly the experiences of the movement and theoretical readiness to apply those experiences in a critical manner. In "Left-Wing Communism," Lenin sums up the most important pre-requisites through which Bolshevism attained success, not only nationally but also internationally:

"For half a century—approximately between the forties and nineties of the preceding century—advanced intellects in Russia, under the yoke of the wildest and most reactionary Tsarism, sought eagerly for a correct revolutionary theory, following each and every 'last word' in Europe and America with astounding diligence and thoroughness. Russia has attained Marxism, the only revolutionary theory, by dint of fifty years' travail and sacrifice, through the greatest revolutionary heroism, the most incredible energy and devotion in study, education, practical experience, disappointment, and comparison with European experience. Thanks to the emigration forced by the Tsar, revolutionary Russia, in the second half of the nineteenth century, came into possession of rich international connections, and of a grasp of the best forms and theories of the revolutionary movement abroad, such as no other country had.

"On the other hand, having come into existence on this granite theoretical foundation, Bolshevism went through fifteen years (1903-1917) of practical history, which, in fertility of experience, had no equal anywhere else in the world. In no other country, during those fifteen years, was there anything approximating to such wide revolutionary expedience, such variety and rapidity of shifting forms in the movement, legal and illegal, peaceful and stormy, open and underground, embracing small circles and large masses, parliamentary and terrorist. In no other country, during so short a period of time, has there been concentrated such multiplicity, shades and methods of struggle, embracing all classes of modern society. To this it must be added that the struggle maturing with such rapidity, because of the backwardness of the country and the heavy yoke of Tsarism, assimilated eagerly and successfully the latest developments of American and European political experience." ("Left-Wing Communism," pp. 11 and 12.)

When we take into account, in addition, the fact that since 1917 the C.P.S.U. has had a world policy in the most exact sense of the word, then the leading international position of the C.P.S.U. becomes quite clear. This "world policy" necessarily added to the international political experience of the C.P.S.U.

Because of that Lenin's Party, which played the largest part in the foundation of the C.I. and was at the head in all its struggles, could partly carry out what Kautsky, the creator of

the "Asiatic socialism" legend, foretold at a time when he was still a Marxist:

"Russia, which has imbibed so much revolutionary initiative from the West, is now perhaps itself ready to serve as a source of revolutionary energy. The Russian revolutionary movement, which is now bursting into flame, will perhaps become the strongest means for the extermination of the senile philistinism and sedate politics which are beginning to spread in our ranks, and will again rekindle the militant spirit and passionate devotion to our great ideals." (Kautsky, "The Slavs and the Revolution," 1902.)

The task has become much greater since Kautsky wrote. The "senile philistinism" and "sedate politics" became, to a large extent, shameful treachery and shameless social-imperialism. To a small extent they remained at the stage of philistinism and politics, and found a provisional lurking place in the C.I., crying out against the mechanical application of the experiences of the Russian revolution. The task which at that time Kautsky laid down has been partly fulfilled by the C.P.S.U. at the head of the C.I., and the C.P.S.U. must strive to continue this work with all its strength; to give back, in greater measure, what it received from the international working-class movement.

THE APPLICATION OF RUSSIAN EXPERIENCE

Bolshevism includes not only the obligation to study and work from international experience, but also the dialectic, or, as Lenin called it, critical international application of that experience. If there have been cases in which it was really attempted to apply the experiences of Bolshevism in Russia mechanically, they occurred in opposition to Bolshevism. In truth (and not to defend the C.P.S.U.) it must be said that those who attempted such a mechanical application, seldom came from the ranks of the C.P.S.U., and never from its leaders. Those who have spread this legend of "mechanical application," from Friedrich Adler and Levi, Hoeglund and the rest, right up to Brandler and Thalheimer, have tried to build up a "theory" against the application of Russian experience.

The essence of this theory is: Only the methods of Bolshevism can be employed in the working-class movements of the more developed western countries, not its experiences. The same is maintained by Pannekoek, Gorter, Bordiga, Roland-Holst and the various subspecies of syndicalists. Thalheimer, the Marx-and-Hegel expert, is denying the principles of materialist dialectic when he makes this discovery of the mystic idealist Roland-Holst or the Bergsonian Bordiga his own. For all of them, this theory which denies Marxist principles, is extraneous to its object and to objective reality, becomes the merest subjectivity, dissociated from experience. Correspondingly, for them, experience is not the reflection of objective reality (immediate consciousness of its content, *i.e.*, of objective reality, as Hegel said), the reality which is "apprehended and realised in its verity" by being "completely subjugated to method."

Opportunism, which thus in practice is treacherous, denies the principles of Marxism when it takes the field against the party of Marxism, against the Communist International and its sections.

It is obvious and self-evident that the experiences of the Russian revolution can only be applied with the methods to which those experiences were themselves subjected when the Russian proletariat and its leading party, the C.P.S.U., lived through them in their revolutionary struggles, that is, with the methods of Marxism dialectic. Were there not still some people who have not yet understood this elementary truth even now, in the twelfth year of the revolution and the tenth year of the C.I., the remark would appear platitudinous. Lenin, in his work in the C.I., always reckoned with such a lack of understanding. Lenin, and the C.P.S.U. generally, whenever questions of the international revolution were raised, emphasised again and again, what now sounds such a truism: "dialectical application," "critical application," "differentiation," "careful, not crude application"—these and similar expressions occur again and again in all the declarations and proposals which the responsible leaders of the C.P.S.U. ever made, about the application of Russian experiences and about the Bolshevisation of the Com-

munist Parties, to the committees of the C.I. and the C.P.S.U.

In dealing with the tactical principle of the C.I. Lenin laid down the following guiding principle with regard to the international application of Bolshevik experience.

"We have now considerable experience of international scope which pretty definitely establishes the fact that some fundamental features of our revolution are not local, not purely national, not Russian only, but that they are of international significance. Not in the strictest sense of the word—that is, taking it in its essence—or in the sense of the historical inevitability of a repetition, on an international scale, of what we in Russia have gone through, but one must admit some fundamental features of our revolution to be of such international significance. Of course, it would be the greatest mistake to exaggerate this truth and to apply it to more than the fundamental features of our revolution. It would be likewise erroneous not to keep in mind that, after the proletarian revolution in at least one of the advanced countries, things will in all probability take a sharp turn; Russia will cease to be the model, and will become again the backward (in the Soviet and socialist sense) country.

"But at this historical moment the state of affairs is such that the Russian example reveals something quite essential to all countries in their near and inevitable future. The advanced workers in every land have long understood it—although in many cases they did not so much understand it as feel it, through the instinct of their revolutionary class. Hence the international significance (in the strict sense of the word) of the Soviet Power, as well as of the fundamentals of Bolshevik theory and tactics." ("Left-Wing Communism," pp. 7-8.)

The development of the Russian revolution and the slowing down of the international revolution were necessarily followed by an extension of this truth. This was expressed in the programme of the C.I.—as opposed, for example, to Ruth Fischer—which laid down a new economic policy, varying from place to place, but having general international validity. It is no accident that many of the disputes within the C.I. were and are concerned with the application of the experiences of the Russian revolution. And these disputes are always screened by some sort of "left" or "right" opposition of principle to the revolutionary principles of strategy, tactics and organisation held by the C.I. Now it is the experiences which point to the inevitability of a civil war to which exception is taken, now the experiences which indicate the role of the party, another time factory groups, etc. And when the opportunism in these strategical, tactical and organisational questions has been fully exposed, the legend of the "mechanical application of experience" is brought up. Lenin combatted this legend, against both the centrists and the left deviators. After Lenin's death, those who appealed to this legend tried in one way or another to get Lenin's authority for it. So it was not superfluous for the Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to include at the suggestion of the delegation from the C.P.S.U., the following, in its thesis on Bolshevisation:

"Bolshevisation means the capacity to apply the general principles of Leninism to the given concrete situation in this or that country. Bolshevisation is, in addition, the capacity to seize that essential link in the chain on which all the others depend. But this link, because of the variety of circumstances in different countries, cannot be the same in every country."

The supporters of the "power against power" theory, as well as the orthodox Marxist-Leninists, by their campaign against this "mechanical application," are in reality continuing their fight against Bolshevism as a whole. They forget that it was Lenin himself who, in his letter addressed to the German Communists in 1921, said that it was the task of the German proletariat to emulate the German bourgeoisie in their evaluation of the Russian experience, if they were to work out a correct strategy. "Our tactical and strategic methods (if we look at the matter from an international standpoint) are behindhand, far behind the excellent strategy of the bourgeoisie, who have learnt from the Russian example." (Lenin: "Letter to the German Communists.")

If we consider the struggles of the international revolution and the campaign of the

social-democrats against that revolution, we can still say to-day, as Lenin said then, that the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats have made better use of the experiences of the Russian revolution against us, than we, up to the present, have made of it against them.

THE "VINDICATORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL"

The renegades are exerting all their efforts in this struggle against the "mechanical application of Russian experiences." Following Levi's example, the German right-wingers are again using the name of Rosa Luxemburg in their campaign against the C.P.S.U.—of Rosa Luxemburg who said of the proletarian revolution which had worked to success under the leadership of that party, of the proletariat which stood under the leadership of that party, that they had "saved the honour of the International." This vindication is, in fact, the service rendered by the C.P.S.U., although not quite in the sense that Rosa Luxemburg meant when, at that time, she was still hesitating about the split in the Second International and the foundation of a new revolutionary international.

It is true, quite true, that the matter was one of saving the honour of the international working class, but in the sense that the C.P.S.U. and the small revolutionary groups and the young Communist Parties founded the C.I. and so established anew the honour of the International. The honour of the International was saved when the C.I. was founded and the struggle against socialist treachery organised internationally. That was, above all, the work of the C.P.S.U. against which the renegades of all shades wish to oppose a "power."

Whoever wishes to oppose "power to power" within the C.I., as suggested by these renegades, wishes to direct the power of the proletariat, not against the bourgeoisie, but against the Soviet Union, against the proletarian State led by the C.P.S.U. The position to the C.P.S.U. is in the present situation synonymous with the position of Communism generally. Whoever takes up towards this Party, the founder and leader of the C.I., the attitude of "power against power," is really anxious to oppose Communism as a whole.

The Comintern and the Struggle for the Masses

A. Lozovsky

> The very conception of the masses has changed of recent years. What was regarded as the mass during the period of parliamentarism and trade unionism has now been transformed into an upper group. Millions and dozens of millions who have lived outside all political life are now being transformed into a revolutionary mass. War has put them all on their feet, aroused the political attention of the most backward sections, has awakened in them illusions and hopes, and has deluded them.—("Manifesto of the Second Congress of the Comintern.")
>
> One must learn to approach the masses with especial patience and caution, in order to know how to understand their peculiarities, the special features of the psychology of each stratum, trade, etc. of that mass.—("Theses on the Basic Tasks of the Second Congress of the Comintern.")

THE Comintern was founded in March, 1919, when there was a considerable revolutionary ferment among the masses, but at a time when there was still no C.P. in the great majority of capitalist countries. Consequently the Comintern could not from the first moment of its existence raise the question of how to lead the dissatisfaction of the masses and to transform the elemental ferment into conscious hatred of the capitalist system. Even in the preparatory period it was clear to the organisers of the Comintern, and to Lenin first and foremost, that it would be possible to transform the Comintern into a decisive force only to the extent that it was successful in getting political and organisational control of the masses. And so the Communist International, which grew out of the objective needs of the international workers' movement, being a product of war and revolution, set itself the task of becoming the organiser and leader of the masses, in order to carry through the struggle of the proletariat for power.

At the beginning the Comintern had behind it an enormous force in the form of the October revolution, but beyond the frontiers of Russia, in the capitalist States, it was followed by only small groups of class conscious workers. The basic task consisted in extending the front of the October revolution, in other words, in continuing the line through all capitalist countries, and that was possible only by way of winning the masses to the side of the social revolution. The objective situation was revolutionary. Capitalist society was ripe for its overthrow, but the subjective factor was non-existent, there was no Communist Party, the worker masses were still tied to the tails of the social-democrats. And so from the very first day of its inception the Comintern set itself the task of winning the masses, i.e., set itself the problem of emancipating the vast masses from bourgeois social-democratic ideology. But it is not possible to win the masses by miracles; it was necessary to get a clear understanding of the trend of development of the workers' movement, to take a sound historical course. Had Bolshevism begun by asking only on which side at that moment was the majority of the international proletariat, the Comintern could not have been born. But the organiser of the Comintern saw far ahead, he started not on the basis of the formal majority, but of the transient nature of the bourgeois social-democratic influence on the proletarian masses, and the deeper class necessities and interests of the international proletariat. Hence arose the slogan at the beginning of the war: "Against the current," a slogan directed against the delusions of the majority in the interests of that majority.

THE POSITION OF THE WORKING CLASS AFTER THE WAR

What was the situation of the working class immediately after the end of the war? The masses had been reduced to despair by the long protracted war. Risings in Germany,

Austria, Hungary, mass movements in Britain and France, gigantic strikes in the United States—all these reflected the extreme dissatisfaction of the masses. They were seeking a way out from the deadlock created by the war, but they rarely went beyond the bounds marked out by the social-democratic party. Although the mass movement had not been confined within the framework of international reformism, it none the less had an extremely mournful intellectual and political nature, it could not achieve the aims and tasks set by the course of the class struggle. The unconscious historical process, which had flung vast masses into the streets, did not find conscious expression. The little Communist groups and parties were intellectually, politically and organisationally extremely weak, and hence followed the defeat of all the mass movements during the period directly after the war. These elemental movements showed that a profound discontent ruled among the masses, but that the influence of the social-democratic parties and the reformist trade unions was still strong within them, that they were clinging to traditional organisations, taking no account of the fact that the organisations which they had created had been transformed from organs of struggle against the capitalist system into organs of conservation, consolidation and revival of capitalist society.

The first wave of the workers' movement was guided by the social-democrats and trade unions into legal channels. Even those revolutionary organisations which had developed during the revolutionary period (factory committees and soviets) were transformed by social-democracy into auxiliary organs of their bourgeois policies; and wherever the workers' movement refused to be confined within the framework of bourgeois legality (Hungary and Bavaria), wherever the working class tried to take power into its own hands, those attempts, owing to the political and organisational weakness of the Communist Parties, ended in the bloody suppression of the advance guard of the working class.

THE FIRST TASK OF THE COMINTERN

All these factors set before the organisers of the Comintern, as the imperative task of the day, the problem of the struggle for the masses. All the congresses of the Communist International, from the first to the sixth inclusive, all the decisions of the directing organs of the Comintern in relation to individual parties, had in mind the question how to win the masses from the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats, and to draw them to the side of international Communism. Ten years of the Comintern—ten years of stubborn and ruthless struggle for the masses, struggle for the majority of the working class.

* * * * *

In order to wage a successful war against the bourgeoisie it is necessary to have a strong political consciousness among the masses and a strong revolutionary Communist organisation—for the Bolshevik this needs no demonstration. Every rank and file Communist realises full well that it is necessary to win the masses. But how is it to be achieved? How are we to set about it? What are the links to lay hold upon? What are the keys to the situation, which have to be seized at the right moment? What are the questions on which the attention of the masses must be concentrated? These are the issues which chiefly absorbed the attention of the Communist International, and to which it has given concrete answers over the last ten years.

These answers have followed two lines: the political line and the organisational line. In order to win the masses it is necessary to pursue a sound policy. That would appear to be as elementary as ABC., but it ceases to be elementary when we set ourselves the question of what constitutes a sound policy. The Comintern cannot restrict itself to an abstract answer to this question, it cannot confine itself to a formula, such as: a sound policy is one which assembles the masses around the Communist Party, raises their class consciousness, strengthens revolutionary mass organisations and conduces to the success of the struggle waged by the working class against the bourgeoisie. If such general formulæ were required of the Comintern it would not be difficult to supply them, but the Comintern could not rest satisfied with formulæ. It had not merely to decide what constitutes a sound Bolshevik policy, but to define that policy both in the international sphere and for every separate country. And here the difficulties

began. These difficulties arose out of the fact that it was necessary to apply the principles of Bolshevik tactics to a concrete situation. It was necessary to draw from the international experience of revolutionary class struggle the conclusion that was applicable to a particular country in a definite situation as it arose. Bolshevism is not a dogma, not an abstract formula. If that were so, it would be very easy to learn that formula once and for all, and so become a Bolshevik. No, it is no formula, which has only to be learnt by heart and repeated, but a method of revolutionary action. The extremely varied conditions of the class struggle, the various inter-relationships of forces between classes within the working class, the varying ideological and political attitude of the working masses, the degree of disintegration of capitalism, etc.—all have to be taken into account in determining Communist tactics for the given country and in the given concrete situation. The opportunists draw from this the conclusion that it is necessary to have as many varieties of Communism as there are countries. That, of course, is untrue, for Communism is one and indivisible. But that the methods of approach to the masses vary according to circumstances, that the masses are not to be won with a bare formula, does not admit of the least doubt.

In order intelligently to apply revolutionary tactics it was necessary first and foremost to clear the ground of any kind of social-democratic traditions, ideological and organisational survivals, which hampered not only the working masses but their vanguard, the Communist Party, also.

* * * * *

To clear the ground meant first to determine what was the epoch through which we were passing, and what the role of the working class in that epoch. It was on this very question that the parting of the ways arose between Communism and social-democracy, it was on this very question that the influence of the social-democrats and bourgeoisie with the working masses was strongest. "Nothing unusual has happened. War is an inevitable convulsion, but with the collaboration of all classes, it will be possibe swiftly to heal the wounds inflicted by the war"—such was the view of social-democracy. First and foremost it was necessary to strike a blow at this philosophy, which conjured up before the working class the prospect of the everlasting existence of capitalist society, and transformed the working class into the defender of capitalism. The epoch of peaceful reforms or the epoch of the social revolution, the struggle for democracy or the struggle for dictatorship, peaceful or violent conquest of power, the expropriation of the expropriators or nationalisation by way of compensation, bourgeois democracy or the Soviet system, etc.—these were the questions which the very course of the struggle was raising. These questions led to a differentiation in the masses, they compelled the workers to self-determination, for experience contradicted all the social-democratic teaching, all the social-democratic "philosophy of history."

But this political setting of the question affected only part of the workers. The conscious, revolutionary elements had begun to group themselves around the Communist groups and organisations, transforming them into the advance-guard of the working class of each country. But that was not enough. The problem of the masses, which had been raised on the day of the founding of the Comintern, had not been solved during the first years of the Comintern's existence, and had not been solved because a considerable mass of the workers followed social-democracy even during that period of storm and pressure. It was clear that when the wave broke and the movement began to ebb the influence of the social-democrats was bound to strengthen. Thus the problem of the masses confronted the Comintern on the eve of the third congress, which in this sense is one of the most important congresses held by the Comintern.

THE THIRD CONGRESS

The Third Congress realised (see the theses "On the world situation and our tasks") that "at the present time the open revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for power is passing through a backwater, a slowing up in tempo, on a world scale. But from its very nature the revolutionary advance after the war could not be expected to develop along an unbroken rising line, in so far as it did not lead at once to victory. Political

development also has its cycles, its rises and falls. The enemy does not remain passive, he struggles. If the proletarian advance is not crowned with success the bourgeoisie passes to the counter-attack at the first opportunity."

Thus the Third Congress recognised a slowing up in the tempo of the revolutionary struggle about the middle of 1921. The frontal attack was repulsed, the bourgeoisie had passed to the counter-attack. What were the reasons for the failure of the first revolutionary wave? We have spoken above of those reasons: there was no leader, no standard-bearer, no organiser of the struggle —there were no mass Communist Parties.

And what conclusion did the Third Congress come to on this? Its conclusion consisted in realising that no matter how heroic the struggle of small groups, that struggle is destined to failure if the Communist Parties have not succeeded in carrying the vast masses into the struggle behind them. The second conclusion consisted in the realisation that the Communist Party can carry the masses behind it only provided it frees itself of sectarianism and opportunist errors. In other words, the first basic conclusion from the new situation was drawn by the Comintern in the form of the slogan: "Neither sectarianism, nor putschism, nor opportunism." But what does this mean? It means that the active minority cannot and ought not to substitute themselves for the masses, that it is impossible to set up a theory of attack, as was done in Germany in 1921, and think that attack is always advantageous to the working class, irrespective of the situation, the inter-relationship of forces, and the conditions of struggle.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

What did the theory of the offensive involve in Germany in 1921? It was somewhat similar to Social-Revolutionary terrorism, which consisted in thinking that every terrorist act would arouse the masses for struggle. The offensive, i.e., the attack of an active minority, was to play the same role as terrorist acts in the case of the S.R.'s. The Comintern could not accept that point of view, for it was contrary to the experience of the international class struggle, contrary to the experience of Bolshevism. That theory of severance from the masses, the theory of the heroic minority, which was to make the revolution on behalf of the masses, is a theory very close to the anarcho-syndicalist conception of the inter-relationships between the active minority and the working class, a theory which has nothing whatever in common with the Bolshevik setting of the problem: "party and class."

But the rejection of the syndicalist setting of the problem of active minorities did not in the least mean a continual adaptation to the masses, did not connote the theory and practice of a lagging between the advance-guard and the army. The Party is to be the advance-guard in order to go ahead of the masses, and not to hang on to their tail. The whole art of Bolshevik tactics consists in being continually in the advance-guard, not severed from the basic masses of the proletariat, not getting too far ahead, but certainly not hanging on to their tail. It consists in feeling the pulse of the vast masses, always reflecting the militant attitude of the masses, putting up resistance to the backward elements of their own class. But in order to fulfil this role of militant advance-guard, it is necessary to put our own ranks in order, and to expel from the ranks of the Party all the elements which reflect that backwardness, which have not outlived social-democratic traditions, which in the ranks of the Party reflect the past, and not the future of the working class. In other words, it is necessary to eradicate opportunism.

BOLSHEVIK TACTICS

Here the question may be asked: what is the difference between the syndicalist theory of an active minority and the Bolshevik view of the role of the Communist Parties? Is the Party not an advanced minority, then? Is the Party not the most active section of the working class? And why did the Comintern act sharply and categorically against the anarcho-syndicalist theory of an active minority from the very first day of its existence? There is not the least doubt that the Communist Party is an active minority, which under capitalism, as the resolution of the Second Comintern Congress also affirms, "as

a rule will have only a minority of workers in its organised ranks." But the centre of our disagreement with the anarcho-syndicalists consists in the question of what should be the tactics of that active minority, whether that active minority can be a substitute for the struggle of the masses. Can it always, under any conditions, begin a struggle without taking the condition of the masses into account? Should the active minority run far ahead, severing itself from the main army, in the hope that the masses "may possibly" support it? What was the view of the anarcho-syndicalists on strikes, for instance? "Every strike is a blessing. Our task is to declare a strike, and it is the workers' job to adhere to the strike we have declared." The Communists have never acted on that principle and cannot act on it. We can neither declare a strike nor organise a rising on the basis of a peradventure. In all such cases we must start from the question of the position of our army; is there close contact between the advance-guard and the army, will the army follow the advance-guard, or turn aside, or remain passive? Consequently the disagreement between the anarcho-syndicalists and the Communists lies in their attitude to the masses. The anarcho-syndicalists adopt a haughty attitude towards the worker "plebeians" and their tactics are built on the principle of the "hero and the crowd." There are heroic personalities and an unconscious mass, on whose behalf the "hero" has to struggle. The Communists plan their tactics on a mass basis. The Communist Party is the most class-conscious, most advanced section of the working class. It is always with the masses and only with the masses. The degree of Bolshevisation of the Communist Party is measured not so much by the number of members it contains, as by its ability to head a mass movement, to be always ahead, without severing itself from the basic mass of the proletariat.

* * * * *

This attitude of the Comintern to the mass movement serves as an object of attack on the part of the enemies of Bolshevism. The anarchists and social-democrats accuse the Communists of being entangled in the tail of the masses, of conniving at their "low instincts" and backward moods, of exploiting the backwardness and ignorance of the masses. These accusations still fall from the lips of social-democrats at the present time. Fortunately the October revolution has no need of the recognition of the social-democrats, and so can ignore the repeated attempts to explain October as the result of an "elemental rising." What did Lenin write in answer to that kind of accusation? When one of the leaders of the German independent social-democratic party, Daümig, attacked the Communists on this ground, Lenin wrote:

> "That the Communists connive at elementalism is a lie on the part of Mr. Daümig, exactly the same kind of lie as that which we have heard so many times from the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries. The Communists do not connive at elementalism, they do not stand for disconnected explosions. The Communists teach us organised, purposeful, vigorous, timely, mature attack. The philistine slanders of Messrs. Daümig, Kautsky and Company cannot disprove that fact.
>
> "But the philistines are unable to understand that the Communists consider, and quite rightly consider, it their duty to be with the struggling masses of the oppressed, and not with the heroes of suburbia, who stand aside and wait cowardly upon the event. When the masses struggle, errors in the struggle are inevitable. The Communists, seeing those errors, explaining them to the masses, obtaining a correction of the errors, unswervingly insisting on the advantage of conscious action over elementalism, remain with the masses. It is better to be with the struggling masses, who in the course of the struggle gradually emancipate themselves from their errors, than with the intelligentsia, the philistines, the Kautskyites, who stand on one side awaiting the 'complete victory.' That is a truth which the Daümigs are not given to understand." (From the article "The Heroes of the Berne International," Vol. XVI., p. 233.)

Here with all Lenin's peculiar clarity is given the Communists' attitude on this central question of Bolshevik tactics. In order to win the masses it is necessary always to be

with the masses. So Lenin declared, and so he willed to the Communist International.

TO THE MASSES

Inasmuch as in the middle of 1921 the Comintern recognised a slowing up in the tempo of the revolution and a renewal of attack on the part of the bourgeoisie, it was necessary to raise the question of new methods of winning the masses. In 1919 and 1920, when the masses were in a ferment, there was the hope that they would come to Communism in the process of open attacks. But the force of inertia of the gigantic social-democratic machine, the strength of the pressure of the reformists proved to be so great that only a minority followed the Communists. The great majority of the workers remained in intellectual bondage to the social-democrats. It was necessary to find a road to the masses, it was necessary to confront all the Communist Parties with the question of adopting new tactics, of pressing from a frontal attack to a prolonged siege, to flanking movements, from the conquest of the masses by way of open attacks to their conquest by way of everyday, detailed, undermining activity. How was this to be done? Inasmuch as the bourgeoisie had begun to strike at the elementary conquests of the masses, it was quite natural to bring to the front the struggle for everyday demands, and on the basis of defence to forge a strong proletarian army, and then to pass from defence to attack. Hence the sharp volte-face of the Third Congress under the slogan of "To the masses!" The Third Congress not only gave the slogan of "To the masses!" but also said how it was to be achieved. The Communists must learn to head the daily struggles of the proletariat, for those daily struggle have a profound political character. The Third Congress of the Comintern expressed this in the following clear formula:

> "The revolutionary essence of the present period consists in the fact that the most modest demands of the masses are incompatible with the existence of capitalist society, and that thus the struggle for those demands will grow into the struggle for Communism."

From this it is clear that the basic task is to connect the struggle for sectional demands with the ultimate end. But how was that to be achieved? The Third Congress provided an answer on this point, an answer which has preserved all its importance down to the present time. First and foremost the Third Congress set the problem of the independent leadership of the struggle. This is what we find on this question in the resolution on tactics.

"This independent policy of defence of the vital interests of the proletariat, of its most active or most class-conscious section, will be crowned with success only if it leads to the awakening of the remaining masses, if the aims of the struggle grow out of the concrete situation, if those aims are understandable to the vast masses, if the masses see in those aims their own aims, although they may not yet be able to struggle independently for them.

But the Communist Party should not restrict itself to the defence of the proletariat from the dangers threatening it, to defence from the strokes inflicted on the working masses. During the period of the world revolution the Communist Party by its very essence is a party of attack, of pressure on capitalist society: it is compelled to transform any kind of defensive struggle, as it grows wider and deeper, into an attack on capitalist society. It is obliged to do everything in order to carry the working masses into that attack everywhere where the conditions for this exist."

This resolution was written with Lenin's active participation, and it still has a burning, actual interest at the present time. Here are given the two essentials of Bolshevik tactics in regard to the leadership of the mass movement. Here are set forth the struggle for sectional demands, and also the conditions for raising that struggle to a higher stage, the methods of transforming economic into political struggle, principles which have by no means been assimilated even now by all sections of the Comintern. The decisions of the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern only rendered more concrete the decisions of the Third Congress. This shows best of all how ludicrous are the efforts of right wing Communists

to contrast the decisions of the first three congresses with those of the last three.

THE REFORMIST TRADE UNIONS

Inasmuch as the social-democrats were at the head of the mass trade union organisations, it was quite natural that the Comintern was bound to set itself the problem of the relations between the Communist Party and the reformist unions. The role of the trade unions during the war and immediately after was such a miserable one that many of the leading workers believed in the necessity of leaving the trade unions and beginning immediately to set up their own organisations. Inasmuch as there were millions of proletarians in the reformist trade unions, this kind of exodus could not be supported. And the Comintern therefore resolutely raised the problem of work in the reactionary trade unions. "There's no need for nerves, there's no need to run away from the spots where the workers are. It is necessary to work in the trade unions, no matter how reactionary their leaders." So declared the Comintern to all those revolutionary proletarians who had fled from the trade unions because of the reactionary nature of their leaders. "It is necessary to win the working masses organised in the trade unions," said the Comintern, whilst perfectly realising the reactionary nature of the entire trade union machinery and the treacherous role of the trade union bureaucracy. The Comintern always understood the conquest of the trade unions as meaning the conquest of the main mass of the members, and not the conquest of the reformist trade union machinery, the trade union officials. The Comintern has put this point of view into effect throughout the whole ten years of its existence, teaching all the parties the truth that the Communists must in no case allow themselves to be severed from the masses, that they must be where the masses are.

But whilst teaching Communists not to run away from the reformist trade unions, the Comintern at the same time systematically pronounced against those Communists who stood for unity at all costs, who adopted a "fetishist" attitude to the trade unions, who suffered from trade union legalism and were subservient to rules and regulations, to the injury of the interests of the Communist movement. Many Parties drew from the necessity of working in reformist trade unions the conclusion that only the trade unions can and ought to direct the economic struggles of the proletariat, whilst the Communists' task was only to "drive" the reformists into the struggle. Hence the slogan of "Force the trade union bureaucrats to struggle," the rejection of the independent leadership of the economic struggle, and of trade union legalism which bordered on cretinism. Communists work in the reformist trade unions only in order to win the workers in those unions, and not to inspire the masses with the spirit of obedience and loyalty to the trade union bureaucracy. Communists work in the reformist trade unions not in order to drive the reformist officials into the struggle, but in order to kick these traitors out of the workers' movement. That is why the Comintern declared resolute war on all who sacrifice Communist principles and the interests of the workers' movement to trade union legalism. By such methods not only will you fail to win the working masses, but you will lose even the influence which you previously possessed. A brilliant confirmation of this is the conduct of the right-wing Communists in Germany. They broke with the Comintern, putting forward their own methods of winning the masses. Result: within a few months they have succeeded in losing the remainder of their influence with the masses.

FACTORY COMMITTEES

But the trade unions are not the sole mass organisations. The October revolution brought other mass organisations, arising directly in the workshops and factories, into the picture: such organisations as factory committees and workers' soviets. Both these organisations develop in the process of the revolutionary struggle. The development of these organisations itself bears witness to the fact that there is a revolutionary situation in the country, that the working class is raising the problem of the struggle for power. Factory committees and workers' soviets arose in Germany, in Austria, and in Hungary, and it was quite natural that the Comintern should concern itself with the problem of factory

committees and workers' soviets. The Comintern was bound to give the workers an answer to the question in what circumstances workers' soviets could and should be set up. To this question it answered: it is necessary to set up workers' soviets at the moment when a revolutionary situation is present, when the problem of power arises. To the question of the attitude to be adopted towards factory committees, the Comintern answered, that it is necessary to struggle for the establishment of representatives in the factories and workshops, for the masses can be won where the masses are congregated. Hence the Comintern slogan which runs through all the congresses, sounding in all its declarations—"Into the factories, into the workshops, to the masses!" But factory committees which had arisen during the revolutionary period had been transformed by the social-democrats wherever they had been preserved (Germany, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia) into organs of co-operation with the bourgeoisie. In such circumstances the position of the factory committees was completely different. The task consisted here in wresting the factory committees from the influence of the trade union bureaucracy, in transforming them into organs of the class struggle. How was this to be achieved? By intensifying work in these enterprises, by putting forward independent lists for election, by drawing the factory committees into economic struggles and putting them into opposition to the reformist trade unions. The chief task was to break down the framework of legality and to extend the functions and competence of the factory committees wherever they existed, and to create forms of representation of all workers in any enterprise where these did not exist. What forms of representation? That depends upon the country. In certain places it was possible to establish special commissions, elect delegations, set up committees and so on. The name and the form of the organisation was a secondary question: the important thing was that the organ thus set up should be genuinely elected by all the workers and should represent their interests. On the question of the trade unions and factory committees all the congresses and plenums of the Comintern have given the most detailed instructions (see the trade union question discussions at all the congresses and plenums) the purport of which is the conquest of the basic mass of the workers and the expulsion of the agents of capital from these organisations.

THE UNITED FRONT

Having set itself the problem of the leadership of the day-to-day struggle, the Comintern was bound to come to the slogan of the united front and of unity. In reality, if the Communists have to head every struggle of the proletariat, they cannot but raise the problem of the composition of the fighting army. The capitalist attack confronts every worker with the question of the organisation of counter-action. In so far as it was a question of defending elementary gains, workers of various tendencies could be drawn into the struggle. Hence the united front for defence against the attack of capitalism, a united front which had to lead to a transition from defence to attack, in so far as the masses could be drawn into the task of defence. Thus the united front arose and was formulated as a method of mobilising the masses in the struggle against capital. "The tactics of the united front," says the Comintern program, "as a means of the most successful struggle against capital, of the mobilisation of the masses, the unmasking and isolation of the reformist upper groups, constitutes the most important part of the Communist Parties' tactics during the whole of the pre-revolution period." But if the masses are prepared to act in a united front against capital, why cannot they be in one trade union organisation? The united front led logically to the slogan of the unity of the trade union movement, to the slogan proclaimed by the fifth congress of the Comintern.

Both these slogans, when tested in practice, revealed that within the Comintern social-democratic elements existed, which had made a fetish of the slogan of unity and the united front, and that in order to achieve the united front and unity they were prepared to pay whatever political price you liked. In certain instances the united front degenerated into a pact for mutual non-aggression between the Communists and the reformists, whilst unity became a capitulation to the trade union reformist machine. This capitulation is ex-

plained by the fact that there are Communists who regard the existence of reformist trade unions as an advantage to the working class, and maintain that as long as these trade unions have a positive significance for the workers, capitulation before the trade union bureaucracy is justified. This is a most dangerous and opportunist deviation. Can it be seriously maintained that the American Federation of Labour represents an advantage to the workers' movement of the United States? Or, possibly, the All-German Federation of Trade Unions, which has shattered one revolutionary movement after another, is an advantage to the German proletariat? Would it not have been better for the German proletariat if that strike-breakers' organisation had not existed in November, 1918? One would have thought so. And if that is so, it is quite obvious that the Communists who construct their tactics on such an estimate of the reformist trade unions are closer to the social-democrats than to Communism.

Capitulation arises from a fetishist attitude to the trade unions, from an internal conviction that the reformist trade unions do none the less defend the interests of the workers. The Comintern long ago declared a resolute struggle against this capitulation, believing that an unsound estimate of the real role of the reformist trade unions may lead to a distortion of the whole policy of the Communist Parties and the Comintern.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANISATION IN THE IMMEDIATE STRUGGLE

The struggle for the masses confronted the Comintern and its sections with the problem of leadership in economic struggles. The right wing Communists settle this problem very simply: as the trade unions have been set up for the direction of economic struggles, let them direct them. But the trouble is that the reformist trade unions do not lead them, or if they do, it is only in order to effect the break-up of the movement. In such circumstances the phrase: "Let the reformist trade unions direct the economic struggle," is the very worst form of capitulation and borders on treachery to the interests of the working class. It is quite obvious that the Comintern cannot accept any such view in regard to economic struggles. The instructions of the Third Congress were put into concrete form by the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, and in all the decisions reached the chief feature was the leadership of the economic struggle through organs specially elected for this purpose (militant leadership, strike and lock-out committees, etc.). It may seem strange, but these decisions of the Comintern suffered the heaviest attack of all. Why strike committees, when there are trade unions? If strike committees are necessary, let the trade unions set them up. If strike committees must be elected, let them be elected only by members of the trade unions, and so on. But despite their apparent innocence all these counter-proposals arose from the idea that it was the reformist trade unions who ought to have the leadership in economic battles, whilst the Comintern holds the view that with the aid of strike committees the direction of the struggle for everyday demands can be in the hands of revolutionary trade unions, or where these do not exist, in the hands of the revolutionary opposition. On what ground did the Comintern and R.I.L.U. come to these decisions? On the same basis from which the Second and Third Congresses of the Comintern started: the best method of transforming Communist Parties into mass organisations and linking them with the widest masses of the proletariat. This is all the more necessary since apart from the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions there is no one to direct economic struggles and since without our intervention the working class is condemned to endure constant and systematic depression of its standards of existence and to suffer one defeat after another. In such circumstances any opposition to the independent leadership of economic struggles is playing into the hands of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, the worst enemies of the proletariat.

* * * * *

The independent leadership of the economic struggles brought before the Comintern and its sections the problem of the organisation of the unorganised. This also is no new problem to the Comintern. But although this is not a new problem, it arises in new forms in a par-

ticular situation. First and foremost, the majority of the workers in most countries are unorganised—but this is not new, this was so before. The new factor consists in the fact that with capitalist rationalisation there is developing the application of unskilled labour in place of skilled labour. And as the unskilled labourer is also generally unorganised, this means that the unorganised workers are now playing a much greater part in the process of production than previously, and that without them any strike is condemned to failure. On the other hand, it is necessary to bear in mind that among the unorganised workers there are not a few who have already been in trade unions, who have left them from political motives. All this compels us to regard the problem of organising the unorganised with the maximum of seriousness, for it is one of the most important roads to the masses. Whilst everybody is unanimous on the question of the necessity of organising the unorganised, that unanimity vanishes when the question of how they are to be organised is raised. For countries with a divided trade union movement (France, Czecho-Slovakia, Greece, Roumania, Japan, and so on) the question is clear: the unorganised masses have to be gathered round the class trade unions. In countries where the great majority of the proletariat are unorganised (U.S.A., Poland, etc.), the question is no less clear—the masses have to be drawn into new unions. The question is not so simple in the case of countries with a single trade union movement (Germany, Austria, Britain, etc.). What is to be done with the millions of unorganised workers in these countries, especially during and after large-scale wage struggles? Hitherto, in Germany, for instance, three answers have been given to this question: (1) Organise the unorganised into the reformist trade unions; (2) Assemble them around the International Workers' Committee; (3) keep the Party out of this question, so as to avoid being transformed into a "party of the unorganised workers."

I personally put forward a different solution of the problem (the setting up of anti-lockout associations, of societies for mutual aid in strikes, etc.). I had no idea of maintaining that this was an ideal and final answer to this complicated question. No. I raised the question with a view to calling attention to it and securing its consideration from all aspects. There are comrades who consider this form of organisation unsuccessful. That is a question not of principle but of practice. But no matter what the forms of organisation and the methods of capturing the unorganised, this is clearly a difficult point in the Comintern's struggle for the masses. We must not forget that the section of the workers organised by the social-democrats is the most reactionary section of the proletariat. It is possible to break the united front of the employers, the bourgeois State, social-democracy and the reformist trade union machinery only after the unorganised workers have been drawn into the active struggle. Without achieving this we shall never advance.

WHO ARE THE MASSES?

It is necessary to bear in mind that the conception of the "masses" changes from day to day. Lenin considered this problem even at the Third Congress of the Comintern. In some countries and circumstances, even a few thousand workers may constitute a mass; in other countries, we can talk of a mass only when tens and hundreds of thousands are brought into the movement. On this question Lenin at the Third Congress said:

"If a few thousand non-party workers, customarily living good citizen's lives and draging out a miserable existence, and never having heard a word about politics before, begin to take revolutionary action, we have before us a mass. If the movement extends and grows stronger, it gradually passes into a real revolution. When the revolution is adequately prepared, the conception of the 'mass' changes: a few thousand workers no longer constitute a mass. This word begins to have a different meaning. The conception of the mass changes in the sense that by it we understand a majority, and moreover not merely a simple majority of the workers, but a majority of all the exploited; any other understanding of the matter is impermissible to a revolutionary; any other meaning of this word becomes incomprehensible."

In no circumstances can the conclusion be drawn from this passage that Lenin did not

contemplate a revolution before the Party had united the formal majority of the working class. No, Lenin did not approach the question from the aspect of how many members there were in the Party, but what was its influence on the mass. In the same speech Lenin also said:

"It is possible that even a small Party, the British or American Party for instance, after carefully studying the course of political development and acquainting itself with the life and habits of the non-Party masses, may evoke a revolutionary movement at a favourable moment. If at such a moment it comes out with its slogans and succeeds in drawing a million workers after it, before us is a mass movement. I do not unconditionally reject the possibility that a revolution can be begun by quite a small Party and carried to a victorious end, but it is necessary to know by what methods the masses are to be drawn to your side. To this end fundamental preparation for the revolution is indispensable. Quite a small party is sufficient to draw the masses behind it. At certain moments there is no necessity for large organisations.

But in order to achieve the victory the sympathy of the masses is necessary. An absolute majority is not always necessary, but for victory, for the maintenance of power, not only is a majority of the working class necessary—I use the term "working class" in its west-European sense, i.e., in the sense of the industrial proletariat—but a majority of the exploited and the toilers of the rural population."

Here the problem of the inter-relations between the Party and the masses in the revolution is put with such clarity that it is worth while recalling this passage again and again to the memory of all the Parties. The practical work of the Comintern consisted in explaining to all the parties what the masses are and how they have to be won. In this, as in other questions, the road was laid down by Lenin.

TEN YEARS OF STRUGGLE

The Communist Parties under capitalism can capture the class-conscious minority of the working class, that is not open to the least doubt. Thus the whole problem amounts to the question what road the Comintern has taken during these years. Has it got its roots into the masses, or is it, as the social-democrats assure us, losing all its influence? It is sufficient merely to compare the Comintern of ten years ago in order to be convinced that the social-democratic gutter press is lying. How is the growth in influence of the Comintern to be explained? (1) The economic growth of the U.S.S.R.; (2) the growing social antagonisms inside capitalist countries; (3) the growing antagonism between the capitalist Great Powers. All these factors are shaking capitalist stabilisation and making more and more illusory the hopes of the bourgeoisie and of social-democracy for the restoration of capitalism. If capitalism had really emerged from its crisis and a period of organic development and prosperity were to begin, the Comintern would wane in influence. But the whole essence of the matter is that this is out of the question, that antagonisms and conflicts are increasing every day, that clashes between labour and capital are growing, enormous reserves of unemployed are increasing the uncertainty of the morrow, the national emancipation movement is growing in the colonies, the prognosis given by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern as to the intensification of the social, national, imperial and colonial antagonisms is being confirmed. It is true that capitalism has obtained a series of victories of recent years (the victory of Fascism in various countries, the defeat of the Chinese revolution, the repeal of a number of social laws, etc.), but none the less that which the Third Congress said in its thesis on the world situation remains in full force.

"It remains unchallengeable that during the present epoch the general curve of capitalism, in spite of transient rises, is downward; the curve of revolution—through all its fluctuations—is tending upward."

What is the result of the ten years' struggle for the masses? If a comparison be made between the Comintern of ten years ago and the Comintern of to-day, we see what an enormous stretch of road has been traversed by the international Communist movement. From a group made up of one large party (the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), and several small Communist Parties and

small revolutionary and Communist groups in Europe, the Comintern has been transformed into a mighty World Bolshevik Party. Against whom are all the resources and forces of bourgeois States directed? Against the Comintern. Whose banner is unfurled in all the insurrections and mass movements, from Britain to Australia, from India to China, from Germany to Japan? The banner of the Comintern. Even when the insurgents have no conception of the Comintern and its organisation, the attack upon the exploiters, the rising against the imperialists has to be placed to the credit of the Comintern, for it is the organiser and leader of the social revolution, the inspiration of all the exploited class and oppressed peoples.

This decade has been filled with heavy battles. The position of the Comintern is by no means the same in all sections of the international class front. The united forces of the bourgeoisie and social-democracy have driven the Communist Parties underground in a number of countries; wherever the Communist Party has a legal existence it is subjected to unbroken blows and persecutions; and none the less the influence of the Comintern is enormous. There is not a corner of the globe where the Comintern has no base. It is true the forces of the Comintern are not distributed equally over all countries. In certain countries the Comintern is stronger, in others it is weaker. In many countries the social-democrats still have considerable influence with the masses, but it must always be borne in mind that the strength of reformism is rooted in the strength of capitalism. International reformism bases itself on all the might of capitalism in its struggle against Communism. Hence the defeat of the Comintern in isolated sections of the front. International reformism plus international capitalism is still stronger than the Comintern. That is unquestionable. But for us the important factor is the direction of development of the international workers' movement—whether it is moving from the right leftward, from reformism to Communism, or vice versa. The task of the Comintern is so to work as to hasten the historic process of the emancipation of the proletariat from bourgeois social-democratic ideology. How is that to be achieved? In that consists the whole of Bolshevik tactics. One thing is clear; that one essential for the conquest of the masses is the constant self-cleansing of the Comintern from right and left wing opportunism, and the struggle against compromise with deviations from the Bolshevik line.

The Comintern still cannot boast of having won the majority of the International proletariat, but it is swiftly moving towards that goal. It is moving in that direction because from the very first day of its inception it took a sound course on the basic question: the party—the class—the masses. This course was laid down by the organiser and leader of the Comintern, Lenin, in his theses "On the basic tasks of the Second Congress of the Comintern." In those theses we read:

"For the victory over capitalism a sound correlation between the leading Communist Party, the revolutionary class, the proletariat and the masses is necessary. Only the Communist Party, if it is genuinely the advance-guard of the revolutionary class, if it includes all the finest representatives of that class, if it consists of completely class-conscious and devoted Communists, educated and steeled by the experience of a stubborn revolutionary struggle, if that Party has succeeded in linking itself up indissolubly with the whole life of its class, and through it with the entire mass of the exploited, and in inspiring that class and that mass with trust, only such a Party is capable of leading the proletariat in the most ruthless, the decisive last struggle against all the forces of capitalism. On the other hand, only under the leadership of such a Party is the proletariat capable of unfolding all the might of its revolutionary force, reducing to nothingness the inevitable apathy and partial opposition of a small minority of the capitalist-infected labour aristocracy, the old trade union and co-operative leaders and such like—only thus is it capable of developing all its power, which is immeasurably more than its proportion to the population, owing to the very economic structure of capitalist society."

The service of the Comintern consists in the fact that throughout the entire period of its activity it has unswervingly taken that road. By the example of the October revolution Bolshevism has demonstrated that it

knows how to attack, retreat, and conquer, without for one moment losing contact with the masses. This basic quality of Bolshevism is also the basic quality of the Communist International, which in victories and defeats has always been with the masses, always at the head of the masses. So it was, so is it now, and so it ever shall be.

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD

by

JOHN REED

A vivid account of the November revolution in Russia as witnessed and recorded by that brilliant journalist and author, the late John Reed

Cloth 4*s.* *Post free* 4*s.* 5*d.*

Paper 2*s.* ,, ,, 2*s.* 3*d.*

Of all booksellers or direct from

MODERN ★ BOOKS ★ LIMITED

26 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON, W.C.1

Revolutionary Alliance of the Workers and Peasantry

V. Kolarov

"THE current period of history may justly be defined as a period of desperate struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie not only to win the backward sections of the proletariat, but also the vast sections of the peasantry." This closing section of the "Theses on the Peasant Question," adopted at the Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in 1925, characterises the strategic disposition of the basic class forces during the historical period through which we are now passing both on an international scale and for each separate capitalist country. Owing to their large numbers, and especially owing to the fact that they are the chief reserves for the army, and finally, because they are the producers of foodstuffs and raw materials for industry, the peasant masses are called to play a decisive role in the historic struggle for power between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the majority of the capitalist countries. On their adhesion to one or other of the chief warring forces, on their active participation or neutrality in the struggle, will in the last resort depend the victory or the defeat of the proletariat. Even in such a highly industrial country as Britain, where agriculture occupies only seven per cent. of the population, the peasant problem retains its extraordinary importance, although in that case it is preponderantly a colonial problem. The British proletariat cannot deal finally with its class enemy if it does not succeed in drawing the small farmers of Britain to its side, and if it does not assist the peasants of the British colonies to emancipate themselves from the yoke of British imperialism. The exceptional importance of the peasant problem for the proletariat was confirmed both by the experience of the victorious Russian revolution, and by the defeat of the revolution in Hungary, Poland and Italy. In the resolution of the conference of the Bolsheviks, held in April, 1917, a resolution written by Lenin, the issue was put with the utmost clarity: "Whether the urban proletariat succeeds in drawing the rural proletariat to its side and in securing the adhesion of the mass of the semi-proletarians of the villages, or whether that mass follows the peasant bourgeoisie, which is tending towards alliance with Guchkov, Miliukov, the capitalists and the landed proprietors and towards counter-revolution; on the decision between these alternatives will the fate and result of the Russian revolution depend." As we know, in October the Bolshevik Party achieved a preponderant influence over the masses of the villages, and thus the victory of the revolution was assured. The Hungarian Communists, on the contrary, and the Polish and Italian socialists as the leaders of the revolutionary proletariat, remained isolated from the vast peasant masses owing to their unsound tactics in regard to the peasantry, and this circumstance predetermined the defeat of the proletarian revolution in those countries. Consequently the "theses on the peasant problem" very pointedly warn those Communist parties who do not sufficiently realise the importance of the problem of winning the peasantry, that they "do not observe the terrible danger which threatens the proletarian movement in the event of the bourgeoisie succeeding in binding the vast strata of the peasantry more closely to itself."

THE PEASANT POLICY OF THE BOURGEOISIE

And the bourgeoisie are certainly straining all their energies to recover the influence over the villages which they had before the imperialist war, when they found in the agricultural population a vigorous opponent of the revolutionary ideas of the town and a firm bulwark against the revolutionary tendencies of the industrial proletariat. The struggle to win the

soul of the peasant constitutes one of the chief objects of their care in the work of preserving their shaken class supremacy. In order to achieve this end they do not even stop at certain sacrifies.

Immediately after the October revolution, in order to turn the peasant masses away from the road to the revolution, which the Russian workers and peasants had opened before them, the bourgeoisie was forced to make a number of concessions to the peasantry. Its first concession was in regard to the agrarian question. Everywhere where the land problem was particularly acute, they entered on an era of "agrarian reforms." Owing to the growing political consciousness of the peasantry, the urban bourgeoisie was also forced to renounce its monopoly of State power. Whilst retaining its leading role, it divided the administration of the State with certain peasant strata.

And it would be foolish to deny the successes of this bourgeois strategy. One of the chief causes of the swift ebb in the post-war revolutionary wave in a number of countries was this very weakening of the united front of the workers and peasants, as a result of the concessions which the bourgeoisie made to the latter.

In order completely to safeguard their class hegemony, however, the bourgeoisie had to prepare the economic foundation of their alliance with the peasantry. Consequently all the bourgeois parties and governments brought forward the question of the improvement of agriculture, either by the introduction of a number of agricultural measures, or with the aid of a system of agricultural credits, or by the stimulation of agricultural co-operation, or with the help of protective tariffs, and so on.

In the solution of these vital problems the bourgeoisie has a valuable assistant in the form of international social-democracy. The social-democratic parties of all countries have also intensified their interest in the peasantry and are endeavouring to clear the road for their own influence over them. Their old agrarian programmes have proved useless or inadequate to that end, and in consequence everywhere they are turning to their reconsideration. But it is in their theory and practice in regard to the peasant problem that the irrecoverable decline of the social-democratic parties is revealed most clearly. Nor does it matter whether they are "left" or "right"; their retreat from their pre-war positions and their final entry into the camp of counter-revolution are obvious. The whole purport of their new advance into the villages lies in their attempt to stop the process of the leftward trend among the peasant masses, i.e., to undermine the ground of the revolutionary alliance between the workers and the peasants, and to extend the basis for their own co-operation with the bourgeoisie and for maintaining the economic and political foundations of the existing social system.

This attitude of the bourgeoisie and its social-democratic instruments towards the village may undoubtedly lead to great difficulties in the Communists' work among the peasantry, and is already doing so. It would be stupid and dangerous to deny this. It is the duty of the Communist parties to recognise these difficulties created by their class enemies, difficulties which will increase and not diminish, and to learn to struggle against and to overcome them. The peasant masses will be drawn into the revolutionary alliance with the proletariat only as the result of a constant, stubborn and systematic struggle by the Communists against all bourgeois, petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionary influences in the villages. It would be absolutely un-Communist, un-Leninist, to count only on the elemental factor. The task which the counter-revolutionaries set themselves consists in diverting the elemental revolution of the peasant masses by their conscious intervention. And, as we have already seen, they have been successful in the past; they may have similar successes in the future. The basic class antagonisms of capitalist society in the present epoch set bounds to their intervention, open great possibilities for Communists to work among the peasantry, and create objective conditions for the victory of the revolution. But actual victory can be won only on condition that the Communist parties recognising all the enormous importance of the peasant problem, carry out a sound policy in regard to the peasants, and thus systematically undermine the influence of the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats in the villages, and consolidate the revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants under the leadership of the proletariat.

THE PEASANT PROBLEM FROM A REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST STANDPOINT

The preliminary condition for the creation of the revolutionary alliance between the workers and the peasantry is such an intensification of class antagonisms as will revolutionise not only the industrial proletariat but also the peasant masses. A study of the history of peasant risings and war shows us that the peasantry developed a state of strong revolutionary agitation during the transition of agriculture from one historical form to another: i.e., at turning-points when, under the influence of increased productive forces, the old agrarian relationships are shattered and replaced by new ones. Thus, for instance, the peasant revolts and wars of the 14th century in France and Britain, of the 15th and 16th centuries in Central Europe, which from the 16th to the 18th centuries embraced Russia also, were the answer of the peasant masses to their enslavement under serfdom or to the destructive activity of merchant capital, which was drawing agriculture into its sphere of influence, breaking up the old patriarchal relations in the village and replacing them by new bourgeois relationships. A similar phenomenon is to be observed during the transition from the epoch of merchant capital to the industrial era and again during the period of the constriction of agriculture in the pincers of finance capital. The revolutionising of the peasantry during the present epoch, the epoch of imperialism, is a manifestation of those enormous class antagonisms into whose orbit finance capital is drawing the village more and more.

During the period of its struggle for political hegemony the bourgeoisie of the west succeeded to a more or less extent in carrying through its task, owing to the fact that the swift destruction of the old agrarian relationships wrested enormous peasant masses from a condition of political indifference, and drew them into the struggle with the old regime. The bourgeois revolution was victorious because it was face to face with the fact of the revolutionisation of the peasantry, and the bourgeoisie suceeded in drawing the majority of them to its side.

But history also teaches us that wherever the peasantry rose against its oppressors as an independent and self-dependent force, in the last result it suffered defeat. It was successful only when it entered the struggle in alliance with another revolutionary social class and under its leadership. In the epoch of the British and the great French revolutions, the peasantry constituted a reserve for the bourgeoisie in its struggle for the overthrow of absolutism and the annihilation of the survivals of feudalism and serfdom. Owing to its alliance with the bourgeoisie it gained its emancipation, and certain peasant strata also acquired part of the lands of the landed proprietors.

Marx and Engels, the strategic geniuses of the proletarian revolution, had thoroughly assimilated this historical lesson, and for the first time raised the problem of a revolutionary bloc between the workers and the peasantry. Wherever they considered the concrete tasks of the proletariat in the revolution they pointed out the necessity of an alliance between the industrial workers and the peasantry —not only with the agricultural labourers, but with the small farmers and tenants also. Thus, for instance, in the program of the German section of the Communist League of 1847, signed by Marx and Engels among others, after laying down the revolutionary demands of the Communists, we read: "In the interests of the German proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie, and the peasant estates, to assist with all our energy to bring the above-specified measures into force." Here is expressed very clearly the idea that, despite their attachment to different social classes and groups, the workers and peasants are bound together during a revolutionary epoch by such vital interests as to make it quite possible and absolutely necessary that they should wage a joint revolutionary struggle. And in his famous letter to Engels dated 16th March, 1856, Marx writes: "The whole business in Germany will depend on the possibility of consolidating the proletarian revolution by a kind of second edition of the peasant war: then the affair will be excellent." With the penetration of genius this passage points out the basic disposition of class forces in the proletarian revolution, a disposition which retains its soundness down to the present time; and also puts forward the chief strategic task of the proletariat in ensur-

ing the success of the proletarian revolution namely: the mobilisation of as wide a circle as possible of the peasant masses, in the name of their own interests, in the struggle to overthrow the ruling classes, under the leadership of the proletariat. Developing this same conception, Engels, in his foreword to "The Peasant War in France," written in 1870, i.e., at the moment when he considered that the proletarian revolution was by no means "over the hills and far away," wrote: "The section of the population which depends entirely and permanently on wages is now, as then, a minority of the German people. This class is naturally compelled to seek allies. The latter can be found only among the petty bourgeoisie, the low grade proletariat [lumpenproletariat] of the cities, the small peasants, and the agricultural wage workers." (1927 ed.) And finally, as we know, one of the chief reasons for the defeat of the Paris Commune specified by Marx was the alienation of the town population from the peasantry.

But it must not be forgotten that Marx and Engels raised the question of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry at a moment when, according to their estimates, the conditions for revolution had matured and when they had in view the success of the revolution. In their view this alliance has its historical justification only as a revolutionary alliance between the proletariat and the oppressed peasant masses, for the overthrow of the power of the capitalists.

The estimates made by Marx and Engels, as to the immediate development of the international revolution, were, as we know, unjustified. The period of organic development of capitalism proved to be more protracted than they had thought. This circumstance served as a starting point for the revival of petty bourgeois theories about the special roads of development of agriculture, and for petty bourgeois and agrarian-co-operative Utopias describing the painless, evolutionary road to socialism, theories which Marx and Engels had buried long before. In these conditions the question of the attitude of the proletariat to the masses also took on new aspects.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC REVISIONS

The revisionists, reformists, and other fraternities among the socialist parties, took it upon themselves to "prove" by a series of "unchallengeable facts" that the law of concentration does not find any confirmation in the development of agriculture, that petty rural economy not only is not disappearing, but is manifesting a tendency to a numerical increase, that small-scale farming has advantages over large-scale, which will not only ensure its future but will make it economically more advantageous to society, and so on. In the same spirit they developed their criticism of other basic assumptions of Marxism.

The inevitable result of this theoretical attack on Marxism was bound to be the transformation of social democracy from a party of the proletarian revolution into a party of petty bourgeois reform; and in regard to the agrarian problem in particular the revisionists put forward a "positive agrarian program," which, while it rested entirely and unconditionally on the basis of private capitalist relationships in agriculture, i.e., irretrievably sacrified basic socialist principles, set itself the task of merely increasing the influx of peasants into the social-democratic party. Thus the revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants put forward by Marx and Engels as a weapon of the proletarian revolution, degenerated in the suburban minds of the opportunists into a vulgar fishing for peasant votes in order to ensure the electoral successes of the social-democratic parties.

Under such conditions the revolutionary Marxists in the capitalist countries had first of all to shatter the petty bourgeois theories of the inapplicability of the laws of capitalist development discovered by Marx to agriculture, theories which the revisionists ardently spread among the proletariat with the complete approval of the bourgeoisie, and also to unmask their reactionary and counter-revolutionary purport. As early as 1894, in the Frankfurt congress of the German social-democratic party, Engels stigmatised as reactionary these agrarian theories which sacrificed socialist principles. Under Engels' inspiration the German revolutionary Marxists turned down resolutely the "positive agrarian programme" of the revisionists, with David, Vollmar and others at their head.

The theoretic defeat of revisionism generally and of revisionism on the agrarian problem in

particular undoubtedly signified a great victory for the revolutionary wing of social-democracy. In the determination of the proletariat's attitude to the peasantry the predominant view was that alliance between the workers and peasants is conceivable and permissible only in so far as the latter come to the realisation that their salvation is only in the proletarian revolution, i.e., only in so far, as Plekhanov put it, as the "peasant abandons the viewpoint of his own class and accepts the viewpoint of the proletariat." Of course, the propaganda of socialism among the small peasants ruined and oppressed by capitalism, the development in them of the conviction that only the proletarian revolution can, by putting an end to capitalistic relationships, save them from exploitation and disaster, was an extraordinarily valuable piece of work, but it was inadequate. It was necessary to associate it with the practical defence of the small peasants against all exploitation to which they are subjected in the process of capitalist development, for this was the most hopeful road to their emancipation from the influence of the bourgeoisie. However, it was here, in the sphere of practical activity, that the revolutionary wing of social-democracy in the majority of cases showed the greatest indifference to the small peasants.

In countries where the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution were still unfulfilled (in Russia, for instance), the revolutionary Marxists stood by the theoretical position of Marxism not only against the attack of the revisionists of Marxism, but also against the belated influence of populist ideology, which sought to combine revisionist Marxism with "subjective sociology." In addition, in 1905 they agitated for the complete abolition of landed estates and for the confiscation of the landed proprietors' land in favour of the peasantry, considering that they would thus establish most favourable conditions for the further struggle for socialism. Here the alliance between the workers and the peasantry acquired exceptional importance particularly as an instrument of direct revolutionary activity. On this point, the Bolsheviks obtained a brilliant victory over the Russian Mensheviks who had set the peasantry at the tail of the bourgeoisie. Lenin demonstrated that in the conditions in which the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution was taking place—a higher development of capitalism than that prevailing in western European countries during their bourgeois revolutions, and in a different world relationship of class forces—the chief motive power of the revolution was the proletariat, and not the bourgeoisie. As soon as the proletariat entered the struggle as an independent class, from the very beginning of the deepening of the revolution, the latter became a counter-revolutionary class, and under such conditions only one revolutionary bloc is possible: that of the workers and peasants under the hegemony of the proletariat. The accuracy of the Bolshevik slogan in the bourgeois-democratic revolution: "the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants," was completely confirmed by events.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TO THE PEASANTRY DURING THE EPOCH OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The Communist International had its inception in the epoch of the international proletarian revolution. Its historic task was to assemble the revolutionary forces engendered in the womb of modern capitalist society during its last, imperialist phase, and to organise and bring them into the attack upon world capitalism. "Expressing the historic need for an international organisation of revolutionary proletarians—the gravediggers of the capitalist order—the Communist International is the only force that has for its programme the dictatorship of the proletariat and Communism, and that openly comes out as the organiser of the international proletarian revolution" —so runs the conclusion of the introduction to the "Programme of the Communist International." In relation to this basic task, which is also the task of the individual Communist Parties, the peasant problem, i.e., the problem of the relationships between the proletariat and the peasantry, takes on fresh aspects during the proletarian revolution. Whilst in the preceding period, in order to establish the most favourable conditions for the class struggle, the proletariat was interested in clearing the road of capitalist development from the vestiges of feudalism and in

simultaneously collecting its own forces, during the period of the proletarian revolution, when the immediate issue is the annihilation of the capitalist system, the strategic task of finding allies in the proletarian revolution is of first importance. Under threat of the most serious defeats, rising about their narrow craft interests and renouncing their exclusive care for the improvement of their own situation, the proletariat must secure the active support of their great peasant masses, must become the "advance-guard of all the exploited, their leader in the struggle for the overthrow of the exploiters," as it is expressed in Lenin's theses on the agrarian problem. From this aspect we now have to solve all the most important problems of the agrarian programme and tactics.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALISATION

In the pre-revolutionary period, the social-democratic parties as a general rule put forward in their programmes the slogan of the nationalisation of the land. They regarded nationalisation as the specific form of social ownership of the land, which in turn they regarded as the preliminary and indispensable condition of the introduction of socialist forms of production in argiculture.

Of course, all this was and still remains absolutely sound. The nationalisation of all land is the general aim of the Communist parties also. None the less the latter would be miserable doctrinaires, and not revolutionary parties, if, in working out their agrarian programme for the period of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, they did not place the interests of the proletarian revolution and the assurance of its victory above all doctrinaire considerations. As we know, the bourgeoisie has always built up its united front with the peasant masses on private property, and now, during the revolutionary period, it counts on the same influence. Its strongest agitational weapon against the Communists in the villages is the argument that the peasants are private owners, and the Communists want to destroy private ownership. And, of course, in countries where, owing to the long-accomplished elimination of pre-capitalist relationships from the villages the sense of private ownership has been deeply inculcated into the peasants, that agitation may meet with success. It is clear that in such countries the Communist parties cannot, as the result of the slogan of the immediate nationalisation of all land in the event of the victory of the revolution, allow the owner-bloc of the large landowners with the small peasants to be consolidated or permit a wedge to be driven between the proletariat and the peasantry over what is for the latter the most burning question of all. On the contrary, they should put forward such a slogan as will shatter the private ownership front, isolating the large landed proprietors from the peasant masses, and at the same time creating and consolidating an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry—such a slogan as the confiscation of all large estates and the transference of part of this land for the free use of the landless peasants, and in certain instances, to the middle peasantry. Unconditionally expropriating the large-scale owners, landed proprietors, etc., and putting part of the confiscated lands into the hands of the peasantry, the proletarian power simultaneously decrees the complete repeal of the right of private ownership in land and the nationalisation of all land only where the concrete conditions of the particular country permit this, only where this will not drive the peasant masses away from the revolution. In certain instances, particularly in countries where the traces of feudalism and serfdom are still fresh (as was the case in Tsarist Russia, for instance), such a reform can be carried through without risk. But in the older capitalist countries, where the peasantry have become accustomed to their own private ownership, it would be risky, and consequently erroneous to propose the nationalisation of all land, and including the land of the small and middle peasantry, as an immediate demand of the Communist Parties.

The problem of the nationalisation of the land was given its correct evaluation in the Leninist agrarian theses, and the programme of the Communist International gave it is final solution. The nationalisation of the land is the inevitable prospect in society evolving towards socialism, and then Communism, under the dictatorship of the proletariat. But immediately after its victory the proletariat proclaims only the "confiscation and nationali-

sation of all large landed estates in town and country (private, church, monastery and other lands) and the transference of State and municipal landed property including forests, minerals, lakes, rivers, etc., to the Soviets, with subsequent nationalisation of the whole of the land." As regards the "subsequent nationalisation of the whole of the land," this reform will be bound up with the inevitable transformation of individual agriculture into collective husbandry, a transition which, however, will be a more or less protracted process; the State authorities will have to realise it "only with extreme caution and gradualness, by the force of example, without any exertion of pressure on the middle peasant." (Lenin's theses.) The same idea was also expressed by Engels. Until the complete nationalisation of the land the programme restrains the peasantry from alienating their land in favour of the capitalists, usurers, etc., by the fact that it prohibits all sale and purchase of land.

"For the sake of the success of the revolution the proletariat has no right to pause before a temporary lowering of productivity"—so strictly and categorically did Lenin formulate one of the basic tactics of the proletarian revolution, in connection with the question whether in certain cases the partitioning of the confiscated large-scale landed estates was permissible. From the viewpoint of vulgarised Marxism such a method of action is impermissible, and the Leninist formulation is heretical from that viewpoint. And it certainly came up against a certain amount of resistance at the Second International Congress, during the consideration of the agrarian theses, owing to the very fact that at that time social-democratic prejudices still survived in the ranks of the Communist parties. Since then, however, on the basis of the positive experience of the October revolution and on the negative experience of the revolutions in Hungary and Poland, this formulation has received universal assent in the Comintern.

The proletarian socialist revolution breaks down the framework of capitalist relationships, which had become fetters on the developing productive forces; its victory brings with it a new unexpected growth of productive forces. But in order to make that result generally possible, it is necessary first of all to overthrow the exploiters. "To ensure the proletarian victory and its stability is the first and basic task of the proletariat." Consequently, if in order to raise the peasant masses against the large-scale landowners and capitalists it is necessary that certain large landed estates should be divided among the peasantry, the proletariat should not pause before such a measure, even if it brings with it a "temporary decline in production." Of course in the foremost capitalist countries with a highly developed technique and a large educated proletariat, the partitioning of large-scale and well-organised farms will be a rare exception, and these latter will be transformed mainly into State farms on the lines of the Soviet farms. In the backward countries this division will be met with much more frequently. Whilst allowing the division of large scale estates in certain cases, the Communists by no means reject the view of revolutionary Marxism concerning the superiority of large-scale over petty agriculture, and the necessity and inevitability of establishing collective agriculture. Nor do they join the camp of the petty bourgeois Utopians and reactionaries of the type of Bernstein and David and their pupils Hilferding, Kruge, Baade and other new lights of the German social-democrats. At the Kiel congress in 1927, these luminaries laid down their new agrarian programme, which broke finally with the traditional views of revolutionary Marxism on the agrarian problem, views which for more than thirty years had withstood the storm of petty bourgeois revisionism. In his article "Theoretical observations on the Agrarian Question" (in "Die Gesellschaft" No. 5, 1927), Hilferding profoundly remarked: "The application of the Marxist method shows us that the law of concentration is not applicable to rural economy." And immediately following him, Kruge, the lecturer on the agrarian problem at Kiel repeated: "There is no socialist teaching which would compel us to insist on the replacement of small farms, since the law of concentration is applicable only in industry, and not in agriculture." And further on: "All the important representatives of socialism, with Marx at their head, who were convinced of the disappearance of small-scale farming, were in error." "Marx and Engels regard large-

scale farming as the form of the future because, under the impression they had gained from the Stein-Hardenburg agrarian reform in Prussia and the failure of small-holdings in Britain, they had come to hold the view that owing to economic causes large-scale economy had swallowed up small-scale. They still were unable to realise that in that case the reasons were not so much economic as political." (All the quotations are taken from Willi Torner's article, "The agrarian problem and social-democracy in Germany," published in Nos. 3 and 4 of the journal "Agrarian Problems.") It becomes quite clear that the German social-democrats, the ideological leaders of the Second International, have completely surrendered the socialist position on the agrarian question, and have passed over to the viewpoint of private ownership and capitalist relationships in the village. The Communists on the other hand, with a view to the liquidation of bourgeois relationships both in industry and in agriculture, with a view to the liquidation of the entire bourgeois system, and in order to safeguard the successes of the proletarian revolution, which is the sole means of effecting that liquidation—the Communists agree to the division of part of the large estates "among the peasantry as a temporary measure dictated by revolutionary strategy." Thus they demonstrate that they are revolutionary Marxists, for revolutionary Marxism is above all the theory of the overthrow of the power of the capitalists, large landowners and other parasites by the revolutionary proletariat which leads the masses.

THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE EMANCIPATION OF THE PEASANTRY

This strategic manœuvre in the task of attracting the peasant masses to the side of the proletariat in the proletarian revolution, if that manœuvre be soundly and profoundly thought out, and carried through with determination, has, as the October revolution showed, every chance of success. For wide circles of the peasantry are also vitally interested in the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and the large landowners. "For the masses of the village there is no way of salvation other than in alliance with the Communist proletariat, in wholehearted support of its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the landowners (large landed proprietors), and the bourgeoisie," since "only the urban and industrial proletariat, led by the Communist Party, can save the masses of the villages from the oppression of capital and large-scale landed proprietorship, from ruin and from imperialist wars." (Lenin theses.)

The Communists show the peasants the revolutionary way of solving the land problem, a way which has been tested and proved in the experience of the Russian revolution. Following this road, the peasants received without any payment all the land at their disposition, together with agricultural implements and stock; the revolution abolished land rent, finally and irretrievably, without replacing it by any other form of exploitation of their labour; it liberated the peasants not only from their immediate mortgage, and other obligations, but also from the obligation to pay war and other State debts by ruinous taxation. Further, it liberated them from all other forms of exploitation by trading, industrial and finance capital. Can the peasantry achieve all this, or even part of it, in any other way?

The bourgeoisie and the social-democratic sycophants point to "peaceful agrarian reform." To begin with, such agrarian reforms were undertaken under pressure from the revolutionary movement of the peasants in order to avoid their complete Bolshevisation through the influence of the Russian example. Consequently they are far from bearing such a "peaceable" character. As soon as the revolutionary pressure relaxed, and the bourgeoisie felt firm ground under their feet, they either sent all idea of agrarian reforms to the devil, or else they began to sabotage their operation. But even where they were put into force only certain of the peasant strata, and those predominantly well-off, received part of the land of the large landowners, in return for which they were burdened with heavy purchase payments, which not only did not relieve them from the oppression of the landowners, but added to that oppression their enslavement to usurers, bankers, the State and so on. The experience of all capitalist countries has shown that under the hegemony of the capitalists and landowners "agrarian reforms" are in reality

transformed into a means of intensifying the exploitation of the masses in new forms, i.e., they prepare the conditions for a new mass expropriation of the small owners. Being unable to overcome the laws of capitalist development, these "reforms" lead again and again to the same situation which served as their starting point.

Even the widest "agrarian reform" in the epoch of finance capital cannot lead to any essential change in the situation of the peasant masses, and still less can it lead to their emancipation from all forms of exploitation. It is enough to point to the poverty-stricken state from which the poor peasants never emerge, and into which the middle peasants also frequently fall. It is sufficient to point to the economic crises which frequently desolate agriculture and evoke ruin even among the richer peasantry. The source of the evil torturing the peasant now is not the fact that he is deprived of his own land, on which he could apply his own labour, but the domination of parasitic classes, which exploit and oppress him equally in his capacity of hired worker and in his capacity of semi-proletarian, small owner, or tenant. Without the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and large landed proprietors there can be no talk of the emancipation of the peasantry. Not only from the viewpoint of the proletariat, but also from that of the peasantry the agrarian problem now arises as a revolutionary problem. Any other statement reflects the interests only of the bourgeoisie, and must be rejected not only by the proletariat but by the peasantry also.

We have pointed out that German social-democracy has already gone over to the bourgeoisie on the agrarian problem. But in essence there is a similar point of view in the Austro-Marxist wing of the Second International, which plays the role of "left wing" and frequently plays even with Bolshevik phrases. The characteristic feature of the agrarian programme of the most prominent theoretician of Austro-Marxism, Otto Bauer, is the retention of small peasant husbandry, guaranteeing the large-scale and middle peasantry an adequate and cheap supply of labour power, especially during the seasons of intensified agricultural labour. Thus, in his brochure "The Struggle for Forest and Field," we read: "In order that the agricultural labourer should use his labour power in working for wages, we must not give him too much land—none the less we must afford him the possibility of living by the receipts from his own farm during those months in which the demand for labour power is not great." Obviously Austrian social-democracy, driven into a corner by the rising power of fascism, systematically stupefying the Austrian proletariat and willingly co-operating with the bourgeoisie to stifle its revolutionary outbursts, is experiencing an extreme necessity to prove the success of its "democratic," "parliamentary" methods. Previously it strove to show this to the workers, now it includes the peasantry also. It is now turning its face to the village, is making eyes at the Austrian kulaks and the middle peasants. The "peaceable" "evolutionary" and "parliamentary" tactics of the Austrian social-democrats in an epoch of maturing civil war must inevitably lead to the betrayal of the proletariat and to the support of the bourgeoisie. For the same "democratic" and "parliamentary" considerations, the Austrian social-democratic party has been transformed into an organic, component part of the existing capitalist-kulak-fascist system in Austria. In his agrarian programme Otto Bauer is wisely silent on the question whether there will be purchase of the expropriated parts of large estates, or whether they will be handed over to the peasants free. But his silence signifies consent to the principle of purchase. The "left wing" social-democrats are binding themselves carefully to preserve the interests of the large-scale owners and capitalists in carrying through their reforms: they have completely surrendered to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

In capitalist countries, where the attachment of the peasantry to private ownership has taken deep root, bourgeois ideologists represent an alliance between peasant owners and the peasant poor as nonsensical, utopian, and convincingly "demonstrate" that the place of the peasant is in the bourgeois camp. Only close co-operation with the latter, on the basis of private ownership, can, they say, "safeguard" his interests. Only a joint struggle with the bourgeoisie in defence of private pro-

perty against the attack of the village poor can "safeguard" his future. Not the "alliance of the peasants and workers," but "the alliance of the peasants and the bourgeoisie" is the slogan of the day, which will bring "order," "prosperity," and "security" into the village.

This theory has its adherents in the village also. There are first and foremost the large landowners. Finance capital solves the antagonism between large-scale landed property and industrial capital, and cements their counter-revolutionary alliance. But in fact, the large landowners do not belong to the peasantry. These large-scale peasants are kulaks, who in fact are capitalist employers, and as a general rule are the masters of several wage-labourers. Despite certain contradictions, they are bound by innumerable threads with the industrial capitalist groups. "This is the most numerous of the bourgeois strata which are direct and resolute enemies of the revolutionary proletariat." (Agrarian resolution of 1920). Concerning them Lenin in 1918 wrote: (in "Comrade Workers, we are going into the last decisive struggle," in the "Lenin Album," 1925): "the kulaks are the most bestial, the coarsest, the most savage of all exploiters, who in the history of other countries have more than once restored the power of the landowners, the kings, priests and capitalists. . . . The kulak can easily be reconciled with the landowner, the king and the priest, even if they have quarrelled, but with the working class, never." Of course, co-operation of the urban bourgeoisie with the rural bourgeoisie, especially during revolutionary periods, is quite certain. But in view of the fact that the large-scale peasantry constitute an insignificant minority in the sea of landless, small and middle peasants, the problem of the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry is far from solved by that fact. The peasant theory of the bourgeoisie has in mind the basic peasant strata, and they constitute the chief object of its exploitation in the countryside.

The agricultural workers, and to a considerable extent the agricultural semi-proletriat, the small peasantry, who constitute one of the most numerous strata in the villages, cannot by any means be included directly in the bourgeois property-owning bloc. Despite that fact, the bourgeoisie will not renounce the right to fool them. But wherever their devices are unmasked, they apply other methods, think out other theories in order to turn this group from the revolutionary road; for example the theory of harmony of interests between labour and capital, the theory of class co-operation, the preachers of which among the peasantry are the heroes of international social-democracy and the Amsterdam International. None the less the efforts of the bourgeoisie and its social-democratic agents cannot count on a genuine and permanent success among these peasant strata. The agricultural workers are directly drawn into the class struggle between labour and capital, and are directly interested in the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and large-scale landed proprietors; they are the standard-bearers of the proletarian revolution in the countryside. The situation of the peasant semi-proletarians is so arduous and the relief which the proletarian dictatorship would mean for them so great, that they can become the convinced allies only of the proletariat.

But the chief task of the bourgeoisie in the countryside is to unite the middle and small peasants, the independent peasant farmers and producers, who with few exceptions constitute the majority of the peasant population of capitalist countries, firmly under their leadership. To them above all they demonstrate the "solidarity" of ownership, and convince them of the necessity of defending the existing bourgeois system against the attack of the poor and landless.

As for the middle peasantry, whose farms are partly worked by wage labour, and not only feed their families but also supply some amount of surplus which (in years of good harvest) can be transformed into capital, their class association with the capitalists is evident. In the majority of the capitalist countries the capitalists can establish co-operation with them on a number of questions of practical policy. As a general rule, the middle peasantry are now hand-in-hand with the bourgeoisie, and in a number of countries they participate in the administration of the country under the hegemony of the large-scale capitalists. None the less, their com-

plete dependence on banking and large-scale commercial and industrial capital makes their situation quite unstable, and they feel this especially at time of crisis, when in the main they are ruined; consequently their class "solidarity" with the capitalists has no solid basis, and their co-operation with them can be regarded only as temporary and unstable. During revolutionary crises, under the mighty blows of civil war, their alliance with the large-scale bourgeoisie can be destroyed, and they can be neutralised. And in agrarian countries, which are in a state of semi-colonial dependence on imperialist Powers, or in countries in which considerable traces of feudalism exist, the middle peasantry can even be drawn directly on to the side of the revolution.

Despite the assertions of the bourgeoisie and their sycophants, their attempt to win the petty peasantry to the side of the owners' bloc is foredoomed to failure. The trouble is that ownership or independent production may sometimes unite, but also sometimes disunites. Everything depends on what is the real content of the ownership. The private owner or the independent master can only be a dependable basis for the regime of private ownership when the latter ensures him a tolerable existence and opens before him good prospects for the future. The situation of the petty peasant, who exploits only his own labour and that of his family, as an "independent master" is nothing but that of a wage-labourer in a disguised form, permitting of the most rapacious and most cynical exploitation of his labour and the labour of his family both by the capitalists of all categories (landowners, traders, industrialists, etc.), and by the State through the pressure of taxation. The receipts of the small peasant are a special form of wage payment, which the exploiting classes can cut down to the lowest limit, and which from the class point of view brings him close to the wage labourer, even if it does not place him on the same level; whilst from the social-economic point of view it frequently places him below the wage labourer. The similarity of ownership between the bourgeoisie and the small peasant creates only a formal, i.e., an ostensible solidarity between them, which can temporarily encourage illusions in the small peasant, but cannot eliminate the profound antagonisms which attach these groups to two opposing camps. And on the other hand, the formal attachment of the small peasants and wage labourers to two different social categories cannot abolish their solidarity in the struggle against capitalist oppression. As the proletariat has no interest in opposing measures capable of lightening the miserable position of the small peasants, so the latter cannot object to the struggle of the proletariat for a general improvement of the conditions of his labour and existence. Real class interests draw the small peasants away, both ideologically and politically, from the influence of the bourgeoisie and bring them close to the workers.

Thus the "peaceable" road of the bourgeoisie and its social-democratic sycophants cannot be a substitute, under the guise of "agrarian reform," for the revolutionary settlement of the agrarian problem. So, too, the united front of ownership which is to isolate the revolutionary proletariat from the peasant masses and to foredoom to failure any attempt to overthrow the existing system, is shattered against the class antagonisms, which permeate and embrace the whole of agriculture and condemn the workers of the countryside to ruin. The proletarian revolution remains the only road which history opens before the peasant masses in their struggle for emancipation from the yoke of the landowners and the capitalists. Their first and deepest interests drive the peasantry towards a revolutionary alliance with the proletariat.

THE ALLIANCE OF WORKERS AND PEASANT IN THE PERIOD OF PARTIAL CAPITALIST STABILISATION

The partial stabilisation of agriculture under capitalism is undoubtedly reflected in the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. It is extraordinarily important that the Communist Parties should study and note the new factors which result from this.

On the basis of the war destruction and the severe economic crisis, evoked by that war, we had the post-war revolutionary rise, which embraced the masses of the peasantry of all countries, and, in a number of countries, led to revolutions, risings, and great agrarian

movements. The depth of the crisis is shown by the fact that the revolutionary movement drew in the middle peasantry also, despite the fact that owing to inflation the latter were in fact emancipated from mortgage and other debts. But as capitalism succeeded in overcoming the crisis and stabilising world economy, the revolutionary wave declined and the middle peasantry were the first to abandon the struggle.

But does the partial stabilisation of capitalism, which has undoubtedly embraced agriculture also, imply that the epoch of agrarian crises is over, that a "normal" development of agriculture is ahead? Not at all. The point is that the process of restoration in agriculture, like the reconstruction of its technical basis, occurs unequally both in different countries, and also in industry as a whole. Hence the instability of the market, the lack of correspondence between the prices of agricultural products and industrial products, and so on. The law of capitalist development is working in the direction of further and still deeper agrarian crises.

The agrarian crisis in the transoceanic countries, which was at its height during 1923 and 1924, and caused the wholesale ruin of American farmers, is explained by the fact that in those countries the restoration process in agriculture came before the same process in industry, and led to a sharp decline in the prices of agricultural products. The crisis, as we know, evoked a revolutionary agitation among the peasant masses in the United States, Canada, the Argentine and other countries. It was outlived only when industry gradually caught up with and then surpassed the tempo of development of agriculture. On the other hand the process of concentration of industry in all its forms (trustification, combination and so on) which is going on with extraordinary swiftness, brings agriculture, disintegrated into innumerable independent farms, face to face with the fact of monopoly and creates the conditions for new agrarian crises. The rapid restoration and development of American agriculture leads to a condition of chronic crisis in agriculture in a number of backward countries such as the Balkan, Baltic and similar States, where the costs of production surpass the level of prices on the world market. In the same way the scissors, which connotes an agrarian crisis, have not yet been outlived in all countries.

Thus the agrarian crisis cannot by any means be regarded as past. The development of agriculture in the conditions of capitalist stabilisation can be regarded only as the maturing of conditions for fresh crises, with all their social and political consequences. The rationalisation of agriculture, i.e., the application of machinery, the extensive use of artificial manure, the introduction of perfected methods of working the land and so on, are inevitably accompanied by an intensification of the class struggle in the villages. The attraction of agriculture into the orbit of finance capital, which, during recent years, has been proceeding at an extraordinary speed, is preparing the ground for its complete subordination to the power of finance capital, for the concentration of colossal power in the hands of the latter, which in turn must evoke a further wave of class antagonism, intensifying class conflicts and giving rise to vast social and political disturbances. This is being accomplished before our eyes in America, the chief producer of grain for the international market, when the bankers' trusts have established a real monopoly in the grain trade by the complete subordination of the farmers' pools. The consequences of this will be immeasurable in the development of class and political relations both in America and throughout the world.

International competition on the market for agricultural products, which is growing steadily more intense, owing first to the rationalisation of agriculture, and secondly to the decline or the lag in the purchasing power of the masses, is leading inevitably to a fresh development of the system of protection for "national agriculture," which includes protective and prohibitive import tariffs, the development of agricultural credit and co-operation, export bonuses, etc. A similar policy, the clearest agents of which are large-scale agrarian interests, may strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie over the middle peasantry and even give rise to certain illusions among the small peasantry. There is, for instance, a similar phenomenon in Germany, Austria and

a number of other countries. Undoubtedly during this period it will render more difficult the work of Communists among agricultural populations, whilst the middle peasantry will be completely eliminated as objects of Communist activity, if other factors rendering them more accessible to Communist agitation, such as imperialist oppression, national enslavement, the danger of war, the white terror and so on are absent.

"Protection for agriculture" is a clearly expressed class policy. It is the policy of the upper groups in the villages. It cannot give the poor peasantry anything more than crumbs even in isolated cases, whilst as a whole it will lead rather to a worsening of their general position. Agrarian taxation falls with all its oppressive weight on the proletariat, the urban masses and small peasant producers: it supplements the capitalist system of extraction through direct and especially through indirect taxes, absorbing as much as possible of the receipts of the workers. Partial capitalist stabilisation is everywhere accompanied by an incessant intensification of taxation, thus cutting down the consumption of the workers, deepening and intensifying class antagonisms on a general scale, and thus undermining the stabilisation itself. The agrarian and taxation policy of the bourgeoisie provides enormous material for the work of the Communists in the villages; arising from the immediate practical interests of the small peasantry and from those which they have in common with the proletariat, the Communists must establish a strict line of class demarcation between the small peasantry and the bourgeoisie and so undermine bourgeois influence on the small peasantry.

High import tariffs as a system of defence of national industry and national argiculture are weapons fraught with extraordinarily dangerous consequences. Under the influence of the kulaks the Austrian government made an attempt to defend "national agriculture" by introducing high import tariffs on meat. But that attempt came up against the firm opposition of the Polish government, which threatened to close the Polish frontiers to the products of Austrian industry. But bearing in mind that agrarian taxes are in reality chiefly directed against America, which is the chief supplier of grain, meat and other articles to Europe, it is obvious that the consequence of their introduction would be a sharp intensification of relations with the United States, and the danger of a fresh imperialist war. The development of agriculture, which has not yet got over the ruin of the first imperialist war, as well as the development of industry, will, by deepening and intensifying inter-class and inter-State antagonisms, inevitably lead to a new war. This becomes all the clearer if we take into account the tense relations between world economy and its socialist sector, which find expression in the feverish preparations of international imperialism for the military destruction of the U.S.S.R. But the danger of the swift approach of a new imperialist war opens the widest prospects for the work of the Communists in the villages, as is shown by the periodical mass risings of the reservists, preponderantly peasants, in France.

What we have said shows quite clearly that the stabilisation of agriculture is accompanied by an increase in the antagonisms which are destroying it, and that under its regime the leftward trend of the peasant masses will steadily continue, whilst the temporary and partial retreat of certain peasant sections is compensated by the more rapid advance of the others. This very circumstance compels the ruling bourgeoisie to organise their dual political attack on the peasant masses, on the one hand in the form of the attack of the social-democrats on the villages, and on the other in the form of the attack of fascism. By these two roads, and with the aid of these two complementary methods, they will strive to prevent the spread of Communism in the villages and to paralyse the formation of a revolutionary alliance between the peasants and the proletariat under the leadership of the latter. The task of the social-democrats in the villages consists now in strengthening bourgeois influence over the small peasants, and in organising "peace" on large-scale capitalist farms. Fascism, the White Terror, a naked dictatorship, which in a greater or less degree, in an open or masked form is becoming more and more dominant as the political system of the bourgeoisie, supplements the work of the social-democrats wherever the latter proves inadequate. The unmasking of

the social-democrats at every stage, in connection with the concrete problems of the agricultural workers and peasantry, and also the most energetic resistance to Fascism in the villages, constitute a very essential task for the Communists in the village. The revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants will be created finally in the struggle against social democracy and Fascism.

Capitalist stabilisation is inevitably reflected in the peasant mass organisations, in the unions and parties, and in their programme and tactics. The organisations under the leadership of large agrarian interests, after first pacifying the middle peasants, have again become the agents of the interests of capitalis landowners, frequently drawing after them certain sections of the small peasantry also. The peasant unions, in which the leading role is played by the middle peasants, have also in the majority of cases taken a step to the right on the road towards co-operation with the urban capitalist bourgeoisie; but this meets with the opposition of the small peasantry, who come into conflict with the leading groups. In their relations with the agricultural mass unions and parties, the Communist Parties must set themselves the basic task of struggling against bourgeois influence, wresting from it in the first place, the agricultural workers, semi-proletarians and small peasantry. To this end they must ruthlessly unmask the compromising tendencies of the petty bourgeois leaders. The general support of the Peasant International by the Communists will render easier the work of leadership and organisation of the left revolutionary tendencies among the peasantry.

Frequently bourgeois influence seeks to find a way to the peasant masses in the guise of the "independent activity" of the peasantry. "Neither with the bourgeoisie nor with the workers." But historical experience, confirmed, inter alia, by the miserable fate of the agricultural government of Stambulinsky in Bulgaria, proves irrefutably that a stable independent peasant government is impossible. "The tactics of an independent peasantry in this given instance can be nothing but a means of wresting the small peasants from the proletariat, a preparatory step towards their passing into the bourgeois camp." The Communists must unmask this bourgeois manœuvre and firmly inculcate into the consciousness of the peasant masses that "only the dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the peasantry, is capable of ensuring the victorious struggle of both classes against the exploiters." (1925 theses.)

The development of the capitalist world in the present epoch and as it continues under partial capitalist stabilisation, constantly creates favourable conditions for the attraction of the peasant masses to the side of the proletariat. On the Communist parties will fall the task of transforming this objective possibility into reality. The measure of the extent to which the parties are Bolshevised is the correct understanding of Lenin's teaching on the inter-relations between the workers and the peasantry, and the exact observance of that teaching in practice. The overcoming of purely propagandist methods and of political passivity in the countryside; the estimate of the every-day needs and direct interests of the peasant masses with a view to drawing them into the struggle against capitalism, with emphasis above all on the agricultural workers, semi-proletarians and poor peasants, whilst not for a moment neglecting work for the neutralisation of the middle peasants; untiring energy in overcoming the innumerable barriers which the bourgeoisie creates, using as their weapons first the social-democrats then Fascism—this is the road by which the Communist Party will create the revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants and will ensure the success of the proletarian revolution.

War, Revolution, and the Birth of the Comintern

G. Zinoviev

THAT the birth of the Comintern was largely the result of the world imperialist war can be seen not only from chronological facts. Between the first world imperialist war and the rise of the new workers' International, which has written on its banner the immediate realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is more than a chronological connection: there is a logical connection.

How and why did the Comintern arise from the world war? How and why did the fight against future imperialist wars become the axis of the whole policy of the new International? How and why was the slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war able to rally to itself the entire vanguard of the international proletariat and become the chief slogan of the Comintern?

In the formation of each of the three Internationals—the first International of Marx, the Second International of the social-democrats, the Third, Communist International of Lenin—a certain part was played by wars. At all events, problems of foreign politics, which were chiefly connected with the danger of war, played an enormous part in the formation of each of the three Internationals. But in the birth of the Third International, war played an absolutely unique and decisive part.

The First International, as is well known, was founded in 1864; in the early seventies it had practically ceased to exist. What historical events preceded the formation of the First International, and what events brought its existence to a close? Chartism in England; the events of 1848 on the Continent; the European crisis of the fifties; the Italian war of 1859; the Crimean War; the emancipation of the peasantry in Russia; the war of the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein; the Austro-Prussian War; the Franco-Prussian War; and the Paris Commune—these are the most important historical events which prepared the ground for the formation of the First International, and then provided the field for its activities during the following ten years. The doctrine of Marxism was developed and completed in this period. Nevertheless, it did not have an undivided influence on the First International, in spite of the fact that Marx and Engels themselves were at the head of this International.

In one sense, it might be said that Chartism and the events of 1848 were the introduction to the activities of the First International; while the Paris Commune was the concluding chapter of the International—its swan song. Chartism and 1848 were the Overture to the Marx International; its concluding chord was the Paris Commune. Wars and revolutions alternated with each other during the whole of this period.

The Second International was born in 1889, and broke up in 1914, having existed in its original form for just a quarter of a century. At its cradle stood German social-democracy. It played a decisive part in the International for practically the whole of the twenty-five years. The defeat of the Paris Commune and the triumph of world reaction led to the fact that for fifteen years the proletariat had no international organisation of any form. Very slowly and by degress the ground for the Second International was prepared.

The second half of the seventies, together with the eighties, may be called the "embryonic" period of the Second International, and the twenty-five years of its existence its period of maturity. What historical events fill this "embryonic period" of the Second International and the twenty-five years of its existence as a mature organisation?

The victory of the Third Republic in France; the Bismarck period in Germany; the wars of Serbia and Montenegro against Turkey (1876); the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878); the repressive law against the

socialists in Germany; the entry of the British forces into Afghanistan (1879); the war between France and China about Tonquin (1883-1885); the war between Serbia and Bulgaria (1885-1886); the first stage in the development of capitalism in Russia; the war between Russian and Afghanistan (1885): between Japan and China about Korea (1894); the war between Spain and Cuba (1895); the Abyssinian War (1896); the war between Turkey and Greece (1897); the Spanish-American War about Cuba (1898); the Boer War (1899-1900); the war between the European Powers and China, i.e., the Boxer War (1900); the war of England against Tibet (1904); the war of Germany against the Herreros (1904-1905); the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905); the Russian revolution of 1905; the revolutionary movements in Turkey, Persia and China; the war between Italy and Turkey about Tripoli (1911-1912); the war of Serbia and Greece against Bulgaria (1913).

The terrifically quick growth of German social-democracy on the lines of parliamentarism and strict legality, and then the events of the Russian revolution of 1905—these are the two factors which laid an indelible stamp on the whole period of the Second International. The first factor in connection with a series of other circumstances gradually led towards the degeneration of the Second International and strengthened its opportunism; the second factor in connection with the gradual removal of the revolutionary centre from the West to the East, tended to a differentiation in the Second International, prepared the revolutionary wing within it, and in this way prepared the breaking up of the Second International and the formation of the Comintern.

By the beginning of the nineties, imperialism was completely developed. The series of wars enumerated above had the character of definitely expressed imperialist wars; they were more or less of a local character—they were not yet world wars. The historical position was such that the Second International had either to fight imperialism face to face, or to submit to it and become its tool. Owing to various influences, which are explained elsewhere, the Second International took the second alternative. This made the breaking up of the Second International inevitable.

* * * * *

Looking back on the course of events, it is quite obvious that the Russian revolution of 1905 acted as the first big stimulus to the breaking up of the Second International. The important ideological fights at the Jena Congress of the German social-democratic party were entirely concerned with the Russian revolution of 1905, and had an enormous importance for the whole of the Second International. In 1907, at the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International, the left wing began to consolidate itself under the leadership of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg. The dividing line was the question of the attitude of the working class to the war, i.e., to the imminent world imperialist war, the chief features of which were already foretold in 1907.

Even Lenin, however, the most clear-sighted leader of the left wing, did not dream at that time of a complete and direct splitting up of the Second International. Everybody's mind was entirely filled with the idea of working-class unity. The admiration for the Second International and its chief party, the German social-democratic party, was so great, that at that time nobody could dream of its splitting up. Lenin put this question only during the world imperialist war, when the fall of its chief parties, above all, of the German social-democratic party, was made apparent. Until then Lenin had worked first as a member of the Second International, and then, from 1904-1914, as a member of its highest organ, the so-called International Socialist Bureau.

Of course, it cannot be said that the position of the Bolsheviks in the Second International was in any way satisfactory. Already in 1904 (at the Amsterdam Congress), the Bolsheviks had been received into the Second International as "rebels," "sectarians"—in a word, as "enfants terribles." After the second congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1903), the Mensheviks and especially their patriarch, P. B. Axelrod, who had the most important connections in the Second International, began to call Lenin a "semi-anarchist," a "plotter," a "follower of Nechaev," and so on.

The Bolsheviks, for the first time, sent a special delegation of their own to the International Congress at Amsterdam (1904), in addition to the delegation where the Mensheviks were in the majority. Lenin did not go

to Amsterdam himself. The Bolsheviks had the greatest majority. Lenin did not go to Amsterdam himself. The Bolsheviks had the greatest difficulty in obtaining permission to attend the Congress, and even then they had no vote.

At that time Bebel, the recognised leader of the German social-democratic party and the entire Second International, sent a letter to the Bolsheviks in which he invited them to place their "quarrel" with the Mensheviks before a court of arbitration to be nominated by the German social-democrats. All the sympathy of the leaders of the Second International was on the side of the Mensheviks. Even Rosa Luxemburg, who did not at first realise what the real difference was between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, took the side of the latter in many questions after 1903. The differences between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were understood, even by such people as Bebel, to be a simple fight between little groups of émigrés, a fight which had no special fundamental basis. Naturally Lenin, in a polite manner, declined the German social-democratic proposal for an inquiry by a court of arbitration. Such enormously important questions, as had to be decided by the revolution of 1905, and then by the revolution of 1917, could not, of course, be decided by any court of arbitration.

After the events of 1905, after the extremely important struggles of 1905-1906, when the tactics of the Bolsheviks took the lead, after the Mensheviks, with the defeat of the revolution of 1905, had begun to turn very energetically to the right—then some of the leaders of the Second International began to listen to the voice of the Bolsheviks, and even supported them in part. Rosa Luxemburg and the Polish social-democratic party which she led, tended, in 1905-1906, to the side of the Bolsheviks. In some fundamental questions—in the estimation of the counter-revolutionism of the Russian bourgeoisie, in the question of the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry, in the question of the character of the Russian revolution—Kautsky himself supported the Bolsheviks (Rosa Luxemburg at that time had a very big influence on Kautsky, especially in questions of the Russian revolution, in which Kautsky recognised her authority).

Lenin was at the head of the Russian delegation at the Stuttgart Congress in 1907; for at the London Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party which had taken place a few weeks before, the Bolsheviks, supported by the Polish and Lettish social-democrats, had received the majority, though by a very slight margin. In the question of the neutrality of the trade unions, the Bolsheviks received full satisfaction at Stuttgart; for the Second International declared against neutrality. Matters were worse with the question of the struggle against war. The famous amendment of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg was carried, but in a weakened form.

"I remember that a long conversation between Bebel and us preceded the final edition of this amendment. The first edition spoke much more directly of revolutionary agitation and revolutionary actions. We showed it to Bebel: he answered, 'I cannot accept it, for then our party organisations would be dissolved by law, and we are not yet prepared for that while there is no serious cause.' After many consultations with lawyers, and many alterations in the text which would nevertheless express the same ideas legally, the final formula was found, and to this Bebel gave his consent." This is what Lenin wrote in a note to an article by the writer of these lines ("Against the Current," third edition, p. 494.)

The joined forces of the Russian Marxists and the German "orthodoxists" (their leader was Kautsky) were able to repel the attacks of the right, which was trying to impose its completely reformist point of view on the colonial question. Nevertheless, nearly half of the votes at Stuttgart supported the frank attitude of the social-chauvinists.

In 1908-1910 there was a certain rapprochement between Plekhanov and the Bolsheviks, and this, to a certain extent, strengthened the position of the Bolsheviks in the Second International, where the authority of Plekhanov stood high. At the international Congress at Copenhagen (1910) the Bolsheviks, together with Plekhanov, had the majority in the Russian delegation. Lenin and Plekhanov made endeavours to consolidate the left wing in the Second International into a more organised body. In Copenhagen Lenin took the initiative in calling together two conferences,

at which the Russians, the French (Guesdists), a few Germans, Belgians (de Brouckère), Bulgarians (Blagoev), and Poles, were present. Nearly all the "Europeans," however, invited to these conferences, showed great timidity, and no serious results were obtained. Indeed, the Copenhagen Congress itself was not very interesting. The internationalists gained a victory in the discussion on the inadmissibility of the division of trade unions on the basis of nationality (the famous dispute of the centralists and nationalists of Austria-Hungary). But worthless resolutions, against which Lenin fought, were passed on co-operation. (See Lenin's Works, Vol. XI, Part 2, page 99.)

Lenin was not present at the Bâle Congress (1912), which was entirely concerned with the war danger. The resolutions passed at Bâle were on the whole satisfactory. Only the Bolsheviks, however, ever fought seriously for the Bâle manifesto against war. The Bâle Congress was the last before the beginning of the imperialist war.

Lenin attended the meetings of the International Socialist Bureau regularly, and took part in all the important discussions. His speech, for instance, on the question of admitting the British Labour Party into the Second International can be read in the collection of his works (Vol. XI, Part I). Generally Lenin was in the minority. At that time three people were all-powerful in the International Socialist Bureau—Bebel, Jaurès and Victor Adler. But even these leaders listened with respect to Lenin's voice.

The fight between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in Russia was naturally reflected in the Second International. The weaker the Mensheviks became and the stronger the Bolsheviks, the more the Mensheviks turned to the leaders of the Second International, asking them for help against Lenin. Their favourite accusation against Lenin was that of sectarianism. By 1908 the Mensheviks were openly degenerating into liquidation. When, in 1907, Lenin emigrated a second time, he found a staff of Mensheviks under the leadership of P. Axelrod and Martov. Soon the Mensheviks succeeded in raising a campaign against the Bolsheviks in nearly the whole of the International press. From 1910 the hostility of the leaders of the Second International became more or less open. The International Socialist Bureau more and and more frequently interfered in the fight between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks; whenever possible, it came to the aid of the latter. This continued right up to 1914. The International Socialist Bureau supported the Menshevik liquidators against Lenin at their conference in August, 1912. In 1914 Vandervelde, as President of the International Socialist Bureau, went to Russia hoping to force the Bolsheviks to weaken in their fight against the Mensheviks. And finally, not very long before the commencement of the world war the International Socialist Bureau, at Brussels, summoned several conferences of all the so-called "currents" in the Russian Party, with the object of leaving the Bolsheviks in the minority, and so forcing them to submit to the Mensheviks. Even Rosa Luxemburg made the mistake of supporting the Second International in this question.

It is useless to try and guess what would have happened if there had been no world war —whether the Bolsheviks would have remained for long within the Second International, or whether, owing to the fight over the "Russian" question, they would have had to break with the Second Internationad. However that may be, the Second International became more persistent and more systematic in its support of the Mensheviks. There is nothing surprising in that. Just as the task of the Communist International is to support international Bolshevism against Menshevism so the task of the Second International, when opportunism became the ruling factor in it, was to support the Russian Mensheviks against the Russian Bolsheviks. It is quite possible, and even probable, that in 1914 the Second International might have delivered an ultimatum to the Bolsheviks. It is possible that in that case the Bolsheviks might not have rid themselves of the interference of Vandervelde and Co. as easily as they were able to reject Bebel's arbitration suggestion in 1904-1905, in 1905 they were saved by the revolution. In 1914 the opportunists in the Second International were quite capable of insisting on obedience to their own terms. The Bolsheviks could certainly not submit in this question, for this would

simply have meant surrendering to the Mensheviks. This was quite out of the question. But just at that time the world war broke out. On the 4th August, 1914, the German social-democratic leaders voted for war credits. The leaders of the French Socialist Party did exactly the same thing. The fire that had been smouldering for years suddenly blazed up. The end of the Second International became a fact. Then, and only then, did Lenin raise the question of smashing up the Second International.

"The Second International has died, vanquished by opportunism. Down with opportunism! Long live the Third International, purified from all deserters and opportunists! The Third International is the organisation of the proletariat to bring revolutionary pressure on the capitalist States; to wage civil war against the bourgeoisie of all countries for seizing political power; to bring about the victory of socialism." So wrote Lenin in his article, "The Position and Problems of the Socialist International," on the 1st November, 1914.

* * * *

The years 1905-1914 may be considered the embryonic period of the Third International. The first Russian revolution was bound to have sown the seeds for a real proletarian fighting International.

The defeat of the first Russian revolution and the victory of reaction the world over simply retarded the growth of these seeds. They were not lost, however; they shot up ten years later. 1905 in Russia; the revolutionary events, connected with the 1905 revolution, in China, Turkey and Persia; various local imperialist wars, which were a preface to the first world imperialist war; this war and its consequences; in particular, the sharpening of the national question, and the first spasmodic efforts of the colonial and semi-colonial countries to rise against their oppressors; the victory of the bourgeois revolution in Russia in March, 1917, and the victory of the great proletarian revolution in November, 1917; the fall of the monarchies in Germany and Austria-Hungary, accompanied by the first important proletarian revolutionary movements in Central Europe; the revolutionary events in Finland, Hungary, Italy, Turkey and the Balkans; the civil war which followed the proletarian revolution in Russia; the European imperialist blockade of the proletarian revolution; and the victorious fight of the proletarian revolution against this blockade—these are the events which brought about the birth of the Communist International.

The most important of all these gigantic events were (1) the world imperialist war, and (2) the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. The doctrine of Marx, brilliantly continued by Lenin, lit the way for the proletarian vanguard in these bloody, but great, days. The Marxian teaching about war, in particular, became the doctrine of the Communist International.

"The masses of Europe and America are not illiterate, and they cannot look upon war in the old way. They ask: 'Why were 10 million people killed and 20 million wounded?' When the masses put this question they are bound to turn to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist International is strong because it is based on the lessons of the world imperialist war. In every country the experience of millions of people shows that the Comintern has taken the right standpoint, and its attraction now is a hundred times deeper and wider than before." (Speech by Lenin on the anniversary of the Comintern, 6th March, 1920.)

Ten millions killed and 20 millions wounded —this is what it cost the proletariat to build the Comintern. The birth of the Comintern after the world war was inevitable, even if there had been no victorious Russian revolution. Without this victory the Comintern might have remained a comparatively small embryonic organisation for some years, an organisation of part of the proletarian vanguard. The victory of the Russian revolution gave the Comintern an enormous mass basis immediately, "a hundred times deeper and wider" than it would have been without the victory of the November revolution. It gave the Comintern the basis of a proletarian State; it gave it an immediate gigantic authority; it put it immediately in the centre of world politics.

At the moment when the imperialist war "turned" into a civil war, all that was best in the Second International "turned" into the Third International. Not long before the world war, the most important leaders of the Second

International openly said that the proletariat would reply to an imperialist war with a world revolution. Bebel, in a well-known speech during the Moroccan conflict said: "Behind the great world war stands the great world revolution. For the bourgeoisie the twilight of the gods is approaching. The funeral dirge for the bourgeois State and bourgeois social order can already be heard." And Otto Bauer in his "National Question" (1908) said the following: "There is no doubt that the approaching imperialist world war will bring in its train the revolution. Unquestionably, the imperialist world catastrophe will be the beginning of the socialist world revolution."

Otto Bauer was not mistaken. The world imperialist war did indeed bring about the beginning of the world socialist revolution, but when the historical hour struck Otto Bauer, and nearly all the other leaders of the Second International, joined the counter-revolutionary army, and not the revolutionary army. The leaders of the Second International were right when they predicted that behind the great world war stood the great world revolution. They promised that at the head of this world revolution would stand the Second International. But as this promise was not fulfilled, as the Second International "went bankrupt," it was obvious that history must produce another organisation which *would* fulfil this role. In the midst of the world war and the first proletarian revolution, the workers built a new International. This International took upon itself the historical mission which Otto Bauer and Co. had sworn to carry out.

The first statutes of the Comintern, which were drawn up with Lenin's collaboration, and were accepted at the Second All-World Congress of the Comintern, said, "Remember the imperialist war! This is what the Comintern says first of all to every worker, wherever he lives and whatever language he speaks. Remember that, thanks to the existence of capitalist society, a small group of capitalists were able to force the workers of many countries to murder each other during four long years. Remember that the bourgeois war brought terrible famine and poverty into Europe and the whole world. Remember that, unless capitalism is overthrown, repetitions of such murderous wars are not only possible, they are inevitable."

The First, and even the Second, Internationals were also built out of wars and big emancipation movements, and their activities were carried out whilst these wars and movements were continuing. Yet how much wider was the historical background which characterised the period when the Second International appeared on the world stage. The First International compares with the Third, as the Paris Commune, which lasted a few weeks, compares with the dictatorship of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., which has lasted over eleven years already. The Second International compares with the Third International as the local wars of the seventies and nineties compare with the world war of 1914-1918, as the German social-democratic party compares with the Bolshevik Party of Lenin.

"The Communist International, founded in March, 1915, in Moscow, the capital of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic," the statutes say. "Solemnly declared before the whole world that it undertook to continue and complete the great movement begun by the first International Workingmen's Association. The imperialist war has more than ever bound together the lives of the workers in one country with the lives of the workers in all countries. The imperialist war has once again confirmed what was written in the statutes of the First International: 'The emancipation of the workers is not a local or a national problem, it is an *international* problem.' "

* * * *

Both the First and the Second Internationals considered that one of their chief tasks was the fight against Tsarist Russia. Marx and Engels, even at the very beginning of their political life, saw a sworn enemy in Russian Tsardom; an enemy who stood in the way of any progress and proved one of the most important obstacles to the proletarian revolution. This point of view explains their attitude towards the events of 1848 and their leadership in the First International. The Second International inherited this tradition from the First International, and at first was quite sincere about it. But when the world imperialist war

broke out, the leaders of the decaying Second International did with the slogan: "Against Russian Tsarism" exactly what they did with a whole series of revolutionary slogans; they used it to mask their own treachery and to camouflage their desertion over to the side of "their own" bourgeoisie. The most important party in the Second International, the German social-democratic party, gave as its reason for its betrayal of the working class during the world war that, in supporting Wilhelm II, they were fighting Russian Tsarism.

The chief party of the Third International—we are speaking of the Bolshevik Party—entered history as a real plebeian anti-Tsarist Party, a Party that *really* overthrew and uprooted the Tsarist monarchy, and then "overthrew the Russian bourgeoisie." It entered history as the first Party to pronounce and carry out the declaration that a revolutionary class in a reactionary war *must* desire the overthrow of its *own* government. The Third International was born at a happier moment than the two preceding Internationals, Tsarist absolutism, which for years had played the part of an international gendarme with regard to the world revolution, was wiped off the face of the earth. The Comintern, in its first statute, was enabled to write the following proud words: "The Communist International whole-heartedly and unconditionally supports the victories of the great proletarian revolution in Russia—the first victorious socialist revolution in the history of the world. It calls on the proletarians of all countries to imitate this example. The Communist International undertakes to support with all its strength every Soviet State, whenever it may spring up."

The hegemony in the international working-class movement belonged first to England, and then to France; during the period of the Second International it was in the hands of the German social-democrats. With the formation of the Comintern, which grew out of the world war and the Russian revolution, the hegemony of the international working-class movement passed over to Russia.

"It thus happened," wrote Lenin, "that the hegemony in the revolutionary proletarian International went over for a time—for a short time, of course— to the Russians; just as in different periods of the nineteenth century it belonged to the English, then to the French, and then to the Germans.

Whilst the great bourgeois revolution was taking place in France, and was making great historical changes in the whole continent of Europe, England, where capitalism was much more highly developed than in France, stood at the head of the counter-revolutionary coalition. The English working-class movement at that time was in many ways a brilliant forerunner of Marxism.

When the first mass and politically organised proletarian revolutionary movement, Chartism, was taking place in England, on the Continent weak bourgeois revolutions were taking place, whilst in France the first great civil war between proletariat and bourgeoisie broke out. The bourgeoisie, in different ways and separately, smashed up each national proletarian movement.

The strength of the French proletariat seemed to be exhausted after the two heroic and historically important insurrections of the workers against the bourgeoisie in 1848 and 1871. The hegemony in the International of the working-class movement passed over to Germany in the seventies, when Germany was economically more backward than England and France. And when Germany caught up these two countries economically, *i.e.*, in the second decade of the twentieth century, then at the head of the model Marxist working-class party of Germany, appeared a group of shameless scoundrels—the dirtiest scoundrels who ever sold themselves to capitalism, from Scheidemann and Noske to David and Legien, the most despicable hangmen in the service of the monarchy and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie." (Lenin, "The Third International and Its Place in History," Vol. XVI, pp. 183-184.)

Those who, like Brandler and Thalheimer to-day, consider that the supremacy of the C.P.S.U. in the Comintern is a "misfortune," who only want to talk with the Russian Communists as a "power with a power," or a "State with a State," have forgotten Lenin's words. The first victorious proletarian revolution must not for a moment forget its international duties. And the international proletarian revolutionary cannot feel as a "yoke"

the lead given by the victorious proletarian revolution in the International.

* * * * *

The world imperialist war brought a load of misfortune in its train, but it also brought the beginning of the world civil war and the socialist revolution immeasurably nearer, and thus brought humanity nearer to its emancipation from the shame and yoke of capitalism.

Marx wrote: "Only at a period when there will no longer be classes and class antagonisms will social *evolutions* cease to be political *revolutions*. Until then, on the eve of every complete change in the social order the last word in social science will be *war or death, bloody struggle or annihilation—such is the inevitable question.*"

Until 1914 all the official leaders of the Second International shared, or pretended to share, these views of Marx. We have already quoted the declarations of Otto Bauer and Bebel. The chief theorist of the Second International, K. Kautsky, has written pages to explain these same truths. Even in his works, "The Social Revolution," "The Road to Power," etc., Kautsky, very convincingly and irrefutably, showed the connection between war and revolution. But when the Russian proletarian revolution did come, in direct connection with the world imperialist war, Kautsky refused to "accept" this revolution, and declared it to be "unlawful."

"Economic thought and economic understanding," Kautsky began to moan, "have gone clean out of the heads of all classes. The long war has taught the masses of the proletariat to scorn economic conditions and to believe in the all-mighty power of violence." Lenin poked fun at Kautsky for these two "little points" of our "greatly-learned" man.

"We expected," writes Kautsky, "that the revolution would come as a product of proletarian class war; and this revolution came as a result of the military downfall of the ruling systems in Russia and Germany." "In other words, this wise man expected a peaceful revolution. Mr. Kautsky has got so muddled up that he has forgotten what he wrote before, when he was a Marxist; he wrote that, in all probability, a war would be the cause of the revolution." (Lenin.)

Leninism, as the guide in the international working-class movement, is particularly concerned with problems of war. Lenin continued the work of Marx in all branches of economics, politics, and science. But in no subject, perhaps, does this role of Lenin, as the direct follower of Marx, appear so clearly as in the question of war; in his explanation of war, his attitude to it, and in the problems of the tactics of the world proletariat during a war, etc.

In one of his letters to Engels, Marx writes, "Where is our theory that the organisation of labour depends on the means of production more clearly proved than in the human-slaughter industry?" Marx gave the name of "human-slaughter industry" to that industry which deals with the murder of human beings, *i.e.*, war. The works of Marx and Engels on war alone are sufficient to show how great were the services of these founders of scientific Communism.

The problems of war play an important part in Leninism, which *is* Marxism. When Lenin had to consider war only from the theoretical and historical philosophical standpoint he kept entirely to the spirit and letter of the teachings of Marx and Engels; for example, against Lassalle. But in 1904-1905, when he was already the recognised leader of the Bolsheviks, he had independently to consider the question of a new concrete war in a new concrete historical situation—we are speaking of the Russo-Japanese War. And the very first important work of Lenin during this period ("The Fall of Port Arthur") is so remarkable that, looking back, we can say that nearly all that Lenin said about war and the proletarian revolution during the world imperialist war, he put into this article. Anyone who reads the article, "The Fall of Port Arthur," will agree that it is the work of a genius. Every word in this article is of the highest importance even now. Lenin wrote the following—in 1905, remember!—on the fall of Port Arthur:

"Even though it took no part in the war, the European bourgeoisie feels humiliated and depressed. This catastrophe implies a gigantic acceleration in the development of world capitalism, and the course of history; and the bourgeoisie knows, from bitter experience, that

such an acceleration implies the acceleration of the social revolution of the proletariat. The Western European bourgeoisie felt so peaceful in the stagnant atmosphere under the wing of the 'powerful empire' when all of a sudden some 'secret youthful' power dared to disturb this atmosphere and smash down the shelter.

"Yes, the bourgeoisie of Europe has something to fear, and the proletariat may rejoice. This catastrophe of our worst enemy does not only imply the approach of freedom in Russia, it is the sign of a new revolutionary wave of the European proletariat.

"Progressive Asia has struck an irreparable blow at reactionary and backward Europe." (Vol. VI, p. 35.)

This quotation is the "embryo" of practically the whole of Lenin's future attitude towards war and the world revolution.

Is this not amazing?

A large number of bourgeois governments for tactical reasons openly sympathised with the victory of Japan over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War. The part played by the "friend" of Nicholas Romanov, Wilhelm II, in this business was nothing if not equivocal. The usual noise in the newspapers went on about the fall of Port Arthur, and every bourgeois Power and group of Powers looked on this event from its own particular diplomatic point of view. And Lenin—the only man in the whole world—was able to understand what the alarm of the European bourgeoisie signified; of the bourgeoisie that felt "humiliated and crushed" as a result of the first blow struck by progressive Asia (capitalistically-progressive Asia), against reactionary Europe. Yet this was at a time when Europe and America were "model bourgeois States" and the foundation of the world bourgeoisie seemed as firm as a rock! In the fall of Port Arthur—the stronghold of the Far East—Lenin was able to see the imminent fall of Russian Tsarism and the acceleration of the course of history towards the proletarian social revolution.

In this article Lenin crossed swords for the first time with national reformism in the war question. And here again, as we shall see, we have the "embryo" of Lenin's future attitude towards social-chauvinism and social-reformism.

Such brilliant articles by Lenin as "The Fall of Port Arthur" *ideologically* prepared the future Communist International. The part played by the Bolshevik Party in 1905, and Lenin's monumental theoretical works from 1905-1917 *ideologically* prepared the Communist International.

* * * * *

The First International was born during the struggle between Marxism and whole series of other doctrines in the working-class movement that stood on quite a different theoretical basis.

Marxism did not strengthen its position immediately by any means. Marxism, during the first half-century of its existence (beginning with the forties), was fighting against theories that were fundamentally hostile to it. In the first half of the forties Marx and Engels fought the radical Young Hegelians, whose standpoint was that of philosophical idealism. At the end of the forties began the struggle against Proudhonism, *i.e.*, a struggle over economic doctrines. The fifties saw the end of this struggle; the criticism of parties and doctrines that sprang up in the stormy year of 1848. In the sixties the battle was removed from the field of theory into a field that stood nearer to the direct working-class movement: the expulsion of Bakuninism from the International. At the beginning of the seventies the Proudhonist Mühlberger made his appearance in Germany, and at the end of the seventies the positivist Dühring. But neither of these had any influence on the proletariat. All other theorists of the working-class movement were henceforth vanquished by Marxism.

This is the "calendar" of events which Lenin gave in his work, "Marxism and Revisionism."

The Third International, the Lenin International, sprang up at a time of a great crisis of socialism. This crisis grew up at a time (this is the characteristic feature of this crisis) of an almost universal recognition (in words) of Marxism in the international working-class movement. By the mineties of last century the victory of Marxism in its essential points was complete; at the end of the nineties, immediately after the death of Engels, a sharp struggle *within* Marxism began; revisionism sprang up and gradually took the lead in the

Second International; by 1914 it had degenerated into social patriotism.

The very formation of the Communist International implied a fight for Marxism. At the same time the formation of the Comintern implied the universal triumph of Leninism, *i.e.*, revolutionary Marxism in the epoch of reaction and imperialism.

It was the world imperialist war that sharpened and pitilessly revealed the crisis of socialism, which had been ripening within the Second International during the peaceful organic period of 1889-1914. It was, therefore no coincidence that the revolutionary Marxist, or Leninist, which is the same thing, attitude towards the war was the decisive factor in the birth of the Comintern.

The crisis brought on by the world imperialist war was so great that it not only broke up the socialist camp: it broke up the anarchist and syndicalist camps as well. The attitude towards the imperialist war, towards patriotic defence during the war, towards the question of revolutionary struggle against the war—this was the natural dividing line that sprang up in the whole of the working class movement with the beginning of the imperialist war. That is why Lenin, when he was founding the Communist International on the basis of organised Communist Parties, invited into the ranks of the Comintern those anarchists who had spoken against "patriotism" in the imperialist war, and were ready to wage revolutionary war against it, he invited such groups as the "Industrial Workers of the World" (a syndicalist group), and the Shop Stewards' Committee in England, and so on; as long as these groups kept in touch with the mass working-class movement and were sincerely prepared to support the struggle against the war.

But the basis of the Comintern was homogeneous enough from the very beginning of its existence. Its foundation was the iron Bolshevik Party which has always been true to Marx and Lenin. From the very beginning Leninism was its ideological basis. The historical conditions at the time of the formation of the Comintern were such that Leninism always had a much more firm and unmixed influence on it than Marxism had in the First International of Marx.

The Communist International was built in the fire of the imperialist war. Zimmerwald and Kienthal were but steps in the preparation for the Comintern; they were not very important steps either. The Russian revolution and then the revolutionary events in Germany in 1918-19, were the decisive factors. The Communist International came into being when the transformation in a sixth part of the globe of the imperialist war into a civil war, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, became facts.

The Bolsheviks all the world over consider that new imperialist wars, more bloody and more reactionary than the Great War of 1914-18, are inevitable, unless the proletariat rises before, and a victorious proletarian revolution in the most important countries averts it.

"The first Bolshevik revolution," says Lenin, "saved the first hundred millions from the fire of the world imperialist war and the horrors of the imperialist butchery. The greatest "ambition" of world Bolshevism is to save humanity from further world butcheries, i.e., to prevent the bourgeoisie from being able ever again to throw humanity into new imperialist wars." If the Comintern always succeeds in acting in the spirit of Marx and Lenin, and if it always has the support of the great masses of the world proletariat then, perhaps, just as imperialism will be about to set light to a new imperialist war, we shall be able to stay its hand. Who will say that this is impossible? And if Bolshevism is successful in this, how superb will the general "balance" be! One victorious revolution will avert a great imperialist war, and will straight away recover all the "expenses" of the proletarian revolution all over the world: the "expenses" in human beings and material riches. These are the dreams of the "barbarian"—Bolsheviks, the "dictator" Communists. That is why they have the right to expect all honest members of the world proletariat to give their wholehearted support to the U.S.S.R., the defender of peace, and to the Comintern, the collective organiser of the proletarian revolution, one of the chief tasks of which is to prevent further wars. The Communist International was born in the world imperialist war in order to be able, through the proletarian revolution, to prevent

new imperialist wars. This is not a paradox; it is the living dialectics of history, it is Marxism—Leninism in action.

But, of course, the Comintern must be prepared for a worse alternative. New proletarian revolutions are possible without new wars. But new imperialist wars will not be possible without new proletarian revolutions.

The bourgeoisie of the world knows that it is playing with fire. Therefore it will not risk having new wars at once: it will carefully prepare for them. The Comintern must keep a careful watch on every movement of the hands of the bourgeoisie, and be prepared for the imperialists to be successful in starting a new war.

There is no doubt that imperialism is leading humanity into a new cycle of wars. Lenin considered it very probable that the Soviet Union might have to go through a second cycle of wars, in which, once again, the fate of the Soviet Power would be decided. The Second International as represented by its official leaders will certainly be on the side of the bourgeoisie. In the first of these stormy events the Comintern will have, once again, to prove that it is a proletarian International. The proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. and the whole Comintern must show the whole world that they will do everything to prevent a new imperialist war; and if, in spite of this, it will break out, that they will do everything to overthrow the capitalist class. The Communist International was born in the World War; and its fate will be decided once again in a new war.

Surrender of the Second International in the Emancipation of Women

Klara Zetkin

THE inaugural congress of the Communist International in March, 1919, in Moscow, proclaimed to the world proletariat the historical role of proletarian women as a revolutionary force without whose conscious participation in the class struggle capitalism cannot be overthrown, Communism cannot be realised. The congress declared: "This congress of the Communist International maintains that the success of all the tasks which it has set itself, the final victory of the world proletariat and the complete abolition of the capitalist order of society can only be assured by the united struggles of the men and women of the working class. The dictatorship of the proletariat can only be realised and maintained with the active and willing assistance of working women."

This declaration implies the recognition of complete equality between man and woman, and the duty of all national sections of the C.I. to draw all women workers into the fighting proletarian front and to train them for their great historical struggle with the bourgeoisie. It was put forward by the Russian women comrades who took part in the congress. Because of the tremendous difficulties in the way of travelling to the Soviet State at that time, the number of delegates was small, and no women delegates from the west were present. But apart from that it was no accident that it was the Russian women comrades who took the initiative in this matter.

Russian social democracy, led at first by Plekhanov and Axelrod, took up a revolutionary Marxist attitude on the question of women. It supported the efforts of the parties and organisations of the Second International to remain true to these principles, to lead the proletarian women in a united fight with men workers, to take up a clear and vigorous attitide towards those problems and tasks of women's emancipation which were of importance to the working class movement. The Russian social democrats were not daunted by the obstacles and dangers of Tsarism, and tried as far as possible, in spite of that cruel regime, to carry out their principles. Unselfishly and not unsuccessfully—strikes prove this—they worked to carry on propaganda among and organise working women, particuly those in the factories, and to make them trained workers in the moment. This is particularly true of Lenin and his associates. It is significant that the first pamphlet in the Russian language for working women was written by Krupskaya in Siberia, when she was sharing Lenin's exile. The pamphlet "Woman and the Woman Worker," appeared anonymously in February, 1901, and was given such a wide circulation by the illegal organisations that a second edition was issued in August.

THE BOLSHEVIKS AND THE ORGANISATION OF WOMEN

After the split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, the Bolshevik Party energetically continued the work of revolutionising and organising working women. Thanks to Lenin, their work was carried on with a very close observation of events and developments within the Second International, and in the capitalist countries generally, and educated the Russian women who were drawn into the movement in the spirit of international solidarity. Here is one example. In contrast to the Mensheviks, the Bolshevik Party organised International Women's Day, decided on by the International Socialist Women's Conference at Copenhagen in 1910, as a united demonstration of men and women. The Bolsheviks demanded the convening of the International Socialist Women's Conference at Berne in March, 1915, the first international action taken against the imperialist war and in favour of compelling peace by the international class struggle of the proletariat, directed always to its principal object, the overthrow of capitalism.

As in the pre-war years, so during the war the Bolshevik Party organisations worked to enrol proletarian women in their ranks. Their efforts in this direction were intensified after the February-March revolution, when Lenin had returned to Russia; and, with an increasingly strict examination of the realities of the situation, the activity of the Party was consciously and energetically directed towards the revolutionising of the masses and the seizure of State power. Lenin was profoundly and passionately convinced that the class struggle of the proletariat could only succeed if its battles were fought by men and women together. For him, the readiness of the revolutionary women workers of Petrograd was one of the signs which indicated that the armed struggle for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship could be attempted, indeed, in the given circumstances, had to be attempted.

It is an undisputed fact that the women of Russia have brilliantly justified Lenin's appreciation of their historical importance. Their heroic activity in the storm-swept weeks of Red October, and in the period of sacrifice and privation which the young Soviet State experienced, fighting the native and foreign counter-revolutionaries, adorns a page of imperishable glory in the history of revolutions and in the history of their sex. They merited and achieved what the Soviet State, in accordance with the principles of its Bolshevik creators, brought to them: the legal recognition of their complete freedom and equality.

These well-known facts throw a bright light on the nature of the Communist International, in so far as that body is the protagonist of complete emancipation for women, in which respect it is sharply differentiated from the Second International. In this struggle for emancipation through the revolution, the C.I. is moving forwards. It is led with the clear and conscious desire to rally the Communist women's movement in all countries into one organisation, united in principles and objects. This does not mean their dissociation from the workers' struggle for victory by means of the revolution, which alone can bring freedom. It means rather the enrolment of women as equals, with equal duties, in the fighting proletarian ranks. In its attitude to the woman question, in its support for women's rights and interests, the Second International shows a reactionary development. After the first years of hopeful development of the struggle came the retreat from social revolution to reformism, and hopes for an extension of the rights and diminution of the handicaps of women were dashed to the ground. Claims put forward for women's rights showed lack of principle, lack of unity, confusion, cowardly submission to the power of the bourgeoisie, collaboration with them to maintain and strengthen capitalist society, in which women have as little opportunity for full human development and social freedom as the proletariat.

THE DECLARATION OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The inaugural congress at Paris in 1889 of the Second International, like the Communist International at Moscow, in 1919, proclaimed the necessity of drawing proletarian women, as equals, into the emancipation struggle of their class. The resolution was put forward by one of the two women delegates from the German social-democrats, after a lively discussion by the German delegation. The initiative, therefore, came from that party in the Second International which was at that time fighting hard against bourgeois society, against the bourgeois state of the "fatherland." This fight had drilled into the German social-democrats, with pitiless logic, a Marxist recognition of the importance attaching to the convinced participation of women in the proletarian class struggle. Similarly, the declaration at the inaugural congress of the Communist International came from a party which bore the honour and burden of the revolutionary vanguard of the world proletariat, from the Bolshevik Party. But what a difference between the nature and objects of the struggle in 1889 and 1919! What a difference in their historical significance!

In 1889, the German social-democrats on the eve of their victory with regard to the anti-Socialist laws, were the champions of the international working class. The struggle raged around the freedom of action and movement of the proletariat, the Bolshevik Party in 1919 had won the first great victory of the world revolution, had overthrown and crushed capitalism in the largest European State, had

established the class dictatorship of the worker. It often seems to our passionate, impatient hearts, that historical development creeps along, lazily, sleepily, in felt slippers as it were. In the short space of the 80 years between the Paris and Moscow Congresses, it hurried forward with gigantic strides, and at last with a daring leap. The historic task of the proletariat is no longer the struggle for the political preliminaries to the fight for the overthrow of capitalism, but the overthrow of capitalism itself, the proletarian world revolution. The very places where the Congresses were held indicated a changed historical situation which had shifted the central point of the workers' fight from Western to Eastern Europe, and had placed the young Russian proletariat instead of the working classes of the most highly developed industrial countries, at the most difficult, most exposed posts.

It was obvious that this development must find expression in the work of the Second and Third Internationals for the emancipation of women. At the Paris Congress the demand for the complete equality of women with men was put forward, while at the same time the exclusive right of men to the "professions" was energetically defended, a principle which still claimed many adherents in capitalist countries. The winning over of working women to the industrial and political struggles of their class was demanded in a declaration which also contained the assurance that these women would steadily and joyfully do their part in these struggles and win their equality as fighters for socialism. The inaugural congress of the Second International greeted the declaration with stormy applause, but—it did not support the declaration with any decisions which would have obliged the political and industrial organisations to work vigorously along these lines. It was left to the socialist parties and trade unions of the separate countries to turn this undisputed principle into practice, to whatever extent they liked.

This was typical of the attitude of the Second International to the problems of the women's movement, which faced the workers in all capitalist countries. It took no initiative in the theoretical clarification of the problems or practical carrying out of the work. It did nothing towards promoting unity in principle or unity in action. In general, the parties and organisations affiliated to the international considered that the fight to win women to the working class struggle, and for their emancipation, was purely a woman's affair.

This work in almost all countries, was accompanied by an obstinate struggle with the most trivial philistine prejudices against the emancipation of women; in many instances—as at times in Germany—this struggle was aggravated by laws and administrative measures prohibiting the political activity of women. Many socialist leaders were strongly in favour of a united fight of men and women workers in the rank and file of the organisations; for example Bebel in Germany, the great champion of women's rights and women's emancipation, Guesde in France, Turati in Italy, Keir Hardie in England and Viktor Adler in Austria. Others observed the growing struggle and its results with a gentlemanly calm, while still others tried to hinder its development on principle, or for other reasons.

"WOMEN'S RIGHTS" AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

As things were, it can be imagined that the proletarian women's movement in the socialist parties and trade unions, was more or less permeated by bourgeois ideas of women's rights. Capitalism's great progress forced the Second International to differentiate between the proletarian and bourgeois women's movements. It urged women workers to fight for comprehensive legislation covering labour protection, and included in this the question of special legal protection for women workers. The strongly feminist women's organisations in the Scandinavian countries and Great Britain, and leading women socialists in Belgium, Holland and Germany combatted special labour protection for women as an attack on the equality of women, as a slight cast upon women's rights to economic independence and social emancipation. Their resistance, based upon a misconception of the importance of class contradictions in the world of women, placed them, against their will, in the same camp as the capitalists, and made the fight of the organised workers more difficult. At the suggestion of the German and Austrian women comrades, the 1893 Congress of the

Second International at Zurich took a decision on this disputed question. It declared in favour of comprehensive special legislation for women workers and drew a sharp distinction of principle between the proletarian and bourgeois women's movements.

The following Congress of the Second International held in London in 1896, defined this most urgent distinction between the two movements. This step, too, was taken on the initiative of women comrades. German, Austrian and English women socialists convened a conference of women delegates present at the Congress, which resulted in a proposal in favour of the principle of the common organisation of men and women of the working class. It demanded the organisation of women with their men fellow workers, in the appropriate trade unions, the winning of politically active women workers to the socialist parties, which were called upon to conduct a vigorous struggle for the abolition of these laws prohibiting women from joining political organisations and taking part in their activities. It expressly rejected the adherence of proletarian women to feminist organisations. The proposal was accepted. This followed from the position of the class struggle, for the splitting of forces, made itself felt injuriously at times in industrial disputes, and the organisational mix-up of bourgeois ladies and working women prevented a clear class consciousness and kept the exploited in moral and political dependence upon some of the exploiters. The rallying of proletarian women to their class, their training in its industrial and political struggles was having its effects in the various countries. This determined the attitude of women comrades from the different countries to the questions dealt with by the Congresses of the Second International at Paris in 1900 and at Amsterdam in 1904.

THE FIGHT FOR ENFRANCHISEMENT

A decisive step forward was taken by the Stuttgart World Congress in 1907. For most of the parties in the Second International, the struggle for a democratic franchise was extremely urgent. At various times since the Russian revolution of 1905, the workers had urged their parties to use new and sharper fighting methods, such as the mass strike. In such a situation it was natural for the women too, to put forward their claim to full political rights. The position of the socialist parties on this question was neither clear in principle, nor unified. In Norway, Sweden, Denmark and England—apart from the S.D.F.—and partly in Holland, the Socialists flirted with the feminist franchise movement. In Catholic countries they avoided as far as possible, from fear of the powerful priesthood, the working women's demand for political rights, or, as in Belgium, rejected it because of their alliance with the liberals. The strong Austrian social-democratic party was in favour of women's enfranchisement on principle, but had entirely excluded this demand from their splendid election programme, which reflected some of the fire of the Russian revolution. This exclusion was justified on opportunist grounds, as promising an easier victory by its omission, and many leading women socialists agreed to this.

Again it was the socialist women who forced the Second International to take a decision in this matter. The German social-democratic women insisted upon the Stuttgart Congress discussing the question of women's franchise thoroughly. After detailed and often very stormy debates in the Commission which had been set up, and at the full meeting, a resolution was agreed to, which proposed the calling of the first international socialist women's conference. It also called upon the socialist parties to include the fight for the enfranchisement of women in their franchise struggles, making them the fight for universal adult suffrage without distinction of sex. Any limited form of franchise for women was to be rejected. The resolution expressly pointed out that women's enfranchisement was only one element in the struggle for the complete equality of the two sexes, which could be won, not by a struggle between the sexes, but in the proletarian class struggle against the bourgeoisie, for only through socialism could that objective be realised. The Second International, by this decision, dissociated itself utterly from bourgeois feminism, for political equality is the main basis of feminism. At the same time illusions as to the value of the vote, of formal political democracy, were discarded. The discussion on this question aroused passionate dispute between the Marxists and opportunists. On this Lenin wrote:

"In the question of women's franchise, revolutionary Marxism scored a victory over Austrian empiricism."

PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FAMILY

The Second International did not define its attitude towards the far-reaching, involved complex of questions dealing with the civil rights of women, particularly family rights. But the socialist parties, in parliament and publicly, fought strenuously against male privileges in the family, and for the full liberty and equality of women in family matters, as they did when the question arose of the reform of the marriage and divorce laws of the legislation of the unmarried mother and illegitimate child. There was, however, no thorough discussion of these questions—including sexual relationships—although a clear understanding of the inter-dependence of the form of the family, the system of production and private property, the interdependence of economy and morals, is essential to an understanding of the nature of bourgeois society. However much these questions may influence the lives of individual workers, however great may be the importance—both theoretical and practical—to the working woman of the legal equality of the sexes in family matters, for the proletariat as a class the main question is that of the public, the political rights of women, which will directly affect the struggle against the capitalists and against bourgeois society. But apart from this, it is certain that a large dose of philistinism helped to determine the attiture of the parties of the Second International towards these questions, which thus failed to receive a thorough and comprehensive Marxist discussion. They feared all the chatter about "free love" and "women's societies." And so the analysis of these questions was left as the private affair of individual socialists rather than as a Party matter. It was characteristic of the parties of the Second International that they also failed to discuss thoroughly the questions of birth control. Sharply opposed by the Marxists, they allowed the indisputable right of the working woman to limit her offspring, like the wealthy woman, to be used for the revisionist preaching of a sort of neo-Malthusianism, which recommended the proletariat to keep their families small as one means of waging the class war and improving their conditions.

THE FIRST SOCIALIST WOMEN'S CONFERENCE AND THE FUTURE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

In such circumstances the women's movement grew up alongside the socialist parties and trade unions in the various countries. And, naturally enough, that movement bore the traces of its early environment. Apart from the general enthusiasm for socialism, it was, considered as an international whole, a mixture of theoretical uncertainties and organisational varieties, strongly influenced by feminist ideas. Unity in idea and action was at times lacking nationally, as well as internationally. But out of the disputes and conflicting opinions about the woman question, and the enrolment of women workers in the ranks of their class comrades, a process of clarification and unification arose, the leader in this development being the socialist women's movement of Germany with their paper, "Equality." These socialist women also took the initiative in calling the first Socialist Women's Conference at Stuttgart in 1907, which was joyfully welcomed by the socialist women of the countries represented at the Second International. Apart from the resolution on women's franchise, its most important result was the decision to set up regular contact between the socialist women's movement of the different countries through the columns of "Equality," which was to become an international organ, and to have an international secretary. International relations stimulated the growth of the movement. The Second International Socialist Women's Conference at Copenhagen in 1910 decided on unified international action—the celebration of International Women's Day. The Second International displayed benevolent tolerance towards the efforts of women socialists to establish, on an international scale, and on a unified basis, the participation of proletarian women in the class struggle. The progress achieved was essentially the work of women themselves.

Thus the Second International called into being a mass movement and mass organisation of women workers. It roused large numbers of them to class consciousness, and so to a

recognition of their importance; courageous and confident, sharing as equals in the organisation and struggles of their class. But, having accomplished this, it failed to give them a sound theoretical and organisational basis on which they could carry out united international action. Its incompetence to carry out this historical work was due to its own looseness of organisation and lack of a clear and determined will to united action, based on definite principles. In the end, in the world war, it betrayed, besides its general historical duty, its special duty to the working women of the world, by fighting for imperialism instead of for socialism. This betrayal had cast the shadow of death on the Second International at the Congresses at Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Basle. At the decisive moment it did not stand at the head of the proletarian masses, but like them, allowed itself to be carried along by economic events, instead of advancing beyond them mentally, and guiding the will of the working class in a clear, international, revolutionary fight against capitalism. The betrayal of international proletarian solidarity meant that the Second International had ceased to be the champion of women's emancipation and equality. From being a power which menaced capitalism, it became one which supported it, and only by the annihilation of the capitalist order can working women cease to be slaves. In the post-war years, particularly during the revolutionary period, the Second International continued its shameful work of treachery.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN

From its very inception, the Third International continued the work for the emancipation of working women which the Second had begun, but which it had finally betrayed. This was carried on with a full realisation of the higher stage of historical development reached in objective social conditions and in the conscious activity of the proletariat in the Russian revolution. The stage which had been reached determined the aims put forward. It is the duty of the Communist International to hammer into the consciousness of the proletarian women of all countries that the material social conditions for their emancipation are in existence, and that it is their work to carry out, in close unity with their class comrades, the changes in society which will bring freedom. In other words, the C.I. must concentrate the knowledge, the will and the activities of the women masses on the proletarian revolution, must draw them in to the fighting ranks of the world proletarian vanguard which, sure of its road and of its goal, is pressing forward irresistibly against bourgeois society. To prepare for and ensure international unity of action on the part of men and women for the overthrow of capitalist society is the international working out of the idea, the knowledge that bourgeois society is one of slavery, that Communism will bring freedom, that there exists the historical possibility, the historical necessity of abolishing capitalism and realising Communism.

The "Directions for the International Communist Women's Movement" should help to establish unification in idea and action. They are guides on tactics and principles, for active, leading women militants and Communists, not agitation material for working women who have still to be roused and mobilised. They deal with principles and programmes. Their starting-point and central theme is the contention that the basic cause of the social and personal enslavement of the female sex is private property in the means of production, and that consequently women will only be able to attain full freedom and equality when the means of production become social property. The contradiction between the Haves and the Have-nots, arising from private property in the means of production has, under the capitalist system of production, reached its last and highest form in the class contradictions of bourgeoisie and proletariat, which also have their inexorable effect in regard to women.

In the fifteen years which have passed since the outbreak of the imperialist world war, consistent and thorough reaction has characterised the attitude of the Second International, patched up and thoroughly renovated, towards the women's movement. The great external, numerical progress in the organisation of socialist women emphasises the decline in the objectives and content of the movement, in its position with regard to the most important problems which crop up. The internal decay

is inevitable, irresistible. It is the historical complement of the treachery to the revolution and the proletariat by the parties and organisations of the Second International. This treachery began on the outbreak of war, continued throughout the early post-war years, when the objective situation was ripe for the revolution and conditions favourable to proletarian victory, and lasted through the period of coalition governments.

The Socialist Parties of the new Second International, by renouncing the Marxist theory of social development, by putting reform in the place of revolution, bourgeois democracy in the place of proletarian dictatorship, class collaboration in the place of irreconcilable class struggle, support and maintenance of the bourgeois order of society in the place of its overthrow, had put off the social and personal emancipation of women to the Greek Kalends.

It should be noted, however, that the most advanced social-democratic women in many countries resisted this development longer than the working masses. In Berlin 1915 a delegation of organised social-democratic women forced an entry into the Party committee in order to bring before its notice a resolution which sharply condemned the social-patriotic attitude of the Party Committee and Reichstag fraction as a surrender of their principles, and demanded an immediate return to the principles of the class struggle and international socialism, and a fight for peace. The present Chancellor, Hermann Müller, now so warmly extolled by the democrats, was at that time the Party secretary, and tried, by most undemocratic methods, to prevent the women comrades from gaining access to the "Party fathers." He learnt then that even working women have fists, which they didn't keep in their pockets. Intense indignation of socialist women against the betrayal of socialism was expressed internationally, and was eager to be translated into action.

The Socialist International Women's Conference at Berne was attended by women from Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Russia, Poland and Switzerland, and declarations of solidarity were sent from other countries, including Bulgaria and Serbia. The delegates from Germany and France had, by coming, committed a breach of Party discipline, and the action of the German women delegates was not only "outlawed" by the Social-Democratic Party Committee, but reported to the Government. In all countries socialist women were in the vanguard of the struggle against the war; here and there, despite the difficulties and dangers, combatting unflinchingly the social-patriotism of the Social-Democratic Parties. In Germany the Spartakus Bund counted a large number of energetic and willing women among its adherents, many of them quite young.

Many of these women who, during the war, stood bravely by their socialist principles, are now working in the rank and file of the Communist International. Others have learnt nothing from the experience of 1914 and onward, and have forgotten what they knew of revolutionary Marxism in the pre-war years. As a whole, the women's movement in the Second International to-day shows strongly marked tendencies of becoming more and more bourgeois. In sharp contrast to its most promising and glorious advance in the pre-war years, it has now ceased to be an organ of the revolutionary proletarian class struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and capitalist society. It has given up the work of leading the working women masses, in the foremost ranks and the thick of the fight, in the political and economic struggles of the proletariat; it has given up the work of examining, eagerly and thoroughly, the problems arising from the woman question, which are problems of the working class and their emancipation as a whole. It has degenerated into an organ of the corrupted socialist parties and trade unions which, under the deceptive slogans of "Democracy in State and Economy," "Industrial Peace," "Realisation of the State Idea," are serving the class rule of the bourgeois, thus maintaining, and even intensifying, the exploitation and oppression of working women by monopoly capitalism and rationalisation. It has degenerated into being the tool of the chauvinist, social-imperialist, reformist Labour parties which, while chanting gently of peace, League of Nations and disarmament, are furthering preparations for a new world murder, a new war against the only Workers' State. This is shown in the women's news-

papers of the Second International, and reflected in the Women's International Conferences.

THE HAMBURG CONFERENCE, 1923

The character and course of the first of these conferences was symptomatic of the surrender. It took place in Hamburg at Whitsuntide, 1923, in the light shed by the Unity Congress of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals, from which the old Second International emerged with the new superscription, "Labour and Socialist International." Between the last Women's Conference of the Second International at Copenhagen in 1910 and this Congress of women socialists at Hamburg, violent, historical, world-shattering events had occurred: the struggle for power among the imperialist States, then still being fought out in the Ruhr occupation, the revolution in Russia, the five years' existence and activity of the first proletarian State, among whose very first acts were the call to peace and the legal recognition of the complete liberty and quality of women. No word in review of the past, no examination of the present, no glance towards the future. Only two incidents indicated that, outside the Congress, the world was moving in stormy times, in which the old was fighting the new. Despite the abjuration to deal with "political questions," which should have been the real subject of the conference, these women, a Menshevik, a social-revolutionary and an Ukrainian, reported, with as much falsehood as sentimentality, on the "shocking situation of women in Russia."

Nor was the temperamental appeal of the German delegate Lore Agnes, that the conference should decide its attitude to urgent political questions, particularly to the Ruhr occupation, which affected the lives of working women so deeply, granted. The following questions were on the agenda: The political franchise for women, mother and child protection, the re-establishment of international women's day, education in the idea of peace. These problems were decided on resolutions brought forward without any thorough discussion, and like the reports and discussions they lacked any trace of principle, of the materialist conception of history corresponding to scientific socialism. The words and ideas of "struggle" and "fighting" had practically disappeared from the Conference, the word "revolution" sullied no lip, "socialism" was mentioned vaguely in the resolutions, in the style of the old fairy tales, "Once upon a time . . ."

What was germinating at the Hamburg Conference, although quite obvious there, appeared more openly at the following Women's Conferences of the L.S.I. The international socialist movement had no longer as its aim the participation by the working women masses in the seizure of power by the proletariat, in the transformation of bourgeois into socialist society by means of the revolutions. It dreamt of a peaceful "development" into socialism, and tried to instal the exploited and enslaved as comfortably as possible in present-day society. By betraying the basic ideas of revolutionary Marxism, the Second International lost its correct attitude towards reforms within capitalist society, and also lost the will—after it had lost the power—even to force their modest demands for the equality of women by putting up a fight for them.

The Hamburg Conference and its successor at Marseilles in 1925 ignored the hotly contested decision of the Stuttgart Congress concerning women's franchise. They compromised the character and object of the franchise, its sharp distinction from bourgeois democracy and feminism. According to the Hamburg resolution the importance of women's franchise consisted wholly in this, that it enabled "reforms to be carried out and the class struggle to be waged successfully." With what object, their courtesy to bourgeois society and coalition policy prevented them from saying. The franchise was considered as the only means of political activity. "Women cannot do the share of the work falling to them, so long as they are denied active and passive suffrage." Before the war the German social-democratic women had declared with pride and fighting spirit, "We don't need to vote, but we know how to fight, and we are fighting, fighting for the speedy overthrow of capitalist society."

At Marseilles, political equality for women, particularly female enfranchisement, was hailed in true feminist fashion as equivalent to the complete social emancipation of women.

Frau Juchacz, that great admirer of bourgeois democracy, demanded votes for women "constitutionally, as the men have the vote." That is, limited in those countries where the bourgeois constitution limits the votes of workers according to their money-bags or social privileges, or withholds it entirely from them. The crowning contradiction and betrayal of principle occurs in the surrender of the omnipotent women's franchise when this demand exceeds the capacity, when in office, of socialist parties, or endangers their alliance with the liberals. The British delegation requested the Conference to define its attitude towards the infamous treachery of the Belgian socialists who had voted against the Bill for women's suffrage put forward by the clericals. This attack was avoided by the Conference determining to keep rigidly to the agenda.

THE QUESTION OF THE LEGAL PROTECTION OF WOMEN

The rationalisation of capitalist industry makes thorough and comprehensive legal protection for women workers a matter of the utmost urgency for the working class as a whole. The effects of rationalisation and the stabilisation of the rule of monopoly capitalism make legal protection of, and social provision for, mother and child absolutely essential. The effects of the imperialist war and the strengthening of capitalism greatly increase the workers' need of social help, the need of the war victims, the unemployed, the smallholders, the cripples, the aged. This, too, concerns women and women's rights. The women's conferences of the Second International at Hamburg, Marseilles and Brussels (August, 1928) dealt with these questions as they arose under various headings, and the main result was tearful, snivelling gossip about hunger, suffering, "humanitarian" principles and reformist rejection of the working-class struggle.

The Hamburg Conference set the tone for the social policy of the Second International. It limited its demands with regard to the protection of woman worker, mother and child, to the wretched extent of the wretched decisions of the Washington Conference, and even these have never been put into execution by capitalist governments. The Marseilles Conference did not step beyond this magic circle, and declared with unrestrained joy that, thanks to the rule of democracy, necessary reforms, based on "humane" principles, would be carried out. The Brussels Conference obediently took up the same position, and unanimously agreed, that the question of legal protection and employment of working women must be considered from "the point of view of production and society." What was meant by that phrase is expressed somewhat less bombastically and mystically in the report of the Economic Commission of the L.S.I., which condemns the ruthlessness of rationalisation, but is of the opinion that in the future, since it will of necessity be carried out further, it will favourably affect the working class. The report does not deny that "rationalisation condemns the worker to premature incapacity for work, resulting from the extreme strain of work," nor that it leads to "terrible unemployment." The report also refers to the approaching danger of war, and finally holds out the hope of a socialist future, for which rationalisation, trusts and monopolies are creating, at an accelerated rate, the foundations. On the example of the Christian slave morality—be patient and suffer, you will be well repaid in heaven.

The Brussels women's conference declared that "detailed demands, far-reaching demands cannot be put forward to-day in view of the technical progress and other causes which limit the production and distribution of goods." The working woman must be satisfied if economic and parliamentary democracy bestows upon her the blessing of an eight-hour day or 46-hour week. They abstained, with difficulty, from expressing the sinful opinion that working women must fight together with working men for the most necessary demands, and for more than that. They were obviously convinced, as the Amsterdam International Trade Union Women's Conference at Paris in July, 1927, declared, that the dangers and evils of women's work to-day "can only be overcome by the organisation of women in trade unions," that is, without any fight against the capitalist bosses in the factories, etc.

A great abundance of words and wishes at the Brussels Conference served to hide the inactivity of the Second International on the question of mother and child protection. Even

the long list of wishes only contained the demands put forward at the Washington Conference, and did not mention the necessity for subsidising nursing mothers, or for establishing, at the employer's cost, creches attached to the factories. In the opinion of the conference, the poor employer should be guarded against expense, without reference to the fact that he is squeezing surplus value out of the labour of men and women. All the costs arising from the institutions and measures taken for the social care of mother and child are to be met by "public means." The Brussels Conference obviously had not been told of the secret that the masses, exploited as producers, are, as citizens in a democratic State, the largest taxpayers; and was equally unaware of the obstinate truth that every reform must be fought for by the proletariat, and that the parties of the Second International "professionally" drop the demands for social provision and care of mother and child in the period of "socialist" ministries. The reformist women at Brussels lived by the wisdom preached at Marseilles, that reforms in favour of the working woman will fall into her lap as the gift of humanity and parliamentary legislation.

Formerly, the characteristic phenomenon of capitalist exploitation of industrial women workers was the flight of workers' children from this best of all possible worlds, the huge infant mortality rate in the working class. In the age of rationalisation and stabilisation, with its increasing burdens for the working woman, this is accompanied by a rapidly falling birth rate, which is apparent in all capitalist countries. The question of birth control, of legal abortion and contraception, is of extreme urgency. At the meeting of the women's committee of the Second International Secretariat at Cologne in December, 1927, a strong desire was evident to have these questions discussed as a separate item on the agenda of the Brussels Conference. This was resisted by the women representatives of the British Labour Party, whose leaders are opposed "to making this matter a Party matter, for that would wound the deeply religious feelings of a large number of people."

Obedient to MacDonald's piety, the Portsmouth National Women's Conference of the Labour Party decided not to declare its attitude to birth control.

The Brussels Conference was not so virtuous. It had to do something about it. But in order to prevent any too sharp manifestation of the contradictory opinions in the women's movement of the L.S.I. to appear, it avoided a discussion of the question, and contented itself with a resolution on birth control, signed by representatives of twelve parties and some individual delegates, including those from the I.L.P. Just as the resolution indicated the lack of unity of opinion on this question, so its content betrayed the lack of a thorough discussion of the problem from the standpoint of historical materialism. It did not state clearly the necessary connection of the problem with the order of society based on private property, it made no sharp distinction between its own ideas and neo-Malthusianism. In fact, a Czecho-Slovakian delegate prefaced the resolution with a purely neo-Malthusian statement. The Conference betrayed its cowardice and insincerity by maintaining silence, in dealing with the protection of women workers and of mother and child, about the exemplary institutions and measures in the Soviet Union.

"THE PEACE IDEA"

In its attitude to the war danger, the women's movement of the Second International —just like all its organisations—showed indubitably that it is standing solidly with the class enemy, whose rule makes full emancipation for women impossible. With the humanitarian coat of many colours—"Education in the peace idea"—the Hamburg Conference withdrew from the proletarian class struggle against imperialist war on to the less dangerous ground of squabbles with nationalist schoolmasters and protests against chauvinist textbooks. Marseilles followed with an illuminating step—backwards. One item on the agenda was "the fight against war." It was the time of French imperialism's atrocious war on the Riffis in Morocco. A deputation of working women wished to find out the attitude of the Conference towards that war. The Conference refused to see the delegations or to give it an answer. The delegation "smelt of revolution," of Communism. It had been formed on the initiative of Communist women.

But the British delegates, too, lacked the intelligence to refrain from requiring a statement of the Conference concerning the Moroccan war; regardless of the fact that the international unity of the reformist sisterhood would thereby suffer a great shock. The French Socialist Party had voted the credits for the war and dissociated itself from any mass protest. The expert tacticians of the Conference steered clear of this second, and graver cross-examination of their verbose pacifism. They manœuvred the British suggestion into the dark room of a commission, which brought forth a high-falutin' and inoffensive resolution against any war "from whatever side it may arise." Stripped of its pacifist phraseology, this means rejection of civil war and of revolution, and war against so-called "red imperialism," against the Soviet Union.

The Brussels Conference also dealt with the fight against war dangers and war. The military laws drawn up by the socialist, Paul Boncour, included the "mobilisation of women." Like a young lady in love for the first time, the delegates revelled in hopes of the League of Nations, the disarmament conferences, the pacifists' prayers for peace, and, chiefly, in the power of the "mothers' ballot box," to stop the armament-mad imperialists. With pacifist platitudes, they condemned the mobilisation of women for war purposes as prescribed in Boncour's law. The French delegate, Saumoneau—once a convinced opponent of imperialist war—upset this pacifist jubilation. She justified the mobilisation of women, national defence being the duty of all, and extolled the progress made in the establishment of equality for women, although she comes from a capitalist State which denies the franchise to women. In opposition to Saumoneau, the conference held out pacifist illusions; for along with the Second International as a whole, it believed in "defence of the fatherland." How, then, could the Conference reply: mobilisation of women—yes, indeed—but never on behalf of the capitalist State. Mobilisation against the capitalist State, and for the civil war, for the revolution. The conference uttered no word of sympathy for the national freedom movements of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, for revolutionary China, no word of sympathy for the awakening women of the East. It kept silent about the peace policy of the Soviet Union, expressed in Litvinov's proposals at the farcical Geneva Conference, proposals which were warmly welcomed even by bourgeois pacifists. The women's conference shared in the ignominy of the Brussels world conference of the Second International which, in an appeal to all nations, declared the readiness of the L.S.I. "to defend the Soviet republic against the hostilities of capitalist governments," but at the same time called upon the workers of the Soviet Union to protect democracy against "political despotism."

After its resurrection as the Labour and Socialist International, the Second International still remained a confused structure organisationally, and this applied too, to the women's movement, both nationally and internationally. In comparison with the pre-war period, there is better contact between it and the executive of the International, as also with the national organisations. The Hamburg inaugural congress rejected the proposal of previous conferences that a woman should sit on the executive bureau, but it agreed to establish a women's committee to maintain contact. This committee was first regularly constituted in 1927, and consists of fifteen representatives from different countries, with a presidium of five at the head. The women's committee meets at least once annually. Its work is to unite the women's movement in the different countries, to supply information to the executive secretariat, and to arrange the international women's conferences. International co-operation is, therefore, not very strong. This is true, too, of international action on the part of the national women's movements, as in the celebration of International Women's Day, which was decided upon at Hamburg. It was found to be impossible to keep that day the same for all the affiliated countries. The parties in the Second International were hostile to this. In Austria and England, in the last few years, International Women's Day has been very well kept by the reformists. But how changed is its character! It is no longer an advance of united revolutionary forces against the capitalist order, it is reformist window-dressing, in which socialist gestures are used

to hide from the exploited and enslaved women the pious bourgeois reality.

Although the Second International has betrayed, not only the claims of peasant and working women to full social emancipation, but also their most elementary immediate demands for bread, justice and liberty, it still deceives and befools large numbers of them. The International Women's Socialist movement is undoubtedly a strong and rapidly-growing power, helping to protect capitalism against revolution. At the Brussels Conference 915,000 politically organised women were represented, while the reformist trade unions have 1,6870,000 women members. In every report, the German and Austrian parties show an increasing female membership. "Armoured cruiser" Chancellor Müller's party, at the end of 1928, counted 198,771 women among its almost a million members.

These imposing figures suggest clearly advantageous external circumstances. In those countries where the socialist parties and trade unions are friendly and obedient assistants of the exploiting and ruling bourgeoisie, their leaders and active adherents sit on legislative and administrative bodies; they help to decide on the distribution of posts and on the administration of social insurance, welfare institutions, etc. Where women have political rights, their reformist leaders have their share of these privileges. The organisations in the Second International consequently have at their disposal, for work among the women masses, a large staff of active women, who are not, as at one time, persecuted by the authorities and outlawed by bourgeois opinion, but envied and socially influential. This assures to the social democratic parties and trade unions a large access of women members and adherents, as well from proletarian as from middle class circles.

But besides these facts there exist others which must not be overlooked in the effort to overcome the paralysing, deceptive influence of the Second International on working women. These are women among the leading and active reformists who, through many years of activity, have gained wide experience, great ability and knowledge; who have an intimate acquaintance with the conditions of life, the needs and the psychology of the masses, and who enjoy personal confidence. The majority of the women members of the reformist organisations are not petty bourgeois, but proletarian, although in any case we must not forget that at the present stage of the class struggle, not only working and peasant women, but also the lower middle class women must be drawn into the struggle against capitalism, under whose exploiting and enslaving system they live.

But above all, the working women—and not only the labour aristocracy—are in their feelings and ideas, reformist and not revolutionary. That is the real reason why they are led by the Second International, which daily sacrifices their interests, which helps to protect and maintain bourgeois society, which denies and destroys their humanity. To lengthen the life of such a society, the Second International has given up its earlier struggle for the complete emancipation of women in favour of a despicable sham fight. Only under the banner of the Communist International can, and will, that emancipation be realised.

The Comintern and the Second International on Capitalist Stabilisation

A. J. Bennett

THE controversies on capitalist stabilisation and its character have been solved by the Programme unanimously adopted at the Sixth Congress of the Communist International. In the chapter devoted to the analysis of the general crisis of capitalism and the first phase of the world revolution, we read: "The experience of the entire post-war historical period has shown that the capitalist stabilisation achieved through repression of the working class and systematic depression of its standard of life *can only be transient, partial and decaying.*" (My italics. —A.J.B.)

The Sixth Congress of the Comintern declaring in the Programme that the stabilisation of capitalism is temporary and decaying, by no means concealed from itself the fact that the feverishly sporadic development of technique in several countries almost approaches a new technical revolution. But the Programme approaches the question of technical development and all the successes of capitalist rationalisation, armed with the Marxist-Leninist method, exposing the contradictions of present-day capitalist stabilisation in general and capitalist rationalisation in particular. For this reason it sees the *other* side of this technical process. The Programme emphasises the restriction of production, despite the technical development, the merciless and rapacious exploitation of labour power, the chronic unemployment, the absolute depreciation of the situation of the working class, the development of competition between the imperialist countries, and the increasing intensity of class conflicts, etc.

On the basis of a study of the entire process of partial capitalist stabilisation the Programme constitutes the existence of effective pre-conditions for a *new, still higher period in the development of the general crisis of capitalism and the world proletarian revolution.* It is unnecessary to add that the Programme underlines the significance of the greatest historical fact, which the apologists of stabilisation spare no pains in trying to forget, namely, the existence of a socialist State, cut off from general world economy. The same chapter of the Programme, which emphasises the decaying character of modern capitalist stabilisation, shows that "the break-up of world economy into a capitalist and a socialist sector, the shrinking of markets, and the anti-imperialist movements in the colonies intensify all the contradictions of capitalism, which is developing on a new post-war basis.

The question of stabilisation has stood long on the agenda of the Communist International. The slowing down of the rate of development of the revolution was already discernible at the Third Congress of the Comintern. It was no accident that Lenin, in his speech to the Third Congress (on the tactics of the C.P.S.U.) emphasised more than once the fact that in actuality the movement had not taken a straight-line course, after the manner we had anticipated. In the resolutions of the Third Congress the possibility of the then existing crisis being followed in more or less countries by an upward development is referred to. But already then the Third Congress emphasised that this by no means represented the commencement of a new epoch. Considerably later the Sixth Plenum of the Comintern, returning to the question of stabilisation (March, 1926), declared that by stabilisation the Comintern has never under any circumstances understood that capitalism, especially European capitalism, has healed the wounds it suffered through the first world imperialist war, that capitalism has overcome the contradictions, so clearly revealed and sharpened to an extraordinary measure by that war. The resolution continues, "*The period of the decline of capitalism continues.*" (My italics.—A.J.B.)

Deviations from the correct line in the period

between the Fifth and Sixth Congresses, and right deviations in particular, were connected to a tremendous extent with over-estimations of the role and meaning of capitalist stabilisation.

Here, as in a whole series of other questions, the colossal influence of the social-reformists appears. It would seem that controversy around the question of stabilisation was finally settled by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, which gave in the Programme a scientific explanation of the origins and character of modern capitalist stabilisation. It is, nevertheless, necessary to note that, after the Congress, tendencies to over-estimate the role and significance of capitalist stabilisation are remarkable in a number of separate Communist sections. This tendency appeared especially clearly in the ranks of the American Communist Party. Even at the Sixth Congress itself one or two echoes of this exaggeration were audible. As, for instance, comrade Ewert said in his speech on the report of the C.C., among other things: "The British General Strike and the struggle of the miners showed, side by side with the strength and heroism of the British working class, the hard and solid stabilisation of the bourgeoisie." In reply to the interjection "Hard and solid?" Ewert repeated, "Yes, hard and solid, for the British bourgeoisie in its struggle against the working class has not revealed any weaknesses."

These exaggerations carried within themselves serious danger, and therefore deserve the deepest possible attention.

Capitalist stabilisation assumes various forms in different parts of the capitalist world. It goes *comparatively* more smoothly and swimmingly in that country to which the centre of capitalist industry was carried after the war (U.S.A.). That country is the only country which emerged victorious from the world war. From a debtor country she became a creditor of practically the entire capitalist world. Her productive output developed with amazing rapidity. Inside the country itself a rapid intensive industrialisation of new localities is proceeding (south). American imperialism also expands at a rapid rate. But even in the U.S.A. the development of the productive forces proceeds by no means along the path of improvement of technique and the extension of methods of the organisation of production alone. *The extension of the methods of exploitation of the workers* plays a tremendous role in the increase of the wealth of the land of the almighty dollar, and leads in the last resort to the most merciless extermination of living labour power. The latest methods of exploitation impose such a colossal intensification of labour that even bourgeois economists are compelled to admit that we are face to face with an unrelenting shortening of proletarian lives.

Rationalisation in this way presents itself as the immediate daily destruction of an enormous number of working-class hands, working under the highly flourishing and strongest capitalist country in the world.

Side by side with this, however, we observe in the U.S.A. that negative phenomenon referred to in the Programme of the Communist International. The development of capitalism carries only certain branches of industry to flourishing prosperity while others decline.

Together with the mining industry, which is a weak spot of post-war capitalism, we observe a serious crisis also in the textile industry. In all branches of industry we see, together with advances, a headlong development of chronic unemployment, created by the gigantic development of the productivity of labour, pressing on a shrinkage of markets.

Simultaneously American imperialism, being part of the general world imperialist system, is feverishly preparing to submit the contradictions of imperialism to a decision by force of arms. We see therefore in America also all those features of capitalist rationalisation which constitute the pre-conditions for a new and higher period of the general crisis of capitalism.

The path of capitalist rationalisation in Europe is complicated and tortuous—above all in England. The European countries, suffering more heavily from the world war, are faced with the task of rehabilitating their capitalist strength in fierce rivalry with a mighty competitor in the person of the U.S.A. The ruling classes of the European capitalist countries endeavour to compensate their economic and technical weakness (in comparison with

the transatlantic Titan) by means of still more relentless and unmerciful exploitation of the labour of the proletarians. Exactly for this reason we see still more sharply and conclusively the shady sides of capitalist rationalisation, which endorse the general estimate and prognosis formulated by the Programme of the C.I.

These shady sides are especially apparent in Britain. The British bourgeoisie infirm after a lengthy period of control of the world's markets, trails helplessly, not merely after America, but also Germany in the task of rationalising her industry and overcoming the old forms of the organisation of production, and endeavours to shift the entire burden of competition with her more powerful opponents on to the shoulders of the working class. "Merrie old England" abounds to-day in districts in complete poverty. It is no accident that in England we were witnesses of such gigantic class events as the General Strike, and such a lengthy, exhausting battle as that presented by the seven months' heroic struggle of the miners. Those strikes were proofs, not of the equilibrium and solidity of bourgeois stabilisation, but its *decay* and lack of strength. It is correct, of course, that the British bourgeoisie succeeded with the help of the reformists, in recovering itself despite the General Strike and the miners' struggle. But if we retain the logical argument, selected by comrade Ewert, then we may easily arrive at the conclusion that the 1905 revolution in Russia was merely a proof of the solidity and stabilisation of Tsarism (for did not Tsarism recover from the 1905 revolution?).

The unhealthy process of capitalist stabilisation brings in its train radical changes in the role of the social-democracy. The new role and function of the social-democracy is annotated in a whole series of decisions of Plenums and Congresses of the C.I. The Fifth Congress already showed the fact that in Europe the social-democracy were becoming third parties of the bourgeoisie. The same Congress noted that Fascism and social-democracy in the final analysis are similar weapons of the ruling class against the revolutionary proletariat.

A more exact analysis of the new role and function of the social-democracy was given by the Ninth Plenum (February, 1928), which issued the directions for strengthening the struggle against imperialism with the counter-attack against social reformism in all its varying appearances, and, above all against the so-called "left" social-democracy.

Connected with the analysis of the new function of social reformism, the Ninth Plenum issued a new general tactical line for the Communist Parties in the trade unions and specially formulated tactical instructions for the British and French Communist Parties.

Those who are inclined to exaggerate the role of capitalist stabilisation, do not remark the new role played by social-democracy in the present period.

"Boldly" have spoken out their views those right elements who have already broken with Communism and now stand as a bridge for the return to the bosom of the social-democracy.

"Every child knows," we read in the organ of Brandler and Thalheimer, "Against the Stream,"—"that the shameless activities of the reformists, just during the war, during the revolutionary period and after, were so great, that they could hardly be surpassed.

"Therefore it is incorrect to speak of changes now appearing (in the activities of the reformists). It seems to us, that these changes in the activities of the reformists, at least in Germany, have been thought out, in order to find some semblance of a ground for the new tactics." The new tactics of which Brandler and Thalheimer speak so contemptuously is the tactics of the sharper struggle against the reformists, including also the so-called "left" reformists (on all fronts, and in the first place in the trade unions). Against this new tactics Brandler and Thalheimer try to create an impression that the demonstration of the changing role of the social-democracy is a fabrication. Let us examine the "evolution" of the parties of the Second International a little closer.

We commence with Britain. In the course of a long period of time the Labour Party, which was headed by experienced and astute reformist-traitors, allowed its constituent parts not merely the right to criticise the reformist leadership, but to take a stand in defence of the proletarian dictatorship. Now

this honoured party has formulated a programme which even a member of the Independent Labour Party (Wheatley) recognised as a programme of capitalist rationalisation.

The Congress which accepted this programme added to it a resolution on loyalty, the leading idea of which is that all members of the Labour Party are duty bound to loyally observe and fulfil the programme, *i.e.*, support capitalist rationalisation, which in Britain for special reasons is introduced through smashing inroads into the living minimum of the British workers.

A similar example is provided by the General Council of the T.U.C. In 1925 the Trades Union Congress adopted a series of radical resolutions culminating in greetings to the Chinese revolution, at that time advancing its triumphant banner against imperialism in general and British imperialism in particular.

The Sixtieth Trades Union Congress in September, 1928, presents a completely different picture. This Congress accepted the Report of the General Council, which in its most fundamental portions is simply a "proof" of the correctness of the policy of "Industrial Peace," known as Mondism (according to the name of the head of the chemical industry, who in actuality now stands as the "ideological" leader of the British trade unions).

The General Council stated in its Report to the Congress at Swansea with striking frankness, that it rejects the idea of the General Strike, it rejects the idea of partial strikes, and finally declared for the "scientific reorganisation of industry," which means that it declared in support of capitalist rationalisation, as now conducted by the English bourgeoisie.*

The general humour of this Congress was conclusively and sharply expressed in the speech of welcome of the High Sheriff of Swansea. "Do we," asked the Sheriff, "not all do the same work, and are we not all more or less capitalists? For those of us who are British subjects are actually shareholders and have their capital in the great limited liability company, the British Empire, Ltd."† (Retranslated from the Russian.)

The "shareholders" in the persons of the trade union bureaucrats heartily applauded the Sheriff, who formulated their innermost thoughts with such frank simplicity.

A similar picture, for example, is observable in Germany. A few months back the German social-democrats double-crossed on the question of the cruisers. One hand (ministerial) signed the assignations for the cruiser. The other (the benchers) voted against it. Now the German social-democracy has decided to drop the mask and enter the lists with a war programme, which is to be laid before the Congress of the S.P.D. at Magdeburg in March. This programme is, in actuality, not merely a programme of armed defence of Germany, but a programme of armed counter-revolution against the U.S.S.R.

And "Vorwaerts" modestly explains that this programme is merely a minimum programme, and that the fellow-renegades of the German social-democrats in the persons of Boncour and Renaudel have gone much further and placed their signature to the most reactionary law in the world, to the law providing a complete mobilisation of the entire population and militarisation of all organs, including the trade unions.

The French reformists of course do not lag behind their foreign brothers. On the 15th November, 1927 the reformist C.G.T. issued a declaration which the Socialist Party subsequently fully sanctioned. In this declaration we read: "The C.G.T. holds that the chief problem remains always the return of the country to normal economy. She demands to-day, as yesterday, financial stabilisation, which will enable her to end the manœuvres of oppressors and speculators, who make life dearer. Stabilisation must become law in the shortest time if we want productive activity, regularity and unanimity, and to reach a definite recuperation, which will help to increase the wealth of individuals and the community."

The documents quoted deal with the *principles* declared by the social-reformists. If we turn to the *practice* of the socialist parties and reformist trade union bureaucrats then we see that in deeds they are the immediate agents of capital, assisting it to transfer the burden

* See Report of Swansea Congress, p. 209.

† See Report of Swansea Congress, p. 60.

of capitalist rationalisation to the shoulders of the working class. In the European countries, more sharply than in the U.S.A., the social reformists are the most important instruments in the hands of the bourgeoisie in the carrying out of capitalist rationalisation, as in the preparation of imperialist war for seizing territory and in the preparation of counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R.

In the economic field, social reformism plays the role of strike-breaking organisations, differing from the usual strike-breaking organisation only in its hasty recourse to more complex and impudent methods of splitting the workers and disarming them in the face of attacking capital. In the political field the social-democracy forms the third bourgeois party, placing instead of revolutionary struggle not merely the defence, but the immediate strengthening of the capitalist forces through the organisation of the working class.

The new tactics, roughly drafted by the Ninth Plenum of the Comintern and completed by the Sixth Congress, lead to the strengthening of the independent part of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union movement in the preparation and leadership of economic struggles. Throughout Europe we observe to-day a strengthening of the activity of the workers, attempts to pass over to active defence against the capitalist attacks and now and then to attack with the aim of improving their position. All these attempts encounter the resistance of the entire apparatus of the capitalists and the bourgeois government, and in the first place, the open methodical strike-breaking work of the reformist leadership of the trade unions. It is therefore natural that the work of organising the workers' struggles, the independent leadership of these struggles becomes a first-rate task of the Communist Parties. All attempts to deviate from these tasks play into the hands of the reformists, *i.e.*, help capital to operate rationalisation at the expense of a worsened situation for the working class.

In the political field the new tactic leads to a sharper struggle against social reformism. (In Britain decisive attack against the Labour Party as the third party of the bourgeoisie; in France, attack against all bourgeois parties, including the Socialist Party, etc.)

This new tactic is necessitated not merely by the new function of the social-democracy, but also those deep movements proceeding in the working class, on the one hand, and those changes which capitalist rationalisation introduces on the other.

In recent years we may see more and more a deepening cleft between the higher, more privileged strata of workers, alhering to social-reformism, and the great proletarian masses, who are blazing a new trail.

To lead and unite these masses is a first and not to be postponed task of the Communist International and all its sections. The entire present period is one of more sharpened contradictions, which places on the agenda, on the one hand, mighty class happenings, and on the other the increasing danger of war.

As in the struggles between labour and capital, so in the preparation of new war in general and counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R. especially, the social-democracy, and the trade union bureaucracy, which has sold itself to it, have defined their position by programme and action. For this reason the Communist Parties must prepare themselves for leadership of the workers' struggles, strengthen the struggle against war and the war danger, prepare themselves, and at the same time the working-class masses, to convert imperialist war into a civil war.

Such are the conditions which dictated the necessity for the new tactical line which was formulated by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International.

The carrying out of this line of tactics demands the most decisive and intense struggle against right deviations, against conciliation with these deviations, and especially against all attempts to over-estimate the solidarity of capitalist stabilisation and any attempts to under-estimate the treacherous role of social reformism.

It should be self-understood that the determined struggle against right tendencies and conciliation with them cannot under any circumstances, and must not, lead to any weakening of the struggle against the so-called "left" deviations which are actually obvious opportunism.

The Road to the Communist International

The Struggles of the Bulgarian C. P. against the Opportunism of the Second International

C. Kabakchiev

THE struggle against the opportunism of the Second International began long before the collapse of the latter during the imperialist war. When, at the close of the first decade of its existence—at the end of the 90's—Eduard Bernstein came into the open with his criticism and revision of Marxism, in an endeavour to provide a theoretical basis for the opportunist tactics of Vollmar and other leaders of German social-democracy, there began a bitter struggle against his theory in the majority of the parties of the Second International. This attempt to give a theoretical foundation to opportunist tactics revealed and emphasised the strong tendencies which had developed for open struggle against Marxism and revolutionary tactics.

Against Bernstein were arraigned the most famous leaders of the Second International—Kautsky and Bebel in Germany, Jules Guesde in France, George Plekhanov in Russia, and others who afterwards passed into the camp of opportunism and social chauvinism. The most conclusive and unyielding struggle against Bernstein, however, was carried on by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg.

The struggle against opportunism flared up with great strength after the Russian revolution of 1905, which gave a strong impetus to the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and to the left tendencies within the Second International. The party of the Bolsheviks emerged at the head of these tendencies. The struggle of the Bolsheviks and the left against the Second International—especially during the war—is well known. The struggle led by the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party (the "Narrow" Socialists), from its foundation, against petty bourgeois socialism and opportunism and against the participation of the "Broad" Socialists in the Second International is, however, not so well known.

In Bulgaria, the social-democratic movement began in 1891, when the first Social-Democratic Party was founded. The founder, and later the leader, was D. Blagoev, who also founded the first workers' social democratic organisation in St. Petersburg, in 1883—the Party of Russian-Social Democrats, also known as Blagoev's Groups. Already at the foundation of the Party, there began internal struggles between the petty bourgeois socialists and the Marxists, who were led by Blagoev. That struggle ended with the secession of the petty bourgeois socialists and the formation by them of the Social-Democratic Union, an organisation which was opposed to political struggle and in favour of purely economic struggles. This was the period of "Economism" in the development of the Bulgarian Socialist Party.

In 1894, the Party and the Union united to form the Bulgarian Workers' Social-Democratic Party. The struggle between the two tendencies—Marxist and opportunist—continued until 1903, when the Party split and the Marxists, led by Blagoev, Kirkov and Georgiev, founded the Bulgarian Workers' Social-Democratic Party (Narrows).

At the beginning of the Bulgarian socialist movement, capitalism had scarcely penetrated the country. The working class, few and scattered, were occupied in small handicraft production. The population chiefly consisted of peasants together with the petty bourgeoisie and small producers. The prevailing ideology was petty bourgeois, and this ideology dominated the intellectuals and even the workers who joined the socialist movement. In can, therefore, easily be understood why opportunism gained such proportions at the beginning of the movement. At its foundation in 1894, the Bulgarian Workers' Social-Democratic Party was, in its composition, outlook and

tactics, actually a petty bourgeois radical party though it called itself socialist and had a socialist programme.

Nevertheless, it possessed a healthy Marxist wing, led by Blagoev, which conducted an unremitting struggle against opportunism and which finally seceded in 1903 and laid the foundation of the Bulgarian S.D. Party (Narrow Socialists).

The party of the Narrow Socialists was inseparably connected with the growing workers' movement, and continued its struggle against the party of Broad Socialists. The service of the party of Narrow Socialists to the Bulgarian and Balkan proletariat consists in the fact that it carried on an unceasing struggle for the principles of Marx and for revolutionary socialism during whole decades. It thus laid the foundation, protected the growth and ensured the future of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in a petty bourgeois country, as Bulgaria was, and to a large extent still remains.

But the party of Narrows fought not only against Broad and petty bourgeois socialism. It also fought against opportunism in the Second International in general.

At the time of the split in 1903, it opposed the participation of the Broad Party in the Second International and demanded its exclusion. This attitude it maintained permanently. At the International Congress held at Stuttgart in 1907, where the Narrow Party supported the position taken up by Lenin and Luxemburg on the war question, it again demanded the expulsion of the Broads from the International. At the Copenhagen Congress (1910), comrade Kolarov, reading a declaration of the Balkan Social-Democratic Parties in favour of a Balkan Federated Republic, protested to the plenum of the congress against the participation of the Broad Socialists.

The Party of the Narrow Socialists belonged to the left wing of the Second International. It supported Plekhanov against the Narodniki (Populists), Guesde against Jaurès, and Kautsky against Bernstein, as far as Plekhanov, Guesde and Kautsky were Marxists; but it opposed them when they crossed to the opportunist camp. It consistently supported the revolutionary opposition led by Lenin and Luxemburg.

We print below a few documents* which illustrate the struggle which was conducted by the revolutionary groups in the International against opportunism, social-chauvinism and social-imperialism, up to and during the war.

Under the conditions in which it grew the Narrow Party could not attain the clarity of outlook or the definiteness of revolutionary tactics that distinguished the Bolshevik Party. But it was a Marxist party, and its struggles against opportunism, its experience and knowledge, were of international importance in the development and strengthening of those left revolutionary tendencies which finally led to the formation of the Communist International.

The Party of Narrows, in spite of its honesty, steadfastness and loyalty to the principles of revolutionary Marxism, made a series of mistakes, the chief of which was its attitude at the time of the coup-d'état of June 9th, 1923.

At Zimmerwald, the Party did not join the Leninist left because despite its struggles against the war and against the Second International, it was not sufficiently convinced of the necessity of turning the imperialist war into a civil war, and of splitting the Second International (although Blagoev and G. Kirkov made a declaration at the beginning of the war in this sense). At the conclusion of the war, the Party did not join the peasants who headed the rising of the troops in September, 1918, which aimed at the overthrow of the monarchy and the punishment of those who were responsible for the war. This was because during the war, despite the agitation and struggle against the war, at the front and at home, the Party did not create the necessary organisational connections and groups in the army, which would have enabled it, at the decisive moment, to lead the revolutionary soldiers (workers and peasants).

After the war, the Party was unable correctly to estimate the revolutionary part played by the peasants under proletarian leadership in the new revolutionary period. It did not fully understand the tactics of the united front

* These documents are taken from books, articles, etc., in the possession of the Marx-Engels Institute and the Lenin Institute (Moscow).

with the "Peasants' Union," nor did it entirely free itself from the social-democratic conditions. It made a fatal mistake on the 9th June, 1923.

But these mistakes cannot and must not wipe out the previous Marxist and revolutionary past of the Party of Narrow Socialists which emerged with the left-wing in the Second International and now, after the experience of past mistakes, marches in step with the Communist International. The Party of Narrows joined the Communist International immediately after its foundation at its Congress in May, 1919, when it accepted the programme, principles and tactics of the Comintern, changing its name to Communist Party of Bulgaria (Narrow Socialist).

The experiences and history of the C.P.B. (N.S.), are part of the history of the struggle against the Second International of the left revolutionary parties which later formed the Communist International.

I.

THE PROTEST AGAINST THE BALKAN WAR (PRESENTED AT THE BASLE CONGRESS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL)

At the Basle Congress of the Second International, held on the 11th and 12th, November, 1912, the delegate of the Bulgarian S.D.P. (Narrow), Kabakchiev, presented a declaration on the question of the war in the Balkans, in which, among other things, appeared the following:

"We . . . . energetically protest against the war, bloody and ruinous for the Balkan people, which is carried on by the ruling classes and the dynasty for territorial conquests and in the interests of capitalists and monarchists. . .

"In energetically condemning the war and demanding its immediate cessation, we declare that the class conscious Bulgarian proletariat leads the struggle for the national unification and independence of the Balkan peoples, and will continue to do so. We strive for the realisation of the 'Balkan Federated Republics.'"

In the following passage, this declaration predicted the war between the Balkan governments—Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro—which broke out in June, 1913, after the victory over the common enemy—Turkey:

"The alliance founded for the attainment of capitalist and dynastic aims of conquest will collapse into new national conflicts. After the defeat of the common enemy—Turkey—and the plundering of her European provinces."

The Bureau of the Congress, of which J. Zakisov was a member, representing the Bulgarian Mensheviks (Broads), succeeded in preventing the delegate of the Bulgarian Workers' S.D.P. (Narrow), from reading this declaration to the Congress, but it was distributed to the delegates in French and German . Later, "Vorwaerts" reprinted extracts from this declaration, but the journal of the German S.D.P., "Die Neue Zeit," published an article by the writer of these lines in which the views of the Narrows on the Balkan Federated Republic were presented. Kautsky refused, however, to publish a second article by the same author, in which he defended the revolution as the only method of realising the Balkan Federated Republic and exposed the bourgeois nationalism of the Bulgarian Broad Socialists.

The Narrows fought against the Balkan War, at the front and at home, and at the end of the war, greatly increased their strength and influence over the masses.

II.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

Soon after the beginning of the conflict between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, the Bulgarian Workers' S.D. Party (Narrow), through its representative, D. Blagoev, made a declaration in Parliament (12th July, 1914), in which it said that: "Peace is essential to the Bulgarian people," and that "only through the Balkan Federated Republics could the threatening danger of foreign occupation and oppression over the Balkans, which resulted from the monarchist and nationalist policy of the ruling classes, be averted."

The Parliamentary group of the Party issued a "Manifesto to the Working Class of Bul-

garia," on the 17th of July, 1914, and organised many meetings of protest throughout the entire country. A second appeal was issued on the 28th of July, 1914, in which it was pointed out that "the evil lies in capitalist rule," and that "either the power of capital will be broken or humanity will return to barbarism." This appeal closes with the following words: "Down with the Censorship! Down with Martial Law! Down with Militarism!"

After the outbreak of the imperialist war, the Bulgarian Workers' S.D. Party (Narrows), convened a great public meeting, at which D. Blagoev, an old leader of the Party, vigorously protested against the war, which he branded as a war for territorial conquest and for the suppression of the rising proletarian revolution. He roundly condemned the parties of the Second International which co-operated with the warmakers. Even at that time, he propagated the necessity of an immediate "cleansing of the Second International from opportunism" and "the creation of a "new revolutionary International."

On the 26th October, 1914, the Party organised meetings against martial law, against the war and in favour of peace.

On the 22nd February, 1915, an all-Balkan meeting was held in Sofia, at which participated, besides the Party of Narrows, representatives of the S.D. Parties of Serbia and Roumania; meetings were also held throughout the country on this day.

The following day, the parliamentary group issued in the name of the meeting a declaration in which it protested against the approaching war and again put forward the slogan of the Alliance of the Balkan Peoples into a Balkan Federated Republic for defence against imperialism and for the unification of Balkan nationalities.

On the day of mobilisation in Bulgaria, 7th September, 1915, the Parliamentary group of the Party published an appeal in which occurred the following:

"The Bulgarian Workers' S.D. Party must energetically fight from the beginning of the war against the treacherous and murderous policy of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie and monarchists. The working class, reinforced by the great masses of the people at thousands of meetings throughout the country, protests against the war and loudly declares the united steadfast will of the Bulgarian people to establish peace and live in brotherly amity with their neighbours. . . . We, Social-Democratic deputies, loudly protest against the preparation of this crime against the higher interests and against freedom of the nations. Government and Opposition have rejected our proposals in Parliament, in which we demand that the Balkan Parliaments should immediately begin negotiations for the achievement of a general political Balkan alliance independent of the Great Powers and directed not only towards the defence of the Balkan peoples from their common enemies, but towards the aim of laying a granite foundation of the Republic of the Balkans. . . .

"Down with war! Long live the Balkan Federated Republic! Long live revolutionary socialism!"

For the issue of this appeal, the Parliamentary group were charged with high treason and several deputies were arrested. Despite this, immediately following the beginning of the war (October, 1915), D. Blagoev read a declaration in the name of the Party and of the Parliamentary group at the first meeting of Parliament, 15th October, 1915, in which it was declared:

"Bulgarian Social-Democracy even before the outbreak of the war, took up a decisive attitude against the war and did everything within its power to prevent the Bulgarian people being involved. . . . We remain the implacable enemies of the war; we protest against the outrage against the Bulgarian people and, expressing the passionate desire of the mass of the people, urgently demand the immediate cessation of bloodshed and the conclusion of peace.

"Social-Democracy, recognising the right of all peoples to self-determination and self-government, emphatically protests against the annexation of foreign territory* and against the suppression of foreign peoples. Standing always for the rights of all oppressed peoples, Social-Democracy protests against the destruction and oppression of the Serbian people.

* At that time most of Serbia was already occupied by the Bulgarian and Austrian armies.

Social-Democracy perceives the unification of the Balkan peoples only in the Balkan Federated Republic, in which all Balkan peoples, will reciprocally guarantee national and cultural freedom.

"We declare that we do not support in any shape or form the bloodthirsty monarchists and the bourgeoisie, but stand in solidarity with the conscious proletariat of the entire world. The Bulgarian S.D. Party declares that it will do everything possible on its side for the consummation of Peace and Socialism. These are the considerations under which we vote against the 500 millions for military credits."

The Party continued the struggle against the war—both inside and outside Parliament. On the 4th August, 1916, D. Blagoev presented a new declaration to Parliament in the name of the Party and the Parliamentary group, in which it was declared:

"Emphasising once more our declaration of the 15th October, 1915, against the war credits and adhering in full to the decisions of the Zimmerwald Socialist Conference against war and for immediate peace without annexations, the Parliamentary group of the Bulgarian Bulgarian S.D. Party declares:

"It was previously well known that the object of the European war is the re-division of the world between the great capitalist States and the conquest of foreign peoples, especially the small backward peoples—to-day this is still clearer. . . .

"In the Balkans the imperialist States are striving for the splitting of the Balkan Peninsula to ensure themselves a free path to Constantinople and Asia Minor. We declare our votes against the new war credits.

"Down with the War! Long live Peace!

"Long live Peace without annexations!"

III.

THE THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE PARTY "NOVO VREMYA" ON THE WAR AND ON THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

D. Blagoev wrote, during the first days of the outbreak of war, in the theoretical organ of the Party, "Novo Vremya," a journal under his editorship (August, 1914):

"After a wide-scale European war follows revolution. In the flames of war, after the beginning of the general mutual slaughter, we may still more confidently expect the revolution. There can be no doubt that the sole victor of the present all-European war will be the inevitable all-European revolution."

When Blagoev wrote these lines he was still unaware of the treachery of the big parties of the Second International.

The news that these parties voted for war credits caused vacillations in all parties, with the exception of the Bolshevik Party.

In the September issue of the "Novo Vremya," we may observe a certain abstention from sharp criticism of the treacherous policy of the German social-democracy and of the socialist parties of other countries. Nevertheless, the conviction that the revolution would be the inevitable result of the war, and that the proletariat must prepare for it, was always foremost in the party of Narrow Socialists. In the leading article of the following issue of "Novo Vremya" we find: "In the situation created by the war revolution is the inevitable necessity. This is the only way out for mankind." In the following number of the theoretical organ, the party condemns the voting for war credits by the German social-democracy as a policy "full of danger to international social-democracy," which, it was explained by Blagoev, was dominated by opportunists. Simultaneously he branded German social-democracy, which refused to follow the brilliant example of Bebel and William Liebknecht during the Franco-Prussian war, and showed "the revolutionary path of the Balkan Federated Republic" to be the only path which could save the Balkan peoples from imperialist conquest and enable them to realise their national independence.

Attempts on the part of Plekhanov and Parvus to defend their treachery before the party of Narrows and to drag Bulgaria into the war—Plekhanov on the side of Russia and Parvus on the side of Germany—finally ended all reservations in criticism of the treacherous policy of the Second International in connection with the war.

On the 27th October, 1914, Plekhanov sent a Bulgarian (an ex-socialist) a letter, which

afterwards appeared in the collection of Plekhanov, *For the War.* In this letter Plekhanov informed Bulgarian socialists of his desertion to the camp of the social-chauvinists, invited them to follow his example, and called upon the Bulgarian people to enter the war on the side of Tsarist Russia.

Plekhanov enjoyed great authority among Bulgarian socialists, who had graduated on his works and articles, most of which had been translated into Bulgarian.

Nevertheless, this did not deter Blagoev from definitely opposing Plekhanov.

The differences within Russian social-democracy were known to the Bulgarian Narrows, and they defended the Bolshevik position in a resolution in 1915. But in Bulgaria, as in other European countries, until the war Plekhanov was one of the chief authorities of the Second International. In the December issue of "Novo Vremya," in 1914, Blagoev, in publishing Plekhanov's letter, made answer in the leading article, *Magister dixit,* in which the authority of Plekhanov, one of the most popular veterans of international socialism in Bulgaria, was destroyed.

Refuting the view of Plekhanov that the victory of Russia would hasten the world revolution, Blagoev wrote :

"After a defeat of Russia we may expect a revolution, which will lead to revolutions in other European countries. If we stand for international proletarian solidarity and the interests of the revolutionary proletarian movement, we see at once the fatal mistake of the nationalist point of view which social-democracy held and still holds about the present war.

"To fight for the aims of the Russian plunderers in the Balkans means to fight for the political and economic enslavement of the Balkan people. Similarly, in the opposite case, if the Balkan people fight on the side of the Germans . . .

"Neither a victory of Russia or Germany can successfully end our struggle for a Balkan Federated Republic and to ensure the Balkans for the Balkan people. That will be achieved by the revolution which will break out as a result of the present unprecedented war. Of that we are convinced, and the revolution will help the Balkan social-democracy in its revolutionary struggle."

Shortly after the publication of Plekhanov's letter, Parvus, one of the theoreticians of German social-democracy and a defender of its policy, arrived in Bulgaria.

D. Blagoev exposed this authority of the Second International with the same decisiveness. In the magazine, "Novo Vremya," of 2nd February, 1915, in the leader, he wrote :

"Parvus invites the Balkan governments and the social-democrats of Bulgaria to join the armies of German imperialism, to enable it to emerge victorious. Bulgarian social-democracy categorically repudiates this advice. Social democracy repudiates this advice on the grounds on which it rejected the counsel of Plekhanov to assist the armies of the Entente for the victory of Russia."

At the conclusion of the article Blagoev, exposing the collapse of the Second International, writes :

"The opportunists who have betrayed socialism and the revolutionary tradition of the proletariat, preach, above all, about bread. They created big trade union organisations with large funds. But a large number of these were without socialist consciousness and entirely devoid of revolutionary traditions, so at the decisive moment they proved to be without bread, and instead were gifted in making themselves the agents of imperialist nationalism and chauvinism."

In the following number of "Novo Vremya," 15th February, 1915, Blagoev wrote:

"The vote for the war credits by the German parliamentary fraction connotes the placing of the International at the service of German monarchism and imperialism, and for the other countries means that it is the servant of Russo-French-English imperialism. The collapse of the Second International denotes merely the collapse of that "socialism" which is known as opportunist or, in Bulgaria, 'Broad Socialism.'

"Opportunism turned the Second Inter-

national into a rabble, but the war, instead of interring revolutionary socialism, was merely burying opportunism in order to resurrect a new International, cleansed and mighty, as the organisation of international revolutionary social-democracy. . . . The new International can exist solely on the basis of revolutionary socialism; the new International can only be the international organisation of revolutionary social-democracy.

"It follows that the new International must impose new conditions of affiliation on parties and organisations . . . as, e.g., the agitation of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, especially the so-called Bolsheviks in this Party. . . .

"For us it is plain that the new International can exalt and increase its authority and can become strong only on the basis of the international proletarian organisation of revolutionary socialism."

On the Zimmerwald Conference, Blagoev wrote (1916):

"The fundamental idea of the participants of the Zimmerwald International Socialist Conference was to unite the left parties and organisations and to create a new International, cleansed of the elements who betrayed socialism and the proletariat. The Zimmerwald Conference was a conference that split, nevertheless that split was necessary."

IV.

DECLARATION OF PROTEST TO THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

On the 18th March, 1915, George Kirkov, the secretary of the Party and, after D. Blagoev, the most gifted of its leaders, sent, in the name of the E.C. of the Party, a letter of protest to the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau at the Hague, the more important portions of which were as follows:

"The present war, which is a war for the suppression of the whole world, must lead to the outbreak of the social revolution. If the international proletariat, as represented by its leading organisations and militants, had not sufficient strength to prevent the imperialist slaughter, and if the proletarians are impelled during this monstrous war to exterminate each other, then this bloody experience must be fully utilised for the rapid establishment of a united International on the basis of revolutionary socialism and for the immediate concentration of all our forces on decisive action against the enemies of the proletariat.

"We, in the Balkans, having lived through one war and learned its horrors, are deeply convinced that to-day, in the trenches of Flanders, France, Poland and Galicia, is being prepared a great opportunity, which must be utilised by the International, not only to achieve its expressed desire for peace, but also to put an end to the causes of mutual destruction.

"We expected, at the outbreak of the European war, that all brother parties in the belligerent countries would make a united and uncompromising stand against the war. We were bitterly deceived. With the exception of the brother Parties of Russia and Serbia, all other Parties supported imperialism, justifying their action with arguments previously foreign to socialism. . . . But despite this, we have not hesitated for one moment to come forward against the war and against our Government. . . .

"We hold that the resolutions of the international Congress (Second International) remain in force and that they are law for us, although the official representatives of the proletariat in most of the belligerent countries take up a position against the clear meaning of these resolutions."

Further, the firm conviction is expressed that the international solidarity of the proletariat will be re-established, and that then the proletariat "will use the weapon that the war has placed in its hands against the compromised, disorganised and dying bourgeois State."

The resolutions of the International Congress emphasised that "Capitalism has already prepared the conditions for the new socialist society and that the struggle of the proletariat must be aimed at the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist regime. . . . The most suitable condition for the achievement of this end is the general war, which it is necessary to

transform into the destruction of the bourgeoisie and monarchism.

"To the shame of the International, to-day its greatest and strongest sections . . . . participate in the bloody business of the bourgeoisie, the victims of which are millions of proletarians.

"As a proletarian Party, we remain implacable enemies of war. Never can we be accused of responsibility for the declaration of war or for its continuation."*

This letter concludes, with the proposal that the International Socialist Bureau should convene a Conference which "should re-build the shattered International," on the basis of "International solidarity, the class struggle and revolutionary socialism."

V.

THE TRANSITION TO THE "LEFT ZIMMERWALDIANS"

On the 20th July, 1917, representatives of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Bolshevik), the Social-Democratic Parties of Russia, Poland and Lithuania, the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party (Narrows) (G. Kirkov and V. Kolarov), the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, and the Socialist Union of Youth of Sweden, met in Stockholm. A Manifesto was issued to the "Socialist International" on the conference of social patriots and Centrists then in preparation, and in favour of the organisation of a Conference of "Left Zimmerwaldians." In this Manifesto, which exposed the treachery of the social patriots and Centrists, the signatories appealed to revolutionary social-democracy and to all workers in the following words:

"Unmask before the workers the lies and deceit of the Social-Democratic Conference at Stockholm. Tell the workers that not by the way of negotiations, can peace without annexations be achieved, peace corresponding to the interests of the workers, peace freed from the yoke of capitalism and national slavery of peoples. Send delegates to Stockholm! Let them discuss, together with the decisive international organisations, all measures of further struggle for peace and, taking into account the defaulting of the hesitant and hopeless elements among the Zimmerwaldians, let them realise the unification of the revolutionary social-democratic elements."

This Manifesto shows that the Party of Narrows joined the revolutionary "Left Zimmerwaldians," led by the Bolsheviks.

VI.

AFFILIATION OF THE PARTY TO THE C.I. AND ITS NEW DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Bulgarian Workers' S.D. Party (Narrow Socialists) participated in the foundation of the Communist International. Two months after the first Congress in 1919, the Bulgarian Workers' S.D. Party (Narrows) changed its name to Communist Party, Section of the Communist International. At the same Congress the Party adopted a declaration of Programme in which, accepting the principles and tactics of the Comintern, it declared:

"The development of Bulgaria proceeds amidst the general conditions of European imperialism. In comparison with the great capitalist States, her position is poor. Despite the tireless efforts of Bulgaria to annex foreign peoples and countries, Bulgaria is herself an object of conquest and exploitation by the great imperialist States. The working class and labouring peasant masses of our country are under a double yoke—the yoke of their own exploiters, and the yoke of foreign conquerors. Therefore, their situation becomes increasingly more difficult.

"The exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples strengthens the revolutionary movements in the colonies. These movements need but the support of the international proletariat, and they, commencing as national movements, must in the course of development, inevitably lead to social revolutions. Their final victory depends on the victory of the European social revolution. But the emancipation of the peoples oppressed by imperialism shatters the privileged position of the great imperialist States and hastens the revolution there."

* Bulgaria entered the war on the side of the Central Powers in September, 1915.

Ten Years of the Comintern and the International Red Aid

Felix Kon

"NOT only in Russia, but in the most highly developed capitalist countries of Europe also, as Germany, for instance, civil war has become a fact." In these words Lenin greeted the First Congress of the Communist International, and noting this fact, the initiator and organiser of the "International of open mass action, of the international revolutionary realisation of the task confronting the International, the International of deed," said further:

"Let the bourgeoisie be ferocious, let them kill thousands of workers, yet the victory of the world Communist revolution is assured."

The organiser of the staff of the world revolution, Lenin, warned us that "the struggle demands sacrificial victims. That was clear to all who participated in the Congress. "Civil war," as the representative of Germany, comrade Albert (Eberlein) said in the same Congress, "will be carried on with a ruthlessness which world history has never yet known."

The time interval between the First Congress and the Fourth Congress, at which was passed the resolution approving the foundation of the International Red Aid, completely confirmed this diagnosis. The first skirmishes in that civil war in the West, at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919, had been heralded in Germany by the shooting down of workers with machine guns and artillery, the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, and in other countries—Hungary, Finland, Poland—by bloody executions of workers; and these features had become everyday incidents. But later, when the first pressure of the proletarian masses had failed to give immediate results, throughout all countries there began, not only the execution of leaders and the shooting of the masses who had gone on the streets, but a systematic exploitation of those methods with which the Russian autocracy, and later the Provisional Government of the February revolution, had unsuccessfully attempted to save itself. Tortures, summary courts-martial, penal servitude, became a common, normal phenomenon in the life of the toiling masses who continued under the yoke of capital. Thousands of families were deprived of their breadwinners and condemned to hungry death. In some places, as in Germany and Poland, organisations of assistance similar to the political Red Cross organisations which existed in Russia under Tsarism developed under different local names. Even if one ignores the miserable assistance they were in a position to afford the prisoners of capitalism and their families, these organisations did not and could not fulfil the chief function necessary during the period of intensified civil war. The prisoners of capitalism were proletarian fighters snatched out of the proletarian ranks, knowing what they were in for and knowing that they had been taken prisoner in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class. For them material aid played a certain role, but in order to render it acceptable they needed to know that this was no gift flung to them out of the bounty of those in whose overthrow they saw the salvation of the working class. They needed to know that this was the fraternal aid of companions in the struggle, proletarians who clearly realised that this was not philanthropy, not alms, but the demonstration of proletarian solidarity, one of the forms of participation in the struggle for proletarian victory. But no matter how important was the material support rendered to the proletarian fighters wasting away in the prisons of capitalism, it was only of secondary importance to them. The proletarians are not indulged by the capitalist system. They are experienced in poverty, in a half-starving exisence, owing to the capitalists' continual ex-

traction of the last drop of blood from them. The material aspect had no terrors for the revolutionary in prison, nor had the inquisitorial methods and the penal regime which the bourgeoisie apply to their class enemy.

The "justice" meted out to the Paris Commune, to the Spartacus League, to the Finnish revolutionaries and the Hungarian proletariat have left no doubt in the revolutionaries' minds as to what awaits them from the moment that they get into prison. They have been previously prepared for all that. That holds no terrors for them. What is terrible is that the prisoners receive no news of the course of the struggle from outside. The revolutionary can find moral support only in the consciousness that the struggle is going on. Then his strength is increased by the hope that the time will come when the gates of the prison which the bourgeoisie have clanged to behind him will be opened by the victorious proletariat, and he will once again be united with his brothers by class and struggle, that he, the prisoner, will again be transformed into an active fighter.

These detailed functions were beyond the ability of the organisations of purely local character, and they were unable to play one other most important role. After the October revolution, the civil war which raged in various countries broke down, if not in fact then in thought, the barriers between the working class of the various countries. The fate of the proletarian struggles in one country was reflected incomparably more directly than formerly on the fate of the proletariat of other countries. To win the attention of the proletariat of the whole world, no matter where the proletarian struggle was being waged, to achieve a condition in which that struggle, the struggle of the entire proletariat, penetrated deeply into the consciousness of the toiling masses, to ensure that these masses, recognising the community of that struggle, should tighten the bonds of international solidarity and should demonstrate that solidarity in action, was one of the most important tasks which had to be achieved during the period of the civil war.

It was quite natural that the idea of such an organisation should have birth in that environment which for dozens of years had carried on underground struggle, which had experienced the regime of torture and penal servitude and had again rejoined the ranks of the fighters. It was quite natural that it should have been the Society of Old Bolsheviks who came forward at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, on September 30th, 1922, with the proposal for an "International organisation of aid to fighters in the revolution." The resolution adopted by the Congress on this question read :

"In connection with the attack of capital, the number of Communists and non-party workers who have entered the struggle with the capitalist system is increasing in all the bourgeois countries. The Fourth Congress calls on all the Communist Parties to assist in the creation of organisations having as their aim the material and moral aid of those in prison as the prisoners of capitalism, and welcomes the initiative of the Society of Old Bolsheviks who are endeavouring to create an international federation of such organisations."

The summons of the staff of the revolution found a wide response in all countries as soon as the International Red Aid was formed as an organisation.

On December 22nd of the same year the tasks of the International Red Aid were clearly formulated in the constitution which was approved by the Central Bureau. In the main these tasks amounted to the provision of "material, moral and political aid to the fighters of the revolution, the victims of the class struggle in all countries of the world, by the stimulation and development of active forms of the international solidarity of the toiling masses."

We shall not pause to review the history of the International Red Aid, or to show how one country after the other responded to the call of the Fourth Congress, or how the work went on feverishly in all sections of the globe. The progress of past six years is indicated by the fact that parallel with the development of the organisation of the International Red Aid the hatred of the bourgeoisie towards the organisation has grown and developed. In many countries boasting of their democracy, repressions have been let loose on the International Red

Aid organisations and many active workers of the organisation have swiftly found themselves behind the bars.

The bourgeois world, which hides from the masses the methods of struggle against the proletarian fighters out of fear of evoking the indignation of the masses, has endeavoured and still at all costs endeavours to render innocuous the organisation which betrays aloud its bloody measures, and does its utmost to prevent their being carried out. In courts kept closely secret, the bourgeoisie deals with its class enemy without regard even to the laws which it has itself established. In the prisons it smashes, maddens and kills those whom for various reasons it is inconvenient to lead to the scaffold. And the bourgeoisie adopts every measure possible to ensure that the news of its bloodthirsty activities should not penetrate to the masses. The activity of the International Red Aid paralyses these plans, tears the masks from the faces of the executioners who pass themselves off as the most democratic of people, as politicians devoted to the worker masses, names them and pillories them. Not rarely, the sympathetic response of the mass of the whole world, evoked by the activity of the International Red Aid, has snatched the condemned from the bloody hands of the executioners. But even when this is not achieved, when the condemned, frequently without any justification, fall victims on the scaffold, the bourgeoisie begins to feel that the victory won by them on the bloody front is a Pyrrhic victory. And this is due in no small degree to the International Red Aid. One has but to recall the campaign over the Sacco and Vanzetti case to be convinced of this fact. There is not a country in the world where the working masses did not come on to the streets with the demand to release the deliberately, falsely condemned fighters for the workers' cause. That movement embraced the whole world, and drew in even non-proletarian elements. Sacco and Vanzetti were not saved. The American capitalists, over whose head the horny fist of the proletariat has not yet been raised, displayed a craven courage, and did not surrender to the will of millions of workers. Sacco and Vanzetti were done to death. But the knots of international proletarian solidarity were drawn tighter. The masses realised that this murder was the answer of the capitalist world to the struggle of the proletariat for freedom. International solidarity is forged in action and in struggle. Union in struggle is the strongest basis for that solidarity. It is forged in dozens of battles, and the bourgeoisie has no means whereby to weaken it. By comparison with this achievement, by comparison with the fact that the proletariat of all countries is systematically and actively responding to the struggle of the proletarian masses, direct aid to the victims of capital plays a secondary role.

The significance of that aid is enormous. The letters which penetrate into the prisons, the parcels which the prisoners receive from outside, no matter how small they may be, witness to the fact that their brothers in class are solid with them, are always ready to assist them, are continuing their work. That gives them courage, increases their strength, keeps up their revolutionary spirit.

This is particularly noted in the resolution of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, 8th June, 1924.

"The growth of international proletarian solidarity finds its best expression in the swift development and the success of the work of the International Red Aid to Fighters in the Revolution.

"The International Red Aid is a non-party organisation, and has as its task the juridical, moral and material aid to the imprisoned fighters of the revolution, their families and children, and also the families of fallen comrades. The I.R.A. unites around itself vast masses of workers, peasants and petty employees, without distinction of their party associations—it unites all those who suffer from the exploitation of capital and national oppression, who strive for the victory of labour over capital.

"By so doing, in the process of developing its work, the I.R.A., is becoming one of the most important methods of realising the tactics of the united front on the basis of definite manifestations of international solidarity, organising continually fresh forces, which are able to take direct part in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. In addition, emphasis has to be laid on the enormous political importance of the work of the I.R.A.,

the rear organisation of the fighting army of the proletariat, which is indispensable in the continual struggle, both at times of attack and at times of retreat. By surrounding the imprisoned fighters of the revolution with an atmosphere of comradely sympathy, the I.R.A. maintains their courage and readiness for further struggles."

In this resolution, the congress summarised the results of the activity of the I.R.A. during the preceding two years.

Subsequent events confronted the I.R.A. with new and still more complex tasks. A new, serious threat, which had long been presaged by Lenin, hung over the world of capital. The colonies and semi-colonies stirred and began a struggle for their emancipation—Syria, Morocco, Arabia, India, Indonesia, and finally China, where dozens of millions raised the standard of the revolution.

European capital draws its strength not only from the industrial European countries, but in still more considerable degree from its colonial possessions. "By exploiting the population of the colonies," said the Second Congress of the Comintern, "European capitalism is able to proffer quite a number of bribes in compensation to the labour aristocracy in Europe," and so extend the life of its hegemony.

It was natural that the capitalists' method of dealing with the insurgent population of the colonies should be ruthless. The events which occurred in China have no parallel in history.

The International Red Aid was thus confronted with new tasks: with the tasks of giving active assistance to the Chinese revolutionaries and their families, of calling the toiling masses of Europe to the aid of China, of binding them in the bonds of solidarity with the insurgent colonies, of overcoming the prejudices instilled by the ruling classes, as the result of which the army of labour is divided into lower and higher races, in dependence on the colour of the skin.

Together with this task, the intensifying civil struggle both in Europe and in America, which led in a number of new countries, to the development of fascist organisations with the direct object of suppressing the workers' movement irrespective of consequences, rendered the activity of the I.R.A. more complicated even in the imperialist countries. The methods of dealing with the revolutionary movement resorted to by Mussolini, Primo de Rivera, Pilsudsky, Horthy, the Ku-Klux-Klan and similar organisations insistently demanded increased activity on the part of the I.R.A.

The I.R.A. tackled all these tasks as far as its strength allowed, but the continually intensifying struggle demands fresh forces, demands that the millions of I.R.A. members should be multiplied tenfold. With this in mind, the Sixth Congress of the Comintern adopted the following resolution:

"The sharpening of the class antagonisms in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the peoples of the colonial countries against their oppressors and exploiters is effecting an intensification of the white terror and fascism, an increase of repressive measures on the part of class 'justice' and increased persecution of the exploited classes and oppressed peoples. The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International therefore decides:

"1. The course of events in the last few years has fully confirmed the correctness of the decisions of the Fourth and Fifth World Congresses of the C.I. on the International Red Aid as an independent auxiliary organisation standing outside of parties, and on the necessity of the Communist parties supporting the I.R.A.

"2. As the I.R.A. is an organisation outside of parties which, on the one hand, gives support to all victims of the revolutionary struggle and, on the other hand, accepts members regardless of what party to which they may belong, the I.R.A. is one of the most important instruments for carrying out the tactics of the united front.

"The Communist Parties, therefore, are interested in the activity of the I.R.A. more than other parties and must constantly support the latter in its work, both by participating in all campaigns of the I.R.A., particularly in its campaigns for amnesty and for the right of asylum, and by providing a special place in their journals for the I.R.A.

"3. As one of the most important tasks of the I.R.A. at the present time is the fight against fascism, the Parties must support with all their energies the I.R.A. and the W.I.R. in this their activity. One of the

most important tasks of the sections of the I.R.A., and especially of its section in the United States, is the fight against the Ku-Klux-Klan (a fascist organisation in the United States) and the barbarous lynch justice exercised towards the negroes. It will be possible to conduct this fight successfully to the end only when the million masses of the white workers are mobilised to take part in it.

"A particularly important task of all sections of the I.R.A., is the fight against the white terror in China, a terror which is now being employed also by the Kuomintang.

"4. The growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries increases enormously the persecution of the workers in these countries. The Communist Parties of the imperialist countries must support the sections of the I.R.A. on the occasion of their formation and organisation, in order that they shall be able to fulfil the great tasks falling to them in the colonies and semi-colonies of the country in question.

"5. All the above-mentioned tasks are closely interwoven with the fight of the workers for the right of asylum, a fight to which the Communist Parties have not up to the present devoted sufficient attention and to which, in the future, the Communist Parliamentary fractions in their activity, must pay special attention. The Communist Parties of the mother countries are further confronted with the special task of fighting against the foreign concessions in China.

"6. Capitalism is making use of prison sentences as a means for physically annihilating the captured revolutionaries. It is therefere, necessary to conduct in the masses, as well as by the Communist Party fractions, a constant fight against prison regime.

"7. As the realisation of all these tasks of the I.R.A. is closely bound up with the organising of campaigns, which can be successful only if they are carried out jointly with the various mass organisations, the Communists working in these mass organisations must see to it that these mass organisations of workers (trade unions, co-operatives, Workers' International Relief, League of Freethinkers, International Ex-Servicemen's League, League Against Imperialism, workers' sport organisations, etc.), form a working unity in order to co-ordinate the campaigns.

"8. The Communists who are active in the sections of the I.R.A., must strive to win the broadest masses in the towns and in the rural districts for the I.R.A. Of special importance is the recruiting of social-democratic and trade union organised workers and the broad masses of the working women."

The road which the I.R.A. is following is being broadened. In the form of the I.R.A., the auxiliary rear army is accomplishing a great task and is strengthening the front. On the tenth anniversary of the Comintern that front is stronger and more dependable than ever before.

The Bankers' Conference at Paris

THE work of the bankers' conference at Paris is shrouded in mystery. The bourgeois press is exercising all its ingenuity in its guesses, passing on to the world rumours of the first checks to the consideration of the reparations problem. But one doubts whether any of the European politicians seriously expects fresh discoveries about the reparations problem from the "independent experts." In particular the German bourgeois press has adopted a highly sceptical attitude.

The importance of the reparations conference consists in the general role which it has to play in the developing struggle among the foremost imperialist governments. Undoubtedly the Paris conference is an essential landmark in the development of imperialist rivalry, and from this aspect it unquestionably deserves the greatest attention. It is worth while remembering that the negotiations over reparations are by no means an isolated affair, but are closely connected with the relationships between the participants in the negotiations and with other debated questions of international policy and economy.

As we know, the final decision to enter upon reparations negotiations was taken during the last session of the League of Nations at Lugano. At that session Germany insisted on the reparations problem being isolated and considered independently of the Rhine problem, and at the first possible moment. The Entente made a formal concession and agreed to the establishment of a separate commission of independent experts for regulation of the reparations issues. But in reality the reparations discussions are closely connected with, and will have immediate influence on, the decision of a number of other problems.

In the first place, the question of the evacuation of the Rhine and further control over the German demilitarised zone is bound up with the reparations problem. Also, despite the formal inflexibility of the United States, there is no doubt whatever that the nature of the decision come to on the reparations questions will have inguence on the further regulation of the problem of inter-Allied debts, or to be more exact, on the cancellation of the European indebtedness to the United States.

EVACUATION AND DEBTS

The Rhine problem and the nature of the decision come to on that problem provides a measure of the correlation of forces among the foremost European States. The question of inter-Allied debts in its turn indicates the correlation of forces as between the United States and the Franco-British bloc. The circumstance that the work of the reparations conference and its probable decisions will have special importance for the negotiations over the Rhine problem and the inter-Allied debts was, by the way, emphasised strongly by the leader of French social-democracy, Leon Blum. In a series of articles published in the European press Leon Blum underlined the opinion that the summoning and the success of the conference are of equal importance to France and to Germany; to France, because without the regulation of the reparations problem it is impossible to settle the problem of indebtedness to the United States; to Germany, because only after a final fixation of the extent of the reparations payments and the nature of their settlement is it possible for the issue of the evacuation of the Rhine to be raised seriously. The economic organ of the French bourgeoisie, "L'Information," completely agrees with Leon Blum's view, and praises his sagacity and sound understanding of the essence of the matter.

The "socialist" Leon Blum undoubtedly correctly interpreted the attitude both of his own national bourgeoisie and of the leading circles of the German bourgeoisie. None the less, one other factor enters into the settlement of the reparations problem, and that factor is, of course, the decisive one. We refer to American finance capital. The bankers of the United States approach the question of reparations payments from quite a different angle to that of European politicians. It has to be recognised that of all the participants in the reparations conference, the Americans, as the true

masters of the situation have obviously the most definite and most "businesslike intentions." But before we touch upon this side of the matter we have to add a few words concerning the tasks of the reparations conference.

DAWES PLAN PROBLEMS

We do not intend to survey the arrangements made by the Dawes Plan or the essential nature of the reparations problem. We need only mention the problems bound up with the functioning of the Dawes Plan, which, to a more or less extent, have to be considered by the commission of experts. Among these are: the total sum of reparations payments; the final fixation of the extent of the annual payments; the period within which Germany's reparations indebtedness has to be liquidated; the transfer question, *i.e.*, that of the guarantees involved in the transfer of reparations payments into foreign currency; the prosperity index, *i.e.*, the action of the mechanism set up by the Dawes Plan and directed to the enlargement of the German payments in the event of a special improvement in the general condition of German national economy. Finally, the reparations conference has to consider the notorious question of the commercialisation of the reparations debt, *i.e.*, the translation of the German State debt into private legal obligations and the distribution of part of these obligations over the international money market.

Both before the conference and during its sessions Germany has maintained the view that all the above specified problems have to be settled exclusively on the basis of an analysis of Germany's ability to pay and with due regard to the interests of the normal development of German economy. The first few days of the work of the commission would give the impression that the commission had in fact decided to take the line desired by Germany. Apparently the German representatives presented detailed reports on Germany's financial position, the state of her national economy and foreign trade. However, as soon as this stage of the conference's work was passed, certain serious difficulties arose which evoked great disquiet in Germany. It transpires that the analysis of German economy did not set up an objective basis for the working out of decisions on the reparations problem. This was only to be expected, for, as we know, Germany's creditors have quite definite demands, and by no means accept the view that the condition of Germany's national economy demands serious reconsideration of the Dawes Plan and the payments fixed by that Plan. Consequently the reparations conference immediately found itself at a deadlock.

THE DEMANDS ON GERMANY

What are the desires of Germany's creditors? The European press has contained very definite statements concerning the demands which each country has placed before the conference. It is only natural that the "independent experts" should be the mouthpieces for the opinions held by the real arbiters of the destinies of the respective countries; they are the stewards of finance capital to the same extent as are the governments ruling the various countries.

France demands of Germany the payment of a sum which will cover her indebtedness to the United States and her expenditures on compensation for losses caused by war activities. Britain, in accordance with the Balfour Note, desires that the payments of her debtors should cover her own indebtedness to the United States. Italy takes up approximately the same position. Belgium demands the payment of the sums previously assigned to her, and also payments to cover the losses due to currency put into circulation by Germany during the occupation of Belgium. In addition, all these States insist on the maintenance of their present proportion of receipts from the German payments, whilst Italy further demands an increase in her proportion. As we know, of the total sum of reparations France receives 52 per cent., Britain 22 per cent., Italy 10 per cent., Belgium 8 per cent. Judging by press statements and Mussolini's declaration published on February 4th, Italy would like to see her share doubled, for it is now certain that Italy cannot hope to receive anything from Austria and Hungary.

NO PROSPECT OF SETTLEMENT

We have specially stopped to consider the claims of the various creditors, for their con-

sideration shows clearly that their attitude opens up no prospects of a real amelioration of the reparations burdens lying first and foremost on the German working class. "A final and complete settlement of the reparations problem," as the instruction to the commission of experts formulates it, is impossible of realisation in the present circumstances. It is impossible of realisation because there is no proposal whatever for a serious reduction in reparations payments, whilst the proposal for Germany's systematic payment of these sums is in the last resort altogether unreal. As is well known, Germany has hitherto met its obligations on the Dawes Plan out of sums received in the form of foreign loans. On the other hand, there are various estimates in existence, including one by comrade E. Varga, which show clearly that the payment of reparations out of Germany's active balance is impossible. To enable this to be done such an increase in Germany's export would be necessitated, such an intensive elimination of Germany's competition from the world market, that it would come into conflict with objective obstacles, and with the merciless opposition of Germany's creditors, Britain and France, in the first place.

Thus it can be dogmatically stated that the reparations conference will open out no real prospects of a genuine solution of one of the contradictions gnawing at post-war capitalism. At the same time the conference cannot, of course, hold out any prospect of an amelioration of the heavy burdens which the German bourgeoisie have transferred to the backs of their working class. According to the Dawes Plan the basic sources of reparations payments predetermine a heavy burden of taxation on the working class and petty-bourgeoisie. Of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ milliard marks fixed for annual payment, 1,250 millions have to be paid out of the budget, *i.e.*, are covered by excise and indirect taxation, 660 million marks are derived from railway bonds, *i.e.*, in particular from increased fares, 290 million marks have to come out of taxation on turnover. If to this be added the supplementary burdens which fall on the working class as the result of Hilferding's new budget, owing to his seeking ways and means of covering the State deficit, one obtains a clear picture of the monstrous exploitation of the German workers which is going on; an exploitation which can only be intensified as the result of the work of the present reparations commission. For the cunning financial combinations which undoubtedly will form the essence of the negotiations between the bankers at Paris will have as their prerequisite the further extraction of profit from the German working class.

MORGAN'S PLANS

The plans for these financial speculations are locked up in the portfolios of John Pierpoint Morgan. His participation in the commission of experts was hailed by the world press as the transference of the settlement of the reparations problems to the competence of the banking house of "Morgan and Co." Morgan had already interested himself in these problems in 1922, when he turned down the idea of an international loan to Germany previously to the regulation of the reparations problem.

It is possible that this time Morgan may prove more amiable. In any case, the French bourgeois press is doing everything possible in order to win Morgan over. The French scribblers are interesting themselves not only in the "generous personality" of the American usurer who subsidised the imperialist slaughter, but even in his no less estimable wife. Thus, for instance, "L'Intransigeant" recalls that Mme. Anna Morgan established a fund for assistance to the French war victims, and altogether is distinguished by the "fine activity which is her family's virtue." In a word, the "holy family" of Morgan is to save Europe.

A certain amount of information exists as to the plans of the American bankers. Articles published in the middle of January in the journal of the American great bourgeoisie, the "New York Times," are worthy of attention. From these articles it is clear that the American bankers regard the reparations conference purely as an opportunity for effecting large-scale financial speculation. Not for nothing did Morgan's, the oldest established banker's house in America, hasten to get their hand in on the affair, lest the younger American banking houses, Dillon, Reed and others, which

have invested their capital in Europe since the war, should seize the opportunity. The basis for this proposed American speculation has to be the proposal to commercialise Germany's reparations obligations. According to the "New York Times," the question of commercialisation has already been considered by the chief banks of the world. Morgan is disposed to take 300 million dollars as his share. According to another proposal bonds to the value of one milliard dollars are to be placed on the world market; of this sum 40 per cent. is proposed to be placed in the United States, 40 per cent. in France, and the remainder in the rest of Europe. From these figures one can see that the notorious proposal for the commercialisation of the reparations payments is in essence by no means bound up with the regulation of the reparations problem. It is a financial speculation which corresponds to the interests of several countries. France would appear to receive an advance on account of her forthcoming immediate payments to the United States, Germany will bargain for compensation in exchange for her agreement to commercialisation, and the New York, Berlin, London and Paris bankers will have done a good day's work for themselves.

BANKERS AND BONDS

None the less, it has to be remarked that the commercialisation proposal has also an essential principle inherent in it. That principle was noted very precisely by the head of Barclay's Bank, Goodenough, who declared himself in favour of some reduction of the reparations payments and of their commercialisation, as the accumulation of State debt obligations was interfering with international circulation. This idea was warmly supported by the "New York Times." There can be no talk of a real commercialisation of all reparations payments. In the first place, this is impossible of realisation because it is impossible to place such a large sum on the international, and in particular on the American, money market. Secondly, it is doubtful whether Germany would agree to such an operation, for it would lead to such a saturation of the international market with German reparation bonds that cardinal difficulties in the way of placing any other form of German loans would arise. None the less, the idea of commercialisation has this essential advantage, as the London banker noted. The commercialisation of reparations obligations would clear the road for further competition between the finance capital of the United States, Britain and other countries. Consequently, among the other proposals is put forward the suggestion of separating the reparations debt into two parts: a political part, not to be commercialised and to remain a German State debt, and a "non-political" part, to be transformed into private legal obligations. The putting into effect of such a proposal would, *inter alia*, render more easy a decision on the disputed issue of the total sum to be constituted the extent of reparations German payments. The position at present is that the Dawes Plan would appear to have left in force the legendary figure of 132 milliard marks fixed in London in May, 1921. Meantime from the formal aspect the method of amortisation of the railway bonds permits of the conclusion that the Dawes Plan presupposes a considerable smaller total sum of reparations payments, and payments to be completed in 37 years instead of the 62 years desired by the Entente in corrsepondence with the periods assigned for payment of the inter-Allied debts.

THE POSITION OF THE GERMAN WORKERS

Whether this be the case or not, the realisation of these or any other proposals considered at Paris will not change, and in any event will not reduce the rate of exploitation of the German proletariat. Moreover, the German bourgeoisie is already preparing to ensure that in the event of the establishment of any relief in the reparations sphere it should in no way result in an amelioration of the burden imposed on the working class. The German press has published a number of articles pointing out the forthcoming crisis in Germany. These articles have as their object not only the strengthening of the German demands for a reduction in reparations payments, but also undoubtedly that of simultaneously establishing a favourable situation for a further attack on the working class. The corresponding proposals and attitude of the German bourgeoisie, and of industrial capital in particular, are excellently

illustrated by a programme article published long before the opening of the reparations conference in the organ of German heavy industry, "Bergwerk-Zeitung." In the number for December 11th last there was published a leading article in which the programme of German demands on the commission of experts was expounded, whilst at the same time the menace of an economic crisis in Germany was emphasised. The article closed with the following very remarkable declaration: "Germany cannot in any event of its own initiative carry through any measures which might place in jeopardy the fulfilment of reparations obligations on the basis of a presumed revised Dawes Plan." Further, through their newspaper the industrial magnates of Germany point out that there can be no talk of a maintenance of the intensified taxation of industry, together with a reduction in the extent of reparations payments. At the same time, the newspaper emphasises that it "is necessary to render it impossible that there should be any raising of the cost price of German industry by any method whatever on the basis of references to the reductions of Dawes payments." In other words, the German industrialists are demanding that in the event of a reduction in reparations payments, and in general of the establishment of any relief in this sphere, there should first be a reduction in the taxation burdens lying on the *entrepreneurs,* and that in no event should there be an increase in wages or a shortening of the working day.

The picture is clear and complete. The conference of bankers and certain representatives of the heavy industry of the United States, France, Britain, Italy, Japan, Germany and Belgium now taking place in Paris has as its economic significance the introduction of definite financial combinations, as the result of which the severity of the economic antagonisms will be by no means ameliorated, whilst the economic exploitation of the working class will be intensified.

A BASIS FOR POLITICAL BARGAINING

When analysing the results of the decisions adopted in Lugano, we pointed out that the isolation of the Rhineland problem had its own specific significance. It is easier to confront Germany with the necessity of once more seriously considering the question of her active participation in the imperialists' anti-Soviet bloc during an independent consideration of this question. The result of the conference of experts will be of no small importance to the direction of the further political negotiations between Germany and the Entente. It was not for nothing that the same organ of German heavy industry, "Bergwerk Zeitung," put forward an open proposal for Germany to break with the U.S.S.R. and to attach herself to the Franco-British bloc even after the beginning of the work of the commission. By making such promises, which might be realised, of course, after the close of the reparations conference and during the course of the negotiations over the Rhineland, the German industrial capitalists hope to obtain important concessions on the reparations problems. Germany offers participation in the anti-Soviet bloc, and at the same time, by adhering to the Entente, she offers also co-operation in the struggle between the Franco-British bloc and the United States.

Judging by the course of the reparations negotiations the transaction proposed by German heavy industry is hardly likely to be realised. The American financiers will not agree to pay Germany in order to enable her to take part in the struggle against the expansion of American capital. But, provided they are not temporarily interrupted, the actual consummation of the reparations negotiations will serve as a starting-point for a further political bargaining between Germany and the Entente. In this sense the reparations conference is an essential stage to the further preparation of fresh war cataclysms.

The present conference of the staff of world finance capital cannot effect any essential alterations in the antagonisms of post-war capitalism. On the contrary, it may have as a consequence only the further development of conflicts among the imperialists, a deepening of the antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie, an intensification of the class struggle, and an extension of those processes which are shaking the edifice of capitalism to its very foundations.

Ten Years' Fighting Experiences of the Communist Party of Germany

W. Ulbricht

LIKE the Comintern, the C.P. of Germany, one of its strongest sections, is now reviewing ten years' experience. Ten years of struggle under the leadership of the International, ten years employment of the principles and tactics of Leninism have made our Party a revolutionary mass Party.

The foundation of the C.P.G. on 30th December, 1918, was the most important result of the previous history of the German working-class movement. The break with social-democracy was completed. That laid the foundation stone of a revolutionary mass Party which, by its principles and revolutionary tactics, developed the capacity of leading the masses in the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

The foundation of the Communist Party occurred comparatively late; although, even in the pre-war period social-democracy, because of its unequal social composition and strong petty-bourgeois influence and its incapacity of leading the working masses in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, contained an opposition which at times appeared definitely as a fraction. When the petty-bourgeois elements got the upper hand, as in the triumph of revisionism and the policy of 4th August, 1914, the weakness of the left-wing became particularly apparent in its inability to realise at the correct time the necessity for organising an independent fraction and for a split in the S.D.P. When, at the end of 1914, Lenin received the first report on the situation in Germany, his first question was whether the organisational break with Menshevism and the split in the Party would now take place. But it was only years later, after the treachery of the S.D.P. and United Socialist Party, that the Spartakus group constituted itself an independent party.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST DEFEATISM

Reflecting development in the Communist International as a whole, our Party, too, had to combat two deviations, firstly, against the policy of capitulation to the social-democracy, and, secondly, against the isolation of the Communist Party from the masses, against a sectarian policy. The fight against these deviations, against both dangers, had greater or less importance according to the objective conditions and the experience of the Party. The deviations were due to the changing social conditions and the varying experiences of the workers. The development of a labour aristocracy, the differentiation in the working class following differentiation in labour conditions, the enrolment of petty-bourgeois sections in the class struggle, the flight from the land, and the constant pressure of a bourgeois ideology on the reformists, necessarily affected the Communist Party. At turning points in the class struggle these causes have their effect in practical groupings, which try to direct the policy of the Party along petty-bourgeois lines. All these tendencies were characterised by a policy of defeatism. In 1921 Levi and Co. condemned the heroic struggle of the Central German workers. They wanted the Communist Party and the workers to go down on their knees to Hörsing and Co. and the S.D.P. In 1923 the Party centre, under Brandler and Radek, decided to give up the struggle because the social-democrats had shown themselves hostile to it. In 1925-26 the Ruth Fischer centre carried out a policy leading to isolation from the masses, because they had lost all faith in the workers' will to fight, and were permeated with the most profound pessimism, overcome by the difficulties of rallying the masses. In 1928-29 the right-wingers drew practical conclusions from their opportunist ideas by supporting reformism in the Ruhr struggle, by fighting on the other side of the barricades. The common feature of all these right deviations is the effort to build an alliance with reformism, thus surrendering Communist principles. While these right deviations are due principally to the

influence of the labour aristocracy and petty-bourgeois social-democrats, the ultra-left sectarian deviations is traceable to the "detarian deviation is traceable to the "depauperised middle classes, the uprooted intellectuals, etc. The ultra-left deviation, which in 1924 and 1925 gained a strong influence in the Party, resulted from the grave opportunist mistakes of 1923, and was objectively favoured by the temporary decline in the working-class movement, by the weakening of the workers' activity in the worst period of capitalist rationalisation. This deviation was clearly manifested in the rejection of the united front tactic, and in neglect of work in mass organisations, particularly the trade unions.

OUR PAST HISTORY

What are the chief experiences of the C.P.G.? In 1919 and 1920 the Party by widespread propaganda rallied the workers to the fight for proletarian dictatorship. This created the basis for the splitting of the United Socialist Party and the formation of the United Communist Party in 1920. The Communist Party became a mass Party, but its experiences and organisation did not yet enable it to lead the workers in struggle. Early in 1921 the Party used the methods suggested in the "Open Letter," and put forward definite fighting demands to the Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) and the S.D.P. These methods were used to expose the reformist leaders and to lead the masses, even against the wishes of those leaders, on to struggle. These tactics were interrupted by the March action. By the military occupation of the Mansfeld district the bourgeoisie and their social-democratic assistants provoked the Central German workers. The Party answered with an appeal for an armed fight against the Hörsing guards. Nearly 200,000 workers were in the fight. The Party immediately placed itself at the head of this action against the military suppression of the Mansfeld workers, but it was false to attempt to carry on this revolutionary defensive struggle as an offensive struggle, and to develop a "theory of the offensive" which contradicted the real facts. The Third World Congress of the Comintern helped our Party to overcome these errors. Levi and Co., who wished to discredit the heroic struggle of the workers as a "putsch," were excluded. On this question Lenin said at the World Congress: "Anyone who opposes that fight must be excluded. The Congress gave the Party the slogan, 'To the masses!' "

The defeat of the Central German workers was followed by sectional struggles in other areas to maintain revolutionary gains. With the changing conditions, with the increasing strength of the capitalists and the temporary weakening of the workers' militant forces, the Party believed that it was possible to rally the workers with demands suited to the tactics of social-democracy. Many slogans from the acutely revolutionary period were used mechanically (*e.g.*, control of production), and put forward in an opportunist manner. They forgot that the slogan of "Control of production" had been put forward, in connection with the struggle of the political workers' councils, as a slogan of action. The later use of this slogan gave rise to the illusion that, with the help of other "councils" like the factory committees, and without the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, control of production could be carried out. The same criticism applies to the use at that time of the slogan of price control. The opportunist nature of all these "transition slogans" is most clearly apparent in the demand that 51 per cent. of the value of commodities should be appropriated. The demand that 51 per cent. of commodity values should be the property of the State is really a denial of the Leninist theory of the State, and is essentially in agreement with the social-democratic demand for "economic control" and State economic undertakings. This policy led naturally enough to the defeatist policy of 1923.

In October, 1923, two different policies were visible, Saxon defeatism and Hamburg insurrection. Although the Hamburg workers may have fought without sufficient preparation and without sufficient contact with the masses, still they did try to carry out the revolutionary work of the Party and to execute its decisions as far as possible. In Saxony, on the other hand, where the workers were much more widely rallied, the Brandler leadership, in

deference to the attitude of their social-democratic "brothers," gave up the struggle. Actually, our Party's policy was determined, not by the Central Committee, but by the social-democratic leaders. The chief mistakes were that the Party made an incorrect estimation of the social-democrats, and particularly of the "left" social-democrats. The Party believed in the fighting capacity of the left leaders and made the carrying on of the struggle dependent upon an alliance with them. This alliance policy was connected with the attempt to "improve councils" in Western Europe. It had suddenly been discovered that in Germany factory councils could play the part of workers' political councils. In practice this means making the revolutionary class struggle a purely economic struggle, for factory councils are only able to conduct the workers' struggles in the factories, their economic struggles. In such conditions the Communists entered the Saxon government. This ministerial socialism is a classic example of the attempt to carry out working-class demands within the framework of bourgeois democracy. This "labour government" was nothing but a coalition government, existing through an alliance between leaders of the C.P. and the S.D.P.. It was therefore not difficult for the bourgeoisie to send the ministry to the devil and set up a regime of terror in Saxony. But even after such a lesson, Brandler, Radek and their friends failed to recognise their mistakes. They spoke of "Fascism's victory over the S.D.P.," and did not realise that both the S.D.P. and Fascism are the assistants of the bourgeoisie. After October, 1923, the S.D.P. was openly and obviously the third capitalist party. Whoever believes that the S.D.P. was defeated by Fascism is suffering from the illusion that social-democracy fought against Fascism. In reality the S.D.P. allied itself to Fascism to defeat the militant workers.

The Party leaders' great mistakes, which came to a head in October, 1923, resulted in a serious party crisis, during which the mass of members condemned the opportunist errors of the leaders. At the same time, partly in reaction from those opportunist mistakes, the ultra-lefts found a favourable opportunity. Work in the trade unions was neglected, many Party members left the trade unions, the united front tactic was practically rejected by the Ruth Fischer centre, and reorganisation on the basis of factory groups sabotaged. This was accompanied by the absence of discussion among, and joint responsibility of, the Party membership. The profound pessimism of the leaders, their disbelief in the fighting capacity of the workers prevented any efforts being made to develop the initiative of the Party members and workers. It was only after the E.C.C.I.'s Open Letter in August, 1925, that the Party began, step by step, to regain its hold in factories, trade unions, and other mass organisations.

THE ESSEN CONGRESS

The Essen Party Congress of 1927 was devoted to consolidating the Party. The Trotskyist danger had been practically overcome, and, following the Congress decisions, the Party rallied firmly together all its revolutionary forces. The Essen Congress took place at a time when the activity of the workers was on the up-grade. The principal Congress discussions were devoted to the role of the Party in the struggle against reformism, and particularly against the "left" social-democrats. At the Congress the right-wing, under Böttcher's leadership, were opposed to this description of the "left" as the more serious danger in the working-class movement, and demanded that the Party put forward the slogan of control of production as a rallying cry. The right attack was continued throughout 1927 and 1928, gradually increasing the opportunist danger, the causes of which are an under-estimation of the changed situation expressed in increasing working-class activity and a growing strike movement. Moreover, the Party's judgment of the reformist policy as "inadequate" was false. Because the capitalists, at a time of prosperity, made some wage concessions, the rights believed that the reformists were really able to conduct the workers' struggles. This over-estimation of capitalist stabilisation and incorrect estimation of reformist policy was accompanied by an under-estimation of the workers' will to fight. The right completely ignored all changes in the S.D.P. and the trade unions, and failed to recognise the qualitative change in the role

of social-democracy. Since the war social-democracy and trade unions have gradually become a part of the capitalist State power. In their fight against social-democracy, and particularly in the employment of the united front tactic, the workers have gained great experience. It was necessary therefore to develop the use of that tactic in accordance with the workers' development. The workers should have been led by the Communist Party to fight the opposition of the reformist leaders and trade union bureaucrats. The changed position of reformism made it almost impossible to do anything with the workers, within the trade union organisation, against the leaders' wishes. In most cases where the workers had decided upon a militant policy, the bureaucracy set the union machine going to put obstacles in the way of its execution. This abolition of democracy within the unions on all important occasions required the employment of the united front tactic as a means of rallying and organising the workers, under the leadership of the C.P. and the revolutionary trade union opposition, to oppose the resistance of the social-democratic leaders. Any other policy would awaken illusions as to the militancy of the reformist leaders and the dependence of the C.I. on their manœuvres. Following the decision of the Essen Congress the Party carried out the correct policy, although opposed by the right-wing and the conciliators. The Ruhr struggle showed that it was correct to do so. When this policy was decided upon the real extent of the right danger became apparent. With the intensification of the class struggle the fractional struggle of the right against the policy of the Party and the Comintern also intensified, while the leaders of the conciliation group drew closer to the right. In connection with the Ruhr struggle, in which the Party for the first time employed the policy decided upon by the Sixth World Congress of the C.I. and the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress in a correct fashion, the leaders of the right fraction were excluded from the Party, for they had shown by their conduct during that struggle that they were allies of reformism. The platform of the conciliators, brought out at the same time, was based on opposition to the Sixth World Congress decision.

"CLASS AGAINST CLASS"

The present position and tasks of the Party are summed up in the slogan "Class against class." If we compare the present situation with that of ten years ago, we can observe the following. At that time, the different capitalist groups were out to save whatever could be saved. To-day there is concentration of capitalist forces under the leadership of finance capital. In spite of their differences, trust capital, bank capital, manufacturing industry and large scale agriculture present a united front to the workers. In organisation, too, this development is apparent in the centralisation of employers' bodies under the leadership of the National Union of Industry.

In the working-class movement ten years ago three parties were fighting for the leadership of the masses—S.D.P., U.S.P., and C.P.G. At that time the C.P. was relatively weak, the mass of workers being organised in the other two parties In the ten years since then, the process of clarification has gone so far in the working class movement that the C.P. is now a revolutionary mass Party, while the S.D.P. has become an "indispensable part of the capitalist State."

This is expressed by the composition of the hostile forces in present class struggles in Germany. On the one side trust capital, reformism and State power, on the other side, the class conscious workers led by the Communist Party. Many workers, members of or sympathetic to the S.D.P. are nowadays hostile to the social-democratic policy on defence, arbitration and unemployment, but they have not made the break and come over into the proletarian class front. The Party's task is not only to expose by general agitation the bourgeois, reactionary character of social-democracy, but to lead the workers in the struggle. In the struggle for immediate demands, the Party will succeed in bringing about that organisational break, and the proletarian class front will be extended and reinforced. The importance of such bodies as councils of action, strike committees, factory committees lies in their power to mobilise and organise all workers, organised and unorganised, Communists, non-Party, social-democrats, etc.

The main political questions are: (1) the fight against imperialist war and for the revolutionary defence of the Soviet Union. (2) The fight for the 8 or 7-hour day and wage increases, and against the arbitration system. (3) The fight for the unemployed demands, against the bourgeois social-democratic fiscal system and the political suppression of the working class. (4) The fight against trust capital, the coalition policy, and for the proletarian dictatorship.

REFORMIST DEMOCRACY

The organisation of the masses for these demands requires better Communist work in the workers' mass organisations and among the unorganised. Wherever the Party succeeds in rallying the organised and unorganised workers to oppose together the trade union bureaucracy, the terrorism of the reformist leaders will be intensified. In times of acute class struggle, the bourgeoisie and reformists use both democratic and fascist methods to suppress the workers, and the same is true in the trade unions, sports organisations, etc. The methods of Zörgiebel, Grzesnisky and company are being used to an increasing extent in the workers' organisations. The reformist leaders of the metal workers' union are threatening to exclude hundreds and thousands of revolutionary workers. This threat indicates the great fear and anger of the coalition politicians who are no longer able, by any other than police methods, to ensure trade union support for the coalition policy of the S.D.P. The Communist Party will answer these attacks by intensifying the struggle to form a united proletarian class front. It is no longer sufficient for the Communists alone to fight reformism in the trade unions and factories, it is necessary to organise and train the opposition in the trade unions.

In all the rank and file trade union organisations, the members of the opposition must be summoned regularly to meetings and lectures, by comrades in the Communist fraction. It is particularly necessary to call a meeting at least once a month, of all workers in a factory, whether organised or unorganised, who favour the trade union opposition. By drawing them into work on the factory paper, to take up "workers' correspondence," and to help in the distribution of literature, the strength of the Party in the factory will be increased. By these methods it will be possible to make many workers members of the I.C.W.P.A., the Red Front League, etc., and even members of the Communist Party. Systematic work among sympathetic workers and the organisation of a trade union opposition are among the most essential preliminaries to independent fights, to the abolition of trade union "legalism," and to active resistance to the reformists' splitting policy. To the extent that the Party succeeds in making the factory group the real fighter for the Party's political policy, and in influencing and obtaining the help of sympathisers, it will also be able to use the united front tactic with success in the work of rallying and organising the masses.

The Ruhr struggle and the preparation for the factory committee elections in Germany show that many Party members do not understand these tasks and are offering a passive resistance to them. Objective self-criticism will expose and do away with this. The new elections must bring new blood into the leading Party bodies, from the groups to the Central Committee. Party members who have distinguished themselves in the most recent struggles should be elected to Party committees. Perhaps many of them will make mistakes at first, get into the run of things slowly, or lack technical experience. That is not of great importance. The important thing to be considered is the political tendency, the revolutionary activity of comrades. The great political tasks which the Party must fulfil require a fundamental examination of the fighting capacity of the Party machine and a thorough examination of the experiences of the Party.

All the many-sided practical work should and must be unified by one idea: the necessity of preparing for the decisive revolutionary struggle which is drawing nearer and nearer. With this object in view the Party is keeping in close and sensitive contact with the workers, the Party is trying to lead every mass movement, is filling the proletariat with the consciousness of the great tasks confronting them, is ruthlessly fighting all petty bourgeois irresolution in its ranks, is steeling its members with iron discipline.

In the fire of struggle the C.P.G. became a revolutionary mass party. Our Party's leadership in the most recent industrial disputes, in the fight for the demands of the unemployed and against the imperialist war policy of the capitalist social-democratic bloc shows that the Party, guided by the Communist International, has drawn the correct lessons from international and German experience, and that it is developing a powerful section of the revolutionary army capable of leading the German working class in the fight for proletarian dictatorship. Under the leadership of the Comintern, the Communist Party of Germany is carrying on the struggle for revolutionary support of the Soviet Union, for the world dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Third International and the French Working Class Movement in the Last Ten Years

Pierre Semard

WHEN the Third International was founded in March, 1919, eighteen months after the seizure of power by the workers of Russia led by the Bolshevik Party, there existed in France neither a Communist Party nor any organised body holding Bolshevik principles.

After the first constituent Congress of the C.I., the United Socialist Party, at its Paris Congress in April, passed a resolution declaring its "conditional" adherence to the Second International. But since 1914 there had existed within the French working class movement, both in the Socialist Party and the trade unions, a current of opinion, very weak at first, but stronger and more conscious as the war continued, in favour of the formation of a new international, really proletarian and revolutionary.

Lenin's words in 1914, proclaiming the bankruptcy of the Second International and the necessity of creating a Third International, faithful to the principles of the first founded by Marx, had been heard. From the beginning of the war, a certain number of militant socialists and revolutionary trade unionists, isolated or in small groups (such as the "Vie Ouvrière") had courageously taken a stand against social-patriotism and had tried, in a more or less confused fashion to find a way towards a new International.

This movement must not be mixed up with the minority socialist opposition of Mayeras and Longuet, which began to appear in the national conferences and congresses of the Socialist Party from May, 1915, and which never went further than a demand for a more "democratic" management of the war and for the opening of negotiations for a "just" peace, without "conquerors or conquered." In France opposition to the imperialist war was always more pacifist and sentimental than proletarian and revolutionary.

In September, 1915, the Metal Workers' Federation and the minority of the General Confederation of Trade Unions sent two militant delegates to the Zimmerwald conference, Merheim and Bouderon, the latter a member of the 12th Section of the Socialist Party. They opposed Lenin's proposals which demanded energetic action among the working masses and in the army, and the organisation of the workers and soldiers in preparation for any events which might allow the imperialist war to be changed into a civil war. Merheim, who was later to submit absolutely to Clemenceau, spoke against the proposals, declaring in favour of agitation against the war, and for an immediate and unconditional peace.

In April, 1916, the Kienthal Conference, arranged at Zimmerwald, took place. The deputies Brizon, Blanc and Raffin-Dugens attended on their own account, against the will of the Socialist Party, which was at that time practising the "sacred union" with the bourgeoisie for war to the end. Their attitude was that of good pacifists, determined to fight against the war by all legal means and, like the militant trade unionists Bouderon and Merheim, they proposed to carry on parliamentary opposition to the war and agitation for an immediate peace, without conquerors or conquered.

Brizon, who opposed Lenin's resolutions, said that it was easy enough for Lenin, who lived in Switzerland, to preach the revolution as the only way of stopping the war, but that he would very much like to see what Lenin would say if he were in Russia. Less than two years afterwards, events themselves

were to give Brizon and his friends their answer.

These two international conferences, despite the revolutionary weakness of the French participants, found strong support among the masses. In the trade union movement, the opposition grouped around Merheim contributed greatly to an increase in the strength of the minority movement within the old trade union federation (the C.G.T.). Parliamentary opposition, the refusal to vote for war credits by the "three pilgrims from Kienthal," also helped to create within the Socialist Party an opposition which was to develop into the "Committee for the re-establishment of international relations," later the "Committee of the Third International."

The moral and political repercussion of these events was consequently very great, and in the trenches the soldiers heard of this opposition, and approved of it.

Little by little, a more definite tendency towards truly revolutionary aims became apparent in the trade union and socialist movement. The committee for the re-establishment of international relations was formed (Loriot, Merheim, Monatte), and rallied the left-wing socialists and revolutionary trade unionists who were determined to sweep away the old political and trade union bureaucracy which was working hand-in-hand with the bourgeois State. But this committee limited its work to propaganda within the organisations, in order to clear out, one by one, the old leaders who had betrayed the movement. It played no part in the mutinies and strike movements of 1917, it never appealed directly to the masses of soldiers and workers. It secretly published some pamphlets (the letters to the subscribers of the "Vie Ouvrière") but these only reached the actual adherents and sympathisers. Nevertheless, the situation was such that this propaganda went beyond these narrow limits and spread among a fairly large number of soldiers and workers.

The revolutionary minority within the C.G.T. grew, particularly among the metal workers and railwaymen. A minority congress was held at St. Etienne in spite of the C.G.T.'s prohibition, and put forward the slogan of a general strike against the war. Dumoulin, who was later to return to the fold of Jouhaux, wrote his famous pamphlet "The French Trade Unions and the War," in which he mercilessly flayed the traitors of 1914, giving the history of their treachery and compromises with the bosses.

At the meeting of the National Council for the Socialist Party, held on the 29th and 30th of July, 1918, the centrist minority carried their resolution by 1,544 votes (Longuet-Cachin) to 1,172 (Renaudel) while 152 votes were registered for Loriot's resolution. Frossard became the secretary of the Party, and Cachin replaced Renaudel in the editorship of "L'Humanité." The party "officially" ceased its collaboration in the government, and turned towards legal and timid parliamentary opposition to such of Clemenceau's politics as was considered too brutal.

THE SOCIALIST SCHISM: THE TOURS CONGRESS

While the working masses were entering upon a period of more and more direct struggle against the French bourgeoisie and the war (the general strike in the Loire district in 1918), while, on the example of the November, 1917 Russian revolution, the organised revolutionary militants became more and more conscious of their real tasks, a certain number of them being "pushed" towards Moscow, the old clique of social patriot leaders approached nearer and nearer to the bourgeoisie and prepared to make the Socialist Party purely reformist, determined to collaborate even more closely with capitalism, that collaboration having been so useful to the corrupted leaders of the labour movement. It was this situation that gave rise, after the war, to the internal struggles within the Socialist Party between avowed reformists, vacillating centrists and partisans of the International. (The great majority of the centrists rejoined the reformists after the first revolutionary wave of 1919-20 had subsided. The period of the temporary stabilisation of capitalism was later to send a great many of the third group into the ranks of the socialists or Trotskyists.)

After the creation of the Third International in March, 1919, these struggles become more definite and more bitter. The creation of the Third International greatly influenced the

working class. The "Committee for the re-establishment of international relations" became the "Committee of the Third International" (Loriot, Souvarine) which became the nucleus of the French Communist Party. It was composed of the most diverse elements: anarcho-syndicalists, left-wing socialists, anarchists, and the "war youth," lacking experience in the working class movement, lacking contact with the masses and guiltless of any clearly defined principle. The Committee acted as a rallying point for the various forces definitely hostile to war socialism. Through those of its adherents who were members of the C.G.T. it took part in the great strike movements which followed the war. The revolutionary mass movement was at that time manifested in widespread strikes, particularly in the metal industries. At the same time, the revolt of the Black Sea marines broke out, and the French troops fraternised with the Red soldiers.

On April 23rd, 1919, the disquieted government made some concession by passing the eight-hour law.

The first of May, 1919, witnessed demonstrations which, in number and violence, greatly surpassed those before the war. In June and July, strikes among the metal workers, transport workers and miners terrified the bourgeoisie into making further concessions. The influence of the Russian revolution grew greater and the conscious section of the working class was obviously in favour of the Third International. The minorities in the trade unions voted in favour of adherence to it. Revolutionary trade union committees (C.S.R.), were formed to organise the struggle against reformism within the C.G.T. and in favour of trade union affiliation to Moscow.

Demobilisation, which Clemenceau was trying his utmost to delay and drag out, aroused the anger of the millions of workers still under arms.

Under its new centrist management, the Socialist Party dodged here and there, opening the columns of "L'Humanité" to the strikers, supporting the parliamentary opposition to Clemenceau and to the Versailles Treaty and heaping praise on President Wilson; while the leaders of the C.G.T. continued to collaborate with the government and to restrain the strikers.

The victory of the national bloc in the November, 1919, elections had a double effect on the Labour movement and the Socialist Party. It drew a fairly large number of reformist and centrist leaders, who had been made responsible for the "Bolshevik" character assumed by the party, closer to the bourgeoisie, and at the same time it turned some centrist elements towards the Third International, thus strengthening the left wing.

From February 25th to March 1st, 1920, the first general railway strike took place. The railway companies, extremely nervous, negotiated a compromise with the reformist leaders of the Federation of Railway Workers, and scattered promises broadcast. The dispute, betrayed by the reformist leaders, came to an end after five days. But as the promises were not kept, the revolutionary railway workers, who had meanwhile acquired control of the Federation, declared a second general strike for the first of May. This strike, which lasted a month, was again betrayed by the C.G.T., and by the reformists within the Federation, who sabotaged the strike in the northern and eastern areas.

This was a serious blow, followed by a great deal of victimisation which reacted very seriously on the trade union movement. The revolutionary workers, in great anger, carried on a merciless struggle within the trade unions against the reformist traitors, a struggle which was to end, eighteen months later, in a split in the trade union movement, brought about by the C.G.T. leaders in order to get rid of the revolutionary elements and to continue their policy of collaboration with capitalism and the bosses.

All these events pushed forward the work of the Committee of the Third International within the Socialist Party. At the Strasbourg Congress (February, 1920) the Committee obtained 1,600 votes for immediate affiliation to the Third International, against 3,000 votes, and forced the centrists and a number of the reformists to vote in favour of withdrawal of the party from the Second International, (4,330 votes against 337). At that congress

it was decided to send a delegation with a watching brief (Cachin and Frossard) to the Congress of the Third International. It is well known that the supporters of the Third International would have carried the day at the Strasbourg Congress had not their adversaries resorted to a regular swindle about the mandates.

The struggle centred on the following questions:

For or against national defence?

For the Third International, or for the "reconstruction of the Socialist International (hence the name of "reconstructors" given to the centrists), or for the maintenance of the Second International?

For revolution or for reformists?

Naturally, the discussions were carried on amid a great deal of confusion. The best elements within the Committee were themselves thinking more of clearing out the war socialists and of morally supporting the Russian revolution, than of directing the mass workers' movement towards the seizure of power. Their ignorance of the trade union movement and the lack of contact with really militant trade unionists were an indication of this.

After their return from Moscow, Cachin and Frossard began an active campaign within the socialist movement in favour of adherence to the Third International, which they explained in the following simplified but extremely confusing way: "It is the only way of effectively defending the Russian revolution, which is being attacked." The working class, which was seriously interested in the Russian revolution and the Third International, turned up en masse to the meetings organised by Cachin and Frossard, which were very enthusiastic and significant.

The "reconstructors" were at that time divided into two groups, one supporting the Committee of the Third International, the other (Longuet-Paul Faure) nearer to the reformists.

The object of the conscious French Communists and of the Communist International was to accept in the new Communist Party only sincere revolutionaries and those centrists who were willing to recognise their mistakes and to make a complete break with the past.

Frossard, a sharp politician, tried to keep the "old party all together," only excluding those right wing socialists who had compromised themselves too far during the war. The National Congress at Tours (December, 1920), discussed the question of adherence to the Third International. The publication of the Twenty-one Conditions and Zinoviev's famous telegram (a bombshell!) forced the reformists, and the most dangerous centrists like Longuet, to use them as an excuse to split the party during the Congress. Although the majority of militants in the Committee, being in prison for conspiracy against the safety of the State, could not take an active part in the campaign for adherence to the C.I., three-fourths of the party (3,208 votes against 1,022) voted in favour of that proposal and the French section of the C.I. was formed. For some months following, it still retained the name of "Socialist Party, Section of the Third International."

THE COMMUNIST PARTY, FIRST PHASE

The great split left within the French section of the C.I. a great many opportunists and hidden reformists who carried on a double game with Frossard. The Tours Congress was rather the end of the struggle against the war socialists, than the theoretical and political struggle to create a real Communist Party. The party formed after the Tours Congress was really only a left-wing socialist party, turning towards parliamentary rather than working class action, refraining from taking part in industrial struggles on the pretext of the autonomy of the trade union movement, and having only the vaguest of contacts with the revolutionary minority in the C.G.T. Thus, during the severe unemployment in the spring of 1921, it took part in the working class struggle only through the columns of "L'Humanité." Its executive, under the influence of Frossard, paid no attention whatever to the proposals of the C.I., and played a prolonged game of hide and seek with the E.C.C.I. It did no more than agitate publicly for the general principles of Communism (usually presented in a most fantastic manner), oppose the government in a strictly parliamentary fashion and defend, oratoric-

ally and journalistically, the Russian revolution. When the trade union movement was split (at Lille, December, 1921), it did nothing at all except record the fact.

At the first congress of the party (Marseilles, December, 1921), the confusion within the Communist ranks was so great that the most elementary principles concerned with the dictatorship of the proletariat, such as, for example, the creation of the Red Army, were put forward for discussion by members of the executive without arousing any general response. Souvarine, the Party's delegate to the Executive, and at that time defender of the C.I.'s policy, was excluded from the Central Committee by the centrist and right-wing elements who at that time filled all the important positions and were excluding, one by one, all left-wing elements.

At that time the International, through its Congress and Committee, made great efforts to put the policy of the French C.P. to rights. It helped the left wing section to cleanse the party of all its anti-Communist elements. It laid down as an essential object of the party the entry of the most class conscious revolutionaries in the trade union movement into the party and into its leadership.

This was a long job, for the left leaders (Souvarine, Treint, etc.), and the members who were determined to fight the opportunism of Frossard and his friends, were not capable of joining in and guiding the French working class movement. Moreover, the anarcho-syndicalist prejudice against the party, which existed among the masses, and the revolutionary trade unionists, was also an obstacle in the way of a rapprochement with the "syndicalist Communists" and of their inclusion in the party.

The inauguration of the tactics of the united front distorted by the enemies of the International and by not a few of the leaders of the party who did not understand it, or affected not to understand it, prevented a large number of sound, proletarian members of the party from accurately understanding its value and from following a correct political line.

However, faced by the anarchist tendencies within the Unitary Confederation of Trade Unions (C.G.T.U.), formed at the end of 1921, and by its anti-Communist bias, and after a general strike had been prematurely declared in unfortunate circumstances, following the assassination of four workers at Havre (August, 1922), all clear-headed Communists realised the necessity of immediate action in the direction indicated by the C.I. That is, they realised the necessity of ridding the revolutionary trade union movement of its anarchist leadership and of working to create a revolutionary proletarian party effectively directing, in closse contact with the C.G.T.U., the struggles of the working class against capitalism.

The double game played by Frossard and Co. had, however, most deplorable effects. At the Paris Congress (October, 1922), Frossard scored a triumph over the left-wing while excluding, as a matter of tactics, those elements most deeply compromised in the struggle against the C.I.

The question of the French Party was brought up at the Fourth World Congress (December, 1922), which decided on the formation of a Central Committee composed of representatives of the various currents of opinions but working effectively along the lines agreed upon by the C.I.

It was then that Frossard and the most opportunist elements in the Party decided to leave it and to form a "Socialist-Communist Union" whose members, in the years following, one by one rejoined the social-democrats. At about the same time the militants in the party and trade unions who had gone to the Ruhr to protest against the occupation decided upon by Poincaré were imprisoned for conspiracy against the safety of the State. Frossard and his friends left the Party and the C.I., but these bodies had found new strength in the revolutionary trade unionists who drew nearer to the party in proportion as the latter turned more to the left and followed the policy of the C.I.

Thanks to the collaboration of the old centrists who had sincerely come over to the policy of the International (Sellier and Cachin), the left-wing controlled the Party committee, and were able to keep within the ranks of the Party the majority of its members.

At the National Council at Boulogne (January, 1923) it might have been thought that with the direction of the Party dominated by the left it would have become a good Communist Party. But one year sufficed to show that that stage had not yet been reached.

THE FORMATION OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

At the Third Congress of the C.I. a comrade, speaking on behalf of the E.C.C.I., said: "In France the real Communists are not yet inside the Party." He was alluding to the fact that the revolutionaries working in the trade union movement remained outside, and even hostile to the C.P. "The most important work for the Party," he contended, "is to win over these men and to bring the most active of them into the direction of the Party and of its various bodies."

The way to this was cleared by the affiliation of the C.G.T.U. to the R.I.L.U. (December, 1922). Moreover, the fight against the Ruhr occupation (January, 1923), which was carried on in common by the C.P. and the C.G.T.U., also helped to bring about the necessary collaboration between the two organisations. The repression exercised against the militants (it was the first great struggle of the C.P.F. against French imperialism) prepared the nucleus of the future direction of the C.P.F.

It was, again, on the occasion of this struggle that the young militants, who were to play a decisive part in the future of the Party, developed their revolutionary capacity in the anti-militarist work done during that struggle.

During the discussions on the Trotskyist deviation these diverse elements (the old left socialists, revolutionary trade unionists and Young Communists), united by their common struggles after the war, and getting closer and closer to a correct Communist policy, reorganised the ranks of the Party membership from top to bottom. It was during this struggle, which they conducted together, against this new and most dangerous form of anti-Leninist opportunism that they trained themselves to play later on a very active role in the Party.

During the 1923 discussion in the Russian C.P. Souvarine used incorrect information with a view to getting the C.P.F. to support the Trotskyist platform. Monatte and Rosmer sided with Souvarine, whose repeated acts of indiscipline merited exclusion from the Party. Monatte had also retained from his anarcho-syndicalist past ideas which led him to combat the work of the Party in the trade unions. Moreover, Souvarine, Monatte and Rosmer had expressed clearly opportunist views with regard to the "democratic-pacifist period" and the tactics which should be adopted by the C.P. in relation to it.

At the Fifth Congress of the C.I. and the Clichy Congress of the C.P.F. (December, 1924), after the exclusion of the Souvarine right, a new committee, including Semard, Treint and Suzanne Girault, set itself to organise the Party and to direct it along true Leninist lines—uncompromising struggle against capitalism and social-democracy, political activity concerned primarily with industry (formation of factory groups), trade union work, work in the army, colonial work.

In the effort to do this the Party again committed many mistakes—both "left" and "right"—because of its theoretical and political weakness. It had to exclude a certain number of members who had disagreed with the C.I. on the occasion of the Morocco war. Many of the faults were due to the actual composition of the Party (too many skilled workers and middle peasants in proportion to unskilled workers) and particularly to its lack of revolutionary experience.

However, our Party carried out another great struggle (after that of the Ruhr); the struggle against the war in Morocco. The Party organised working-class demonstrations and encouraged fraternisation. Another big fight taken up by the Party was against Poincaré and the National Union; that is, against industrial rationalisation, the military laws supported by the bourgeoisie and the socialists, and the preparation for an imperialist war. These activities were naturally followed by persecution of the Party and many of the most active militants were imprisoned.

Our Party, with the assistance of the International, overcame in December, 1926, a

serious left danger, apparent in mechanical discipline and bad trade union work which led to isolation from the masses. It also excluded from its ranks the little group, led by Trient and Girault, which supported Trotskyism and carried on fractional activities.

Since the meeting of its Central Committee in November, 1927, which ratified the tactics of "class against class," the great majority of the Party has been carrying on a struggle against a serious right danger, consisting in an under-estimation of the war danger, opportunism among Party members of the C.G.T.U. in the industrial struggles of the workers, and dissatisfaction with factory groups.

The Party is now hard at work correcting these opportunist faults and fighting the right-wing, and the next Congress, which will be held at the end of March, will mark an important stage in the progress of the Party along the lines laid down by the Sixth World Congress of the C.I.

During these struggles within and without the Party there have grown up within its ranks real leaders of the working-class movement, fighters who have learnt from experience in the factories active in the Party and the trade unions, skilful in carrying on both legal and illegal work, steeled by governmental and employers' persecution.

It is this younger generation which is urging the Party forward along a Bolshevik path, which is to a greater and greater extent, taking the lead in its ranks. In the future war against the U.S.S.R. our Party, invigorated by this new revolutionary blood, will receive its baptism of fire for the seizure of power.

Ten years after its foundation the Communist International possesses a French section which still has a great many weaknesses, particularly in its rank-and-file organisation, which makes political mistakes, but which is sincerely and resolutely treading the path marked out by Lenin.

The Communist Party of Great Britain Under the Banner of the Comintern

Tom Bell

THE socialist movement in England prior to the world war always bore the stamp of insularity. The followers of Hardie, Blatchford, Snowden and MacDonald, the opportunists and reformists of the Labour movement, were for ever declaring the virtues of British socialism (*i.e.*, their reformism) over continental socialism, which was conceived in general as Marxism. This was the period when Kautsky, Lafargue, Guesde and Plekhanov played the role of theoretic exponents of Marxism. As yet Lenin was unknown to the English workers, knowledge of his existence and work being confined to a very small circle of foreign workers resident in London and to those intellectuals of the movement whose privilege it had become to attend the Congresses of the Second International. This general characterisation of British and continental socialism persisted till the outbreak of the war.

The war and the experiences of those active workers who refused to be stampeded by the chauvinist appeals of the reformist leaders, now appearing as recruiting sergeants for national defence (*i.e.*, the defence of their own imperialists) were to find their crystallisation in an entirely new orientation of the socialist movement. The reformists of the "British socialistic" type divided into social patriots and pacifists. The "continentals" were divided into vicious militarists and anti-warites. The reformist pacifists made up the conscientious objectors, the "continental" anti-warites threw themselves into the economic struggles of the workers under the shop stewards and unofficial workers' committee movement. The experiences of the latter were ultimately brought to the formation of a new type of workers' party, the Communist Party.

The Russian movement for emancipation from Tsardom always found a sympathetic ear in England. The stories of tortures, imprisonment, exile and hangings were common stock in the literature of the Labour movement. When the revolution did take place it was welcomed with rejoicing, especially amongst the militant workers who refused to bear arms and fight for the imperialists. Its ideological influence was immediate and far-reaching. Enthusiasts glibly spoke of soldiers' and workers' councils for England, and a conference for the setting up of such bodies was actually called—the Leeds Conference. But perhaps the greatest gain was the rescuing of Marxism from the barren academic role it had hitherto played in England, and its revival as a living force in the proletarian class struggle.

Marxism, supplemented by the bold and courageous application of its principles by the Bolshevik Party, gave a new conception and outlook to the militants of the working-class movement. The parliamentarism and bourgeois ministerialism of Henderson, Barnes, Clynes and Thomas became an obvious badge of corruption before the living revolutionary fervour of the Bolsheviks, who swept the Russian parliament (the Duma) into the rubbish heap. Trade unionism and the economic struggles of the working class ceased to be mere instruments for the winning of halfpennies, but realistic forms of the revolutionary struggle for power. "All power to the Soviets" meant, in England, power only to the working class. The question of the struggle for political power by the working class was brought to the front of the workers' programme of action.

The common fight of the militant workers against the imperialists' exploitation within the war industries, against conscription and the militarisation of the industrial life of the working class paved the way for the new type of party now being freely discussed; 1918-19

was spent exploring the possibilities of unity between the scattered groups of socialist workers in the British Socialist Party, the Socialist Labour Party, the Workers' Socialist Federation, etc. By 1920 fusion became possible and the Communist Party was formed in August of that year. Certain anti-parliamentary elements remained apart, but with the helpful advice of Lenin, which he gave in his pamphlet, " 'Left-Wing' Communism," by the end of the year all the best militants were in one united Party, the C.P.G.B.

Mention must be made here of the divergences on some tactical questions which were expressed at the formation of the Party, such as the question of parliamentary action and affiliation to the Labour Party. The question of affiliation to the Labour Party was the more complex of the two, since it involved an appearance of support to the Labour Party, a party of rank opportunism and reformism. But, apart from the relation of tactics to the revolutionary outlook of the period, there was the traditional sectarian role of the Marxist groups in the pre-war period. It was important to rescue the young Communist Party from such traditional influences, and to make it a mass movement and not a new sect. "Go to the masses." "Without the masses revolution is impossible." Such was the experience and advice of Lenin. Under this impulse the tactics of demanding affiliation to the Labour Party served a useful purpose in saving the party from rank sectarianism.

But there was another side to this question. Lenin was influenced by the belief that it was possible for a Communist Party to be affiliated to the Labour Party, and to retain its complete identity and freedom to criticise. We were soon to be disillusioned on that score. Not only after the formation of our Party a meeting took place in Eccleston Square, the Labour Party headquarters, between representatives of the C.P.G.B. and the Labour Party Executive. At this meeting Henderson quoted from several Comintern theses to prove there was nothing in common between us, on Parliament and Soviets, on democracy and dictatorship, on the ballot and violence. Henceforward there could be no prospects of affiliation. Nevertheless, the C.P.G.B. correctly persisted in its demand, using this as a means of exposing the reformist role of the Labour bureaucracy. The pursuit of these tactics helped in no small way to make clear to thousands of workers what kind of a Party the Labour Party was.

In the spring of 1922, following the Third Congress of the C.I. and the publication in England of the Theses, the Government made a raid on the Party Headquarters, arrested the General Secretary, as publisher of these documents and the "Communist International," declared these illegal literature and imprisoned the Secretary of the Party. Undaunted, the Party began the application of the theses which were especially directed against the old style socialist branch methods of working in the Party, and which provided for group activity in place of individual efforts and platonic membership. This change, like all deep changes, was not carried out without much difficulty and reluctance to throw off old methods which had been useful under different conditions. The establishment of group direction, of centralised leadership, the transformation of the Party organ into a mass paper, its distribution by means of groups, fraction work inside the factories, trade unions, trades councils and the Labour Party, etc.—these new methods of activity were the contributions of the Third Congress of the Comintern to the British workers' movement, no mean contribution in the class struggle in "democratic" England. I should also mention here as of equally outstanding importance the innovation of Party political training of members. This training has gone a long way to expose the purely academic character of the Labour college movement.

The tactics of helping the Labour Party to power—Lenin's tactics in 1920—continued till the advent of the first Labour Government in England (1924). As foreseen by Lenin, MacDonald, Snowden, Henderson and Co. completely exposed themselves as being even more bourgeois than the bourgeoisie themselves. His Majesty's Opposition, become His Majesty's Government, proved this in home and foreign affairs. Their handling of the housing question, unemployment, the transport workers' strike, the secret instructions for recruiting of railway workers under the military, the operation of the Emergency Powers Act, arrest of the Communist editor,

as well as the building of cruisers and increase of armaments, their attitude to India, Irak, Egypt and the Russian Government went to show quite clearly that there was no distinction between Henderson and Joynson Hicks, between MacDonald and Baldwin or Chamberlain.

It is a tradition in the history of the workers' movement in England that when they get a set-back in the trade union struggle they turn to parliamentary action and *vice versa*. There is nothing absolute in the practice, but the tradition is there. It was not surprising therefore that the masses should swing to industrial action and go to the left. It was not a big step from the fall of the Labour Government to the Anglo-Russian Committee and the General Strike. The General Strike, of course, is not to be explained by the purely subjective side of the working-class struggle. A whole series of objective factors; the decline in British capitalism, the loss of its dominant and monopolist place in world economy, inability to give concessions to the Labour aristocracy as before, the growth of a poverty-stricken mass movement of workers and sharpening class relations.

All these factors combined marked the General Strike as the high water mark in the class struggle in England, opening a new period with new perspectives. It is clear to us to-day, though not generally understood at the time, that the General Strike, the consolidation of the reformist bureaucrats, pseudo-lefts and rights; the Mond response to Hicks' appeal for industrial peace, sealed once and for all the old tactical line of the C.P.G.B. as a thing of the past. The situation, indeed, was clearly very much different from the time when Lenin gave his advice in 1920.

Once more the Comintern came to the assistance of the British workers. The Communist Party did not appreciate these deep and very far-reaching changes in the whole situation in England. It continued to pursue its old line under conditions no longer favourable for it. It still spoke of a Labour Government, qualifying it only with the phrases "real" and "under control of the Executive Committee." No better illustration can be formed of the advantages of an international party, as a corrective to national-onesidedness, than the story of the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. Here we find the case of an International Executive showing a national executive the correct road it should travel, and making a complete change in political tactics. Yet again after nearly one year's operation of the new line, the E.C.C.I. comes to the assistance of the Party at its Tenth Congress, draws attention to a series of mistakes made and advises on the tactical line of the Party. These illustrations prove conclusively that under the banner of the Comintern the British working class will surely find the right road to its ultimate goal of emancipation.

The Communist Party in England is passing through one of its most difficult periods. The situation in England is bristling with complexities, rationalisation in capitalism, tremendous unemployment, and fierce attacks from the side of the Labour bureaucracy. The bourgeois backed up by the reformists, who are in its pocket, are arrogant, brutal and ruthless in their attitude to the working class in general and the Communists and militant workers in particular. In these circumstances the active workers, led by the Communists, must find new ways and methods of fighting. They must discard old traditions to free themselves for the gigantic struggles ahead. The Comintern has pointed the way. It calls for independent revolutionary action on all fronts by the class conscious workers, against Mondism, class collaboration, parliamentary cretinism, formalism and constitutionalism in economic action, for revolutionary struggle and a revolutionary Workers' Government in alliance with the Bolshevik sections of the Comintern, marching under the banner of Communism.

The Communist International and the Foundation of the Communist Party of China

Yu-Ang-Li

THE Communist Party of China welcomes the tenth year of the existence of the Communist International as the anniversary of its own inception. The year 1919 is rightly considered by us to be the starting-point of the great wave of revolution in China, which ended in December, 1927, in the heroic rising of the Canton proletariat.

During the very days on which the First Congress of the Comintern was holding its sessions violent waves of anti-imperialist, anti-Japanese agitation were sweeping the country, arousing and summoning it to an active political life, to a struggle for the national emancipation of the millions of human beings in China. The famous Hong-Kong strike of April, 1919, and a number of strikes in Central China brought the working class to the forefront of the revolutionary struggle, and from this moment that class began to make its influence felt on all political events, and to win new positions every year in the struggle for the leadership of the exploited masses of the Chinese people.

The year 1919 was marked by a "Back to the people" movement among the finest, most revolutionary-minded elements of the students, which was met halfway by a movement of the leading ranks of the still disunited, but politically active working class, ready for struggle, but needing a Communist advance-guard.

Out of the groups of workers' organisations created by this movement the Communist Party of China was born in the following year, and it grew vigorously and became the one militant mass Party of the Chinese proletariat.

1. THE HISTORIC CONDITIONS OF THE CREATION OF THE C.P. OF CHINA

From the first day of its birth the cradle of the young C.P. was tended by the Comintern and the revolutionary influence of the first proletarian dictatorship.

Across the ring of the capitalist blockade, through the falsehood and slander of the ideological agents of the exploiting classes, news of the great historical revolution that had been accomplished in Russia began to penetrate in a continually growing stream into China.

No Communist Party was yet in being, not a single Communist existed in China at that time, and yet the basic line of political demarcation even then became the slogan "for Soviet Russia," against "Wilsonism," against the cunning pacifist deceptions of imperialism.

The birth of the Communist Party was welcomed by a chorus of hostile voices, hiding their fear of the workers' movement behind phrases about the "unpreparedness of the social conditions of China for a Communist movement," and the "foreign influence" of the Communist International.

The C.P. of China acknowledged the enormous influence of the Soviet Union and the Comintern both on its creation and on all its further development.

The C.P. of China is one of the many divisions of the international working class, and it naturally sees its origin in the process of decline and disintegration of imperialism and the growth of a world socialist revolution. It affirms its internationalism in its international associations.

Yet the C.P. of China is in no less measure the product of national development, the development of the struggle of classes in China itself.

Possibly there is no other country in the world, with the exception of Russia, which in the course of fifty years has passed through so many revolutionary disturbances as stagnant, backward China. That was indispensable in

order that China might take the road of capitalist development.

From the peasant war of the period of late and disintegrating feudalism (known as the Taiping War), which lasted several decades, and was suppressed with the aid of foreign intervention, through the first bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1911, down to the contemporary gigantic clash of classes—all this distance has been traversed in less than a lifetime.

A development which it took the far west hundreds of years of slow movement to accomplish, China, which set out late on the road of industrial development, had to complete in a few decades.

Into an exceptionally small historical space of time history condensed events of enormous importance: the disintegration of the feudal method of production; the industrial revolution, which began with the direct establishment of great factories and works, the mammoths of modern capitalist technique, on the backward economic ground of China, where artisan and handicraft production had previously reigned supreme; finally, the supremacy of imperialism with all its consequences for the semi-colonial countries; the formation of enormous reserve armies of labour, which can find no application either in agriculture or in industry, the subordinate position of the national industrial bourgeoisie, and so on.

The oppression of triple exploitation; that of a decaying, yet still powerful feudalism, of developing national capitalism and of imperialism, has transformed China into one of the weakest links in the modern system of capitalist States.

Consequently the Communist Party has deep roots and is untroubled by talk of its inadequate social basis. Almost a decade before its birth, in the stormy years of the counter-revolution of 1912, the spectre of Communism was already frightening all the factions of the Chinese bourgeoisie and landed proprietors.

And just as in the summer of 1927, when all the parties of the bourgeois regime concentrated against the "insufferable demands of the working class," against its "illegal Communist strikes," which destroyed the unity of the nation and shook bourgeois legality, so during the years of the first Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution, Yuan-Shi-Kai and Li-Yuan-Lung, Tang-Shao-Yi and Wu-Wang-Ming (the last two being the representatives of the "left-wing" of the Kuomintang of those days) all unitedly broke up the workers' unions, bloodily suppressed the strikes of the Shanghai, Hankow and Chang-Sha workers, and proclaimed the unity of the Chinese nation, in contradistinction to the class struggle, which was proceeding and penetrating deeper into the nation's existence.

During the years of the first revolution the Chinese proletariat did not create a party of its own. The left-wing of the Kuomintang sought to speak in its name, organising workers' unions and exploiting the activity of the proletariat in the interests of the bourgeois parties.

All kinds of groups of anarchists and petty-bourgeois politicians (like the leader of the "Chinese Social-Democratic Labour Party," Chang-Kang-Wu), who had no contact with the masses of the proletariat, with its rank-and-file organisations, none the less spoke in its name. And at the moment when the workers entered on the struggle for essential economic demands (the general strike of the printers in Hong-Kong, strikes in the Shanghai, Hankow and Chang-Sha arsenals, and on the northern railroads), all these "friends of the working class" turned their backs on the working-class and cleared the field for the military and police commanders of conflicting political groups and parties.

Absolutely all historians, both Chinese and foreign, of 1911 pass over in silence working-class struggle which developed during those months.

The direct agents of the ruling classes and the simpletons of the petty-bourgeois groups found it convenient to maintain the illusion of the existence of class peace, the absence of any antagonism of classes.

But that struggle of the still young working class, the majority of whom had only just abandoned their last piece of land or sold their last tools, did not take place in vain.

When in 1919 a widespread movement began for the organisation of workers' unions and socialist labour groups, the radical students went to the industrial areas, and there met the

leading groups of workers, who had acted as leaders even during the strikes of 1912.

For instance, the workers of the Chang-Sha arsenal, whose strike had been bloodily suppressed by Yuan-Shi-Kai in 1912, proved in 1920 to be at the head of the trade union organisations of Northern China.

Through these revolutionary proletarians, through their experience of revolutionary struggle, the Communist Party affirms its descent from the past revolutionary movements of the Chinese working class.

The creation of the Communist Party is thus only the consummation of a long process of development of the Chinese proletariat, its emancipation from childish illusions, its emergence as a separate class in modern society.

But conscious Marxist Communism had to be brought into the workers' movement of China from without.

Just as in Russia, the "theoretical teaching" of Communism "had arisen quite independently of the elemental growth of the workers' movement, arisen as a national and inevitable result of the thought of the revolutionary intelligentsia." (Lenin, "What is to be Done?". Collected works, Vol. V, p. 141.)

About the time of the rise of the national revolutionary and workers' movement in 1919, many of the most radical elements of the Chinese intelligentsia had recognised the complete impotence of all the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois attempts to achieve the national emancipation of the country and its real revolutionary union by the old methods, whether parliamentary, or insurrectionary, or militant.

The national revolutionary movement had got into a hopeless *cul-de-sac*. All its past attempts had proved unsuccessful.

The very first attempt to reconstruct the political and economic system on the basis of constitutional-monarchical liberalism had been bankrupt in all eyes in 1898. And the left bourgeois wing of the Kuomintang, who by their continual compromise with the forces of feudal reaction and their obstruction of the revolutionary activity of the masses during the revolution of 1911-13 had ensured the restoration of the tottering forces of feudalism, had suffered no less a fiasco.

The later attempts were only worse forms of these antiquated methods of struggle. In the antics of the politicians around the lifeless corpses of the constitution and parliament (although the Kuomintang also participated in that game) no one believed. The military adventures in the south of Sun-Yat-Sen, who with his combinations of militarists sought to achieve the unity of China and ignored all the manifestations of a mass movement (Sun was, for instance, opposed to the anti-Japanese campaign of 1919) inspired as little hope of success. The most radical elements of the Chinese intelligentsia turned sharply round towards socialism, to the task of organising the masses, and the working class first and foremost. These first organisers of workers' groups, unions, schools, socialist leagues of youth, and finally of the Communist Party itself, were the product of the disintegration of Chinese nationalism.

They were first and foremost the group that gathered around comrade Cheng-Du-Shu and his periodical, "New Youth," which gradually traversed the road from democracy to Communism. In 1920, at about the time of the arrival of a representative from the Far-Eastern Secretariat of the Comintern, in Shanghai, this group began to call itself a Communist group and thus formed the nucleus of the Communist Party of China.

Very soon, towards the end of the same year, Communist groups began to be formed in a number of the largest centres of China. At the head of the organisation in Peking were comrades Li-Da-Chao (hanged by Chang-Tso-Lin in 1927) and Chang-Ho-Tao; in Canton were Tang-Ping-Shan (a renegade from Communism and now the leader of a third party), and Cheng-Hung-Po (expelled from the Party and now a member of the Kuomintang). In Hunan was comrade Mao-Che-Dun, and in France were Chai-Ke-Shang and the young Cheng (shot by Chiang-Kai-Shek in the summer of 1927). One of the organisers of the socialist League of Youth, which afterwards developed into the Chinese Young Communist League, was comrade Chang-Ta-Lai, who died the death of the brave during the days of the Canton Commune.

In Pekin, Canton and Shanghai Communist

journals and newspapers began to be published for the workers, and a number of Marxist and Leninist works were also issued. (The Communist Manifesto, "Wage Labour and Capital," "State and Revolution," "Communist Saturdayings" and so on.) At the same time more or less successful attempts were made everywhere to set up revolutionary trade unions and to lead the strike movement of the proletariat.

The first Congress, which took place in June, 1921, in Shanghai, laid the foundation of a central organisation, which afterwards at the second congress in 1922) became the Chinese section of the Communist International.

2. FROM PROPAGANDIST GROUPS TO A MASS PARTY

From the very moment of its birth the Communist Party had to repel a frantic pressure from petty-bourgeois and Liberal influences on the revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist understanding of the struggle of the proletariat and the tactics and organisational forms of the Party.

Anarchism and guild socialism, Bakuninism, Tolstoyism, and Gandhi-ism, "legal Marxism" and San-Ming-Shui (Sun-Yat-Sen's doctrine of "nationalism, democracy and the people's welfare")—all these products of the ideological atcivity of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the lumpen-proletariat saturated the political atmosphere of 1919 and 1920, rendering incredibly difficult the formation of a proletarian party under a Marxist-Leninist banner.

History had granted the Chinese Communist Party the briefest of periods in which to outlive the vacillations in its own ranks, and to effect the intellectual break-up of hostile theories. The obstacles which the parties of the West, with considerably more preparation, had overcome through a stubborn and systematic struggle spread over a number of years, had to be met and broken up by the C.P. of China in a period literally of months—the months that separated its inception from the revolution of 1925-27, when it was called upon to act as the sole political representative of the working class.

Only just organised, the Communist groups were already living through a serious internal crisis—they had to pass through the experience of a split with the anarchist-Communists. Of the original Communist group in Pekin only two persons were left; the first organisation in Canton proved to be entirely in the hands of the anarchists, and only after its dissolution was a Communist nucleus created. The split occurred on basic questions of principle, such as the dictatorship of the proletariat and the necessity for a centralised and disciplined party.

The young but already implacable Chinese Communists had no ground in common with those who vacillated on these questions, with those who sought to dissolve the Communist Party into unorganised and impotent circles and clubs, with those who declared themselves "for Soviet Russia but against the dictatorship of the proletariat."

But even at the first congress of the Party, after the anarchists in its ranks had been definitely dealt with, the struggle was concentrated on the resistance to bourgeois influence over the proletariat. Communism threw off the ideologists of the national bourgeoisie who had temporarily attached themselves to the Communist movement, such as Dai-Chi-Tao, Li-Hang-Ching and, soon after, Cheng-Hung-Po.

This group suffered from a fundamental fear of the workers' movement, and were no less cautious of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat than were the anarchists. Instead of dictatorship they proposed democracy, instead of work to create trade unions and to extend the Party among the active workers, they spread the idea of work among the students and the peaceable study of the theory of Marxism.

By their endeavours to occupy official positions in the provincial governments, they thrust the Party directly along the road of legal existence and reconciliation with the militarist groups. Their task inside the Communist movement amounted objectively to the dissolution of the Party as a militant and revolutionary organisation of the proletariat.

A small handful, a dozen or so of Communists, firmly raised the standard of struggle for Communism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for a disciplined, Bolshevik Party, for a revolutionary trade union movement.

At that time the Party was not yet faced with the task of participating with other classes and parties in Chinese society in the national struggle for emancipation from imperialist oppression.

In exactly the same way the Party had not yet set itself the task of struggle for the leadership of the peasantry.

It was passing through the period of recognising itself as the political representative of the working class; it was working out its own basic programme.

The enormous number of the petty-bourgeoisie, vacillating between sporadic revolt and anarchism on the one hand, and support of the bourgeois system on the other; the lumpen-proletarian environment (and, to a large extent, origin) of the Chinese proletariat; the burden of backward craft prejudices—all these factors forced the Chinese Communists, no less than the Russian Bolsheviks, "to cut themselves off at first from all others, to single out solely and exclusively the proletariat, and afterwards to declare that the proletariat will emancipate the rest. . . ." (Lenin, "Supplementary Notes on the Draft Programme"; selections from Lenin's writings, Vol. II, p. 132.)

The Party had followed this road down to 1921. But in front of it was the task of transforming itself from small propagandist groups into a mass political Party of the proletariat.

Programmes alone were now inadequate. It was necessary to work out tactics. The proletarian advance-guard was bound to extend its horizon by the inclusion of an analysis of the relations of classes, and to determine its role and its tactical tasks within those relations.

The great importance of the second congress, which met in 1922, consisted in the realisation of the enormous importance of the anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle for national emancipation, for the bourgeois democratic revolution in a semi-colonial country.

This involved a reconsideration of the Party's attitude to the national revolutionary organisations, already existing and struggling in China, and first and foremost to the Kuomintang. By its decisions on the formation of a single national front of all forces waging a revolutionary struggle with imperialism and militarism, the C.P. had pre-determined its later entry into the Kuomintang.

The second congress had been preceded by a "First Congress of the Revolutionary Organisations of the Far East" in Soviet Russia, at which both the Communist Party of China and the revolutionary trade union organisations, and also the Kuomintang, had been represented.

This congress had enormous significance for the whole further development of the C.P. by laying down a permanent and systematic connection between the Communist International and the revolutionary movement of China.

It made that essential change in policy, which was afterwards confirmed by the Second Congress of the Chinese C.P., consisting in the transference from propaganda work and the organisation of trade unions, to active participation in the political struggle, to the struggle of the proletariat for hegemony in the national bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The Party handled this highly important change in its tactical line with comparative ease. Under the leadership of the Comintern it overcame the tendencies towards complete subjection to the Kuomintang which appeared in certain places.

During this period the basic policy of the C.P. in regard to the Kuomintang was the instruction given by the Comintern in January, 1923:

"Whlist supporting the Kuomintang in all national revolutionary campaigns, in so far as that party carries on an objectively correct policy, the C.P. of China must none the less not become merged with that Party during these campaigns and must not lower its own standard."

Foreseeing the danger of the tactics of a united national front before the Third Congress of the Communist Party, held in 1923, the Comintern returned to this question, setting forth the basic task of the bourgeois revolution in China in all its magnitude (the resolution on the agrarian problem) and emphasising the directing role of the working class.

Whilst absolutely confirming the position that "the central task for China is the national revolution against the imperialists and their feudal agents," and thus confirming the neces-

sity of winning the "union of the wide strata of Chinese democracy in this anti-imperialist movement," the Comintern instruction to the Third Congress of the Chinese C.P. raised the problem of the peasants in the revolution to the front rank, long before the Seventh and Eighth Plenums of the E.C.C.I.

In that instruction we read :

"1. The national revolution in China and the creation of an anti-imperialist front will inevitably be accompanied by an agrarian revolution of the peasantry against the survivals of feudalism. That revolution can be victorious only if the basic mass of the Chinese population, the small peasantry, is drawn into the movement.

"2. Thus the central problem of the whole policy is the peasant problem. To blur that basic fact by any other conception whatever means a failure to understand the importance of the social-democratic section on which alone a victorious struggle against foreign imperialism, and for the complete annihilation of the feudal regime in China, can be achieved.

"3. Consequently, as the Party of the working class the C.P. must strive to ally the workers and peasants. That can be achieved only by an incessant propaganda for the realisation in practice of the slogans of the agrarian revolution, such as : the confiscation of rich landowners' estates, the confiscation of monastery and church lands, and its free transfer to the peasantry ; the elimination of rack-renting and of the present taxation system ; the annulment of leases and of taxation regulations between provinces ; the abolition of tax-farmers, and of the mandarine system ; the establishment of organs of peasant self-government to whom confiscated land is to be transferred ; and so on.

"4. Starting from these basic demands, it is necessary to lead the whole mass of poor peasants to see the necessity of struggle with foreign imperialism, exploiting to this end the fact that taxes, the salt-Gabelle, etc., are in the hands of foreign capital. Only by introducing an agrarian programme under the slogan of the anti-imperialist front can we hope for its further success.

"5. It goes without saying that the leadership must belong to the Party of the working class. The latest events in the Labour movement (the large-scale strikes) have clearly revealed the importance of the workers' movement in China. To consolidate the C.P. by transforming it into a mass Party of the proletariat, to gather the forces of the working class into the trade unions, are the first obligations of the Communists.

"6. The Communist Party must steadily thrust the Kuomintang in the direction of an agrarian revolution. In the places occupied by Sun's armies it is necessary to introduce confiscation of the land in favour of the poorer peasantry, and a number of similar measures. Only thus can the success of Sun's revolutionary army, support by the peasantry, and the extension of the basis of the anti-imperialist revolution be assured."

Thus, under the guidance of the Comintern, was the Communist Party of China prepared to meet the great wave of the revolutionary movement. That Party had given birth to great organisations of the working class, had equipped itself with revolutionary theory and had assimilated the experience of the international workers' movement while waging unceasing war on petty bourgeois deviations in its own ranks. And thus within a few years it had been transformed from small, unorganised propagandist groups into the mass Party of the Chinese proletariat, one of the foremost and boldest sections of the Communist International.

On the Road to the First Congress

Boris Reinstein

IN these reminiscences of the First Congress of the Communist International I have not set myself the task of giving an analysis of the work, the discussions and the resolutions of that historic congress. I am confining myself only to an outline of the struggle that went on in that congress over the question whether to raise the standard of the Comintern immediately, or to regard this first congress not as a congress, but only as a preliminary conference, which had first to consider whether to found the Communist International, and if so, would have to take steps to call the first congress at some time in the future. But before talking of the congress, I must sketch the course of development which I, like certain others, had to pass through in order to rally to the standard of the Comintern.

I. BEFORE THE CONGRESS

For revolutionary Marxists who had worked in the socialist movement of European countries the situation in the International in 1917 was clear enough. They knew that from 1914, from the moment of the betrayal of the international socialist movement by the leaders of the Second International; from the moment of the transfer of those leaders and the masses led by them to the side of "their own" bourgeoisie and "their own" governments, and the replacement of the class struggle by "civil peace" and the slogan of defence of "the fatherland," the Second International, in whose ranks we had all struggled hitherto, no longer existed. Of it only the ruins were left. Its standard was flung to the ground, trampled into the mud, and into the blood of the international proletariat betrayed by its leaders. The revolutionary Marxists of Europe not only knew that Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and the Spartacists in Germany had begun and were carrying on a struggle against the war and against social-patriotism, but they also knew that on Lenin's initiative and that of the Russian Bolsheviks, protests against the Second International were growing louder and louder, and with them calls to a revolutionary civil war, to a return to international proletarian solidarity, to the creation of a new International, not social-democratic but Communist. They were fully aware of what had occurred and how questions had been raised at Zimmerwald and Kienthal by the various groups of international socialists of different countries and various shades of opinion. They knew that there could be no question of any resurrection of the Second International, nor of re-assembling the forces of the international proletariat under the social-democratic standard of that International, and they knew that the question of establishing a new, third, Communist International was the order of the day.

But we who had been working in the American socialist movement, even in the then left-wing Socialist Labour Party, were almost entirely cut off, and from the beginning of the war in 1914 we lost touch with the movement in Europe and had only the most distant, and vague idea of what was happening in the International, of whether it should and could be cleansed of social-patriotism and compromise. Nor was it clear to us what had taken place at Zimmerwald and Kienthal or what was the position in regard to the revival of the International. One thing was quite obvious to us, that was that the new international socialist movement, whether it was revived under the Second International purified in the fires of war, or under a new, Third International, that international must stand for revolutionary Marxist principles and tactics in order to deserve the support of the International proletariat. In particular, it was clear to us that in the first place it was necessary to struggle against the idea of the proletariat's defence of "the fatherland," (in which capitalism still ruled), even in the event of a so-called "defensive" war; and that secondly it was necessary to struggle much more insistently for the emancipation of the trade union movement from reformist ideas,

tactics, slogans and leadership, both nationally and internationally—that it was necessary to transfer it to revolutionary lines.

Later on, in 1919, I emphasised and insisted on these basic ideas in my speeches and proposals for the first congress of the Comintern, although at that time these principles which are now generally accepted among Communists, were not so readily accepted by everyone. (See for instance the reservations made in the speeches of Albert (Eberlein) and others —especially on the question of whether it was worth while for Communists to spend so much attention and energy on such difficult, protracted and thankless tasks as the struggle for the conquest of the trade union movement, and whether it would not be better instead to rely on the creation and consolidation of Soviets of workers, soldiers' and peasants' deputies, and the preparation for armed insurrection, the civil war and power to the Soviets.)

The inadequacy of our information on the situation created in the International, as the result of almost three years of war, is the explanation of the fact that in the spring of 1917, when (after the February revolution), I decided to return from the United States to Russia, the C.C. of the American Socialist Labour Party gave me, as its official representative in the International, a mandate to the International Socialist Conference called in Stockholm, by the leaders of the Second International, on the question of bringing the war to an end, and of determining "just and democratic" conditions of peace in the name of the international socialist movement. I was also instructed to study the general position in the International. The American Government, which only just previously had decided to take part in the war on the side of the Entente, learnt of my tasks and endeavoured to prevent me from going to Europe, taking from me the American passport they had previously issued. I had to leave the country illegally.

In June, 1917, comrade D. Pietrovsky, with a mandate from the American Socialist Party, delegate D. from the Jewish party of the social-territorialists and I, arrived in Stockholm. There the "Scandinavian-Dutch Committee" of the Second International was settled. It was headed by the general secretary of the Executive Committee, Camille Huysmans. It also included Branting, from Sweden, Nina Bang from Denmark, Van Kol and Troelstra from Holland, and others. The head of the Second International, Vandervelde, was absent, being occupied with carrying out the instructions of his Belgian king. The Scandinavian Dutch Committee had held a number of preliminary conferences with the socialist delegates who had arrived from various countries. About the time of our arrival a conference with the leaders of German social-democracy had just come to an end. In the hotel in which we stayed we used to come across Scheidemann, now the head of the coalition cabinet of Müller, and others in the corridors. There also were the heads of the then German "Independents," Kautsky, Haase, Luisa Sitz, Ledebour, Eduard Bernstein and others. They were at daggers drawn with the Scheidemann-Müller group at that time, and they would not even talk to one another. I had once, some thirty years previously, studied Marxism from lectures by Bernstein, when he was still one of the most authoritative Marxists, and was editing the organ of the German Party, the "Social-Democrat" (in Zurich, owing to its being prohibited in Germany by Bismarck). He afterwards became the ideological leader of German revisionism. During the war he was a "left winger" to the same extent as Kautsky. Now, from conversations with him, Kautsky, Haase, and others of this group of German "left wingers," "Internationalists" and Zimmerwald leaders, it became clearer and clearer to me that all their Marxism had long since dried out of all of them, that they were typical German social-democrats, that although they, too, were to take part in the forthcoming Stockholm conference of Zimmerwaldists, there would be no means of finding a common language with them, that they would be of no use in building a single, truly revolutionary International. But they were at least "internationalists" in inverted commas, they were at least fair-weather internationalists. But the utter impossibility of reviving a renewed and more revolutionary Second International, and the necessity of creating a new Third International, was made clear to me from conversations with the representative in Stockholm of the Bulgarian social-democrats, the late comrade Kirkov, and comrade Ganet-

sky, who, with Radek and Vorovsky, was working in the foreign bureau of the C.C. of the Russian Bolsheviks, especially after the conferences held between us delegates from America and the Scandinavian Dutch Commitee of the Second International.

The cynical compromises and opportunism of these leaders were to be seen in all their conduct, to be heard in all their arguments and proposals of this committee. I need give only one instance of this.

We were discussing what conditions of peace the international socialist movement ought to recognise as "just and democratic." In particular the question of the restoration of Belgium was raised. When the Committee proposed to include this demand among the others, I said:

"In that case we must fight to ensure that the restored factories, works, etc, of Belgium should be handed over as national property to the Belgian people."

I noticed that Branting, Van Kol, Troelstra and Huysmans looked at each other in amazement. The Belgian Huysmans took it upon himself to overbear me, and the others supported him.

"Do you really want in the name of the international socialist movement to demand the restoration of the ruined factories, etc., of Belgium, and then to have them handed back to their former owners, Belgian and foreign capitalists, so that they can continue to squeeze millions in dividends out of the Belgian proletariat, with the aid of these enterprises?" I said.

"Of course you're quite right in principle," Huysmans answered, "but this demand is too radical. We cannot put forward such demands. The restored factories, etc. must be returned to their former owners. . . ."

I realised that I was wasting time talking to this committee. Our roads lay in different directions. We could find no common language. We could not be in the same International with them.

In the search for a way to the restoration of the International, I turned to the Zimmerwaldists. At that time the situation in regard to Zimmerwald was as follows:

In this camp, there were, besides really revolutionary Marxists, Russian Bolsheviks and the future Communists of various countries, no few social-democrat centrists and Mensheviks. Among them, as I have already said, were also the German independents, Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour and others. It was obvious that Zimmerwald had played its part and that it was unable to enlist all the vital and militant elements in the international proletarian movement for any creative work, especially for the initiation and creation of a new, revolutionary International. In addition to everything else, this possibility was ruled out by the heterogeneity of its composition and consequently the absence of a single ideology, of uniform tactical principles.

Until the spring of 1917, the secretary of Zimmerwald was the notorious Swiss social-democrat "Internationalist" Robert Grimm, a prominent member of the Swiss Parliament. After the February revolution, when the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, Kerensky, Tcheidze, Tseretelli and others were the real government, with "war to a victorious conclusion," as their slogan, Grimm came to Petrograd and there, behind the backs of these lackeys of the Entente, exploiting his connections with the Swiss powers, he endeavoured to assist the German Government in their efforts to achieve a separate peace with Russia. Tseretelli and others got to hear of Grimm's part in these manœuvres and Grimm was "drummed out" of Russia. In June of the same year he arrived in Stockholm completely discredited, and had to hand over his post as secretary of Zimmerwald to one who came with him, and turned out to be not quite so angelic as everybody at that time thought, Angelica Balabanova. Almost at the same time there arrived from Petrograd personages who were eagerly and impatiently awaited, especially by Kautsky, Haase, and the other German independents; to wit, the representatives of the "revolutionary democracy" of Russia, members of the C.C. of the Mensheviks, V. Rozanov (who afterwards, in 1919, was arrested at the quarters of the Yudenitch spy Steinberg in Petrograd for counter-revolution and espionage), also the Social-Revolutionary Smirnov and the late comrade Goldenberg, then a Menshevik, but afterwards a member of the Bolshevik Communist Party.

It was interesting to observe the manœuvr-

ing resorted to by Kautsky and other independents between this trinity of the "revolutionary democracy" and the Zimmerwaldists, among whom the dominating figures were Radek, Vorovsky and Ganetsky, during the Zimmerwaldist conference that was then held. At first, before the independents had finally blended their voices with Rozanov and the others, with whom they sought to curry favour, and with whom they had an affinity of soul, they participated in the Zimmerwald conference, although not displaying any interest in its proceedings. At times they were forced right on to their hind legs, when Radek and Vorovsky lashed them without mercy in the discussions.

One episode of this Zimmerwaldist conference is worth recalling now.

The most temperamental and most passionately argumentative member of the group of independents was Luisa Sitz, who was then already an ageing woman. It was difficult to say whom she hated most, the Scheidemannites or the Bolsheviks. In any case she could not speak calmly of either the one or the other group, and when Radek's criticism and satire stung the independents like a sharp rapier point, whilst Kautsky impotently stuttered and choked, and Ledebour tried to parry the thrusts, poor Sitz almost burst with rage. Finally, in his speech Radek exclaimed: "Why, why do you independents shout about your fight with Scheidemann and Co? It won't be long before you will be in one party again with Scheidemann and the rest." At that poor Sitz could not restrain herself any longer. Flushed and foaming at the mouth, she was ready to fling herself at Radek with her raised fists; and choking with rage, she brokenly exclaimed: "Why, how do—you dare to—unheard-of impudence! How can you declare that we—we—we—independents, will ever be in one party—with those scoundrels—traitors—the Scheidemannites?" Poor Sitz did not suspect then that hardly five years would pass before Radek's prophecy was realised. It is worth while recalling this anecdote for the benefit of those of our comrades who at present are roused to passionate indignation when anyone declares that for such renegades of the Comintern, just as for Levy, there remains only one road: back to the camp of Scheidemann, Müller and Co.

Soon after this the independents entered into relations with Rozanov and the others, and their contact with the conference was broken. At the close of the conference I went to Petrograd, fully realising that from Zimmerwald, or rather from what remained of it, it was impossible to expect any initiative in the creation of a new International.

At that time (the end of June, 1917) the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks were in power in Russia. Even a large number of citizens had decked themselves out in S.R. or Menshevik colours. Only in the factories, workshops and to some extent in the barracks of Petrograd, Moscow and other centres, did the Bolsheviks' influence predominate and increase, and only among them could any talk be heard of the necessity for creating a new Communist International, and even then it was not looked upon as an actual task of the moment. All thoughts were turned in another direction: the October revolution and the Soviet Government arrived. But after October the atmosphere became more and more saturated with the idea of the Third International, the idea of the Comintern. Long before the Comintern was born the mention of this coming international aroused enthusiasm everywhere. Clubs and similar organisations were named after it.

In December, 1917, I was invited to organise a "Department of International Revolutionary Propaganda" (a kind of rudiment of the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the still unborn Comintern). After the peace of Brest-Litovsk the work of my department, which was chiefly concerned with activities among military prisoners from Germany, Austria and so on, was reorganised, and was occupied mainly with work among the masses of prisoners from the Entente armies who had collected in Russia. At the same time, and specially in order to carry on propaganda among the Anglo-American soldiers who had broken into the R.S.F.S.R. without any declaration of war, special machinery was set up which published British newspapers, flysheets and so on, and in this one of the first workers in the E.C.C.I., comrade Fineberg, did great work.

The work of agitation and propaganda for

the coming International was carried on in various ways among the soldiers of the Entent governments then at war with the R.S.F.S.R. At the front, newspapers, fly-sheets, etc., were distributed by means of aeroplanes. At the rear, especially in Moscow, to which town many war prisoners were sent, they were not kept in prison or in concentration camps. They were left at liberty, they were given a fraternal reception in every sense, and for some of them their period of "imprisonment" among the Reds was undoubtedly their first training in Communism and the class struggle. They returned home much more developed, and much stronger than they had come into the R.S.F.S.R. The Bolsheviks returned the Entente soldiers good for evil.

The shadow of the coming International was to be seen also in the setting up of a number of organisations of Eastern and other peoples, who were living, some of them only temporarily, in the R.S.F.S.R. The enthusiasm which the very idea of the coming International aroused, was revealed particularly in connection with the international meeting organised at the end of 1918 in Moscow, at which, for the first time in the Soviet regime, Americans, British, French, as well as Chinese, Koreans, Hindus and others spoke. Soon after an equally successful meeting was held in Petrograd under the chairmanship of Maxim Gorky, and at this war-prisoners and other foreigners spoke.

2. AT THE FIRST CONGRESS

At last the time for the realisation of that which all desired, the time for the foundation of the Communist International, arrived.

About the beginning of the new year a small conference of representatives from the C.C. of the Russian Communist Party, and certain other comrades who were working along this line, was held. An appeal to the revolutionary proletarian organisations of all countries was drawn up, inviting them to send representatives by secret methods to Moscow by March 1st, 1919, to discuss the question of founding a Communist International. I was, of course, glad to sign this appeal in the name of the American Socialist Labour Party, since it was realising something which I had sought and desired for almost two years. Cut off by the blockade from contact with the American Party, I had no reason to doubt whether I had expressed their desire by participating in the foundation of the Comintern.

In consequence of the blockade, the intervention and the need for secrecy, only a few persons from Germany, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Switzerland, Latvia and other countries could come from abroad for this congress. The majority of the 51 comrades who participated in that congress with voting or advisory powers consisted partly of representatives of the Russian Communist Party, and partly of Communist emigrants from the Baltic and other countries, who were living in the R.S.F.S.R.

Next to the Russian C.P. the greatest prestige and respect were enjoyed by the members of the German Communist Party, which had been reorganised from the Spartacus League not long before the congress. Only some six weeks before the congress Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg had been killed, with the participation of the Scheidemannites. In the person of its advance-guard, led by the Spartacists, the German proletariat had struggled at the barricades of Berlin and other centres of Germany, for a Socialist Soviet Republic, for the replacement of the bourgeois democracy by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The social-democratic executioner, Noske had shot the flower of the German working class in tens of thousands on the streets and squares, in the prisons and the barracks. It is difficult to describe the affection and respect with which the hundreds of devoted comrades who gathered at five o'clock in the evening of March 2nd, 1919, in the small historical Mitrofaniov hall in the Kremlin, regarded the heroic, self-sacrificing German Communist Party. That feeling was passed on to its representative at the congress, comrade Albert (Eberlein). Apart from the opener of the congress, comrade Lenin, there was hardly another comrade whose opinion and wishes were so much respected, owing to the party which he represented, as was comrade Albert. Everybody was in the mood to do anything to meet the demands of his party half-way.

But almost from the moment of the opening

of the first session it became clear that this feeling would be subjected to the heaviest of tests. It transpired that the Spartacus League were against that which all the others present beginning with Lenin, so passionately desired, They were against the immediate proclamation here in Moscow, before the delegates departed, that the Third International had been founded, that its standard had been raised and that this was the first congress of the Comintern in Moscow. In the name and by the instruction of his party, comrade Albert insisted on regarding the sessions not as sessions of the first congress of the Third International, but as sessions of a preliminary conference, which had to consider whether it was necessary, whether it was expedient, whether the conditions were ripe for the founding of the Comintern, and if so, to take measures to call the first congress for the foundation of the Communist International in the future; but only after the basis and the guiding lines of such an International had been drawn up, and it had become clear that the revolutionary ranks of the proletariat in various countries would react with sufficient approbation and in sufficiently large masses to the international. If we remember the blockade of the R.S.F.S.R., the military fronts still existing around the republic, the conditions of the first months after the close of the war, the police and military repression and persecution of everything that was vital among the proletariat, especially when it was a question of relations with Moscow (several comrades were in fact arrested without getting to the congress), it must be admitted that to adopt comrade Albert's proposal meant putting off the foundation of the Comintern for an indefinite period.

Everybody was astounded by the proposal. Everybody had come with the first intention of laying the foundation of the Comintern, and could in no wise agree with comrade Albert's argumeiits that the revolutionary ranks of the proletariat in the various countries might prove too timid and sceptical, might not respond to a sufficient extent, that a fiasco might prove very injurious and so on. During the interval the astonished and disillusioned comrades discussed the situation thus created with great animation. There were comrades who saw in comrade Albert's arguments the expression of the timidity and scepticism of the Spartacus comrades themselves on the question of the expediency of establishing a new International. Certain of them said that Rosa Luxemburg had also been against the immediate foundation of a special Communist International. Others went further and considered that the position of comrade Albert indicated that the Spartacists and Luxemburgites had not yet ceased to regard the social-democrats as their deluded party comrades, had not given up hope that they would some time or other be united again, and so were endeavouring to postpone the foundation of the Comintern, since the latter would interfere with their hopes.

Whatever was the case, the spell of the German Communist Party was so strong that at the first session no one plucked up courage to definitely oppose comrade Albert's proposal. Even comrade Lenin and the Russian Communist Party delegation were ready to restrain their desires and give way. In the name of that delegation comrade Zinoviev declared: "Our party holds the view that the moment for the formal foundation of the Third International has arrived, and we should propose to found it at this its first congress. But as our friends from Germany, the German Communist Party, insist on the recognition of this congress as only a conference, we consider it necessary for the present to adhere to this proposal of the German Communists. At the same time we declare that we shall continue to agitate for the foundation of the Third International as an official organisation as soon as possible." This statement was made in the name of the delegation, which was composed of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Stalin, Bukharin and others, and Vorovsky and Osinsky with advisory powers.

Comrade Kuusinen also, in the name of the Finnish delegation, (Sirola, Manner, Kuusinen, I Rakhia and E. Rakhia) declared: "We, the Finnish delegates, also adhere to the view that the Third International ought to be founded now. Taking into consideration the circumstance just mentioned by comrade Zinoviev, for the present we do not put forward this proposal. But in our view it would be a highly gratifying result of this conference if

it were to end with a decision that it should, as a congress, set about the foundation of the new International."

The assembly decided to hold its sessions as an International Communist Conference.

Thus it appeared that the question was settled: the standard of the Comintern would not be raised immediately, but at some time in the future. Comrade Albert had won a temporary victory, but it was merely temporary, lasting only a few hours.

None of those who had voted for the decision were satisfied with it. They all felt that a great error had been committed under pressure, and were eager for a suitable moment to put it right. That moment came the following day, at the evening session. A change occurred in the mood of almost all the delegates, in the direction of a resolute struggle for the revocation of the concession made the evening before to comrade Albert.

Considerable assistance was given by the speech at the evening session of the second day made by the delegate from Vienna, comrade Gruber (Steingart), who had only just arrived. He was a very temperamental and able agitator. Intensely stirred even before his departure from Vienna by the passionate struggle of the handful of Austrian Communists with the treacherous social-democrats, the bourgeoisie, clericalism and militarism, Gruber and his colleague laid themselves open to continual risk and danger, struggling for seventeen days to get to Moscow for the congress. They rode on locomotives and tenders, on the buffers and in cattle-trucks, they got safely across the front of the Petlura and Polish bands, and at last they were in Red Moscow; and hardly allowing themselves time to wash, they sped to the Kremlin in order to be the sooner at the congress, among comrades, in order to aid in raising the standard of the new revolutionary Communist International. Here they were at last among comrades, delegates, and talking to them, describing the struggle, the enthusiasm, the self-sacrifice of the Austrian Communists in words of fire. But how Steingart spoke! It is difficult to convey the impression. He seemed to electrify his audience, infecting them with his boundless enthusiasm, audacity and faith in the strength of our movement. I have heard Steingart many times since in Moscow, but I have never again heard him make a speech like that first speech in Moscow.

That speech, coinciding with the formal proposal of a number of comrades to set to work to found the Third International immediately, turned the course of the congress on this question. It was clear to all that the error committed the evening before must be corrected, that the foundation of the Comintern must be proclaimed at once.

The proposal read:

"The representatives of the Communist Party of German Austria, the left wing Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, the Balkan Social-Democratic Revolutionary Labour Federation, and the Communist Party of Hungary, propose the foundation of the Communist International.

"1. The necessity of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat demands the existence of a consolidated, international organisation of all Communist elements.

"2. The foundation of the Third International is all the more urgent since at the present moment in Berne, and afterwards perhaps in other places, attempts are being made to restore the old, opportunist International and to gather together all the irresolute, indeterminate elements of the proletariat. Consequently it is necessary to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the revolutionary and the treacherous elements.

"3. If the Third International is not founded by the present conference the impression may be given that there is not unity among the Communist parties; that, of course, would weaken our position and would increase the confusion among the vacillating elements of the proletariat in all countries.

"4. The foundation of the Third International is consequently an unconditional necessity, and it must be accomplished by the international Communist congress in Moscow."

Again the discussions began, but now everybody, not excepting comrade Albert himself, saw clearly that the proclamation of the Communist International at this its first formal congress was predetermined. Comrade Albert conscientiously carried out his instructions.

He brought into play all the force of his eloquence and conviction, but he convinced no one. He was no poor advocate of a bad client. But everybody realised that he was wasting his powder or was talking only for the sake of the shorthand typists. Some listened with a benevolent smile of commiseration. Others yawned in their boredom. He was answered by Zinoviev, Balabanova, Grimlund, Rakhia (he also read a declaration made by the C.P. of Finland), Sadoul, Gruber, Fineberg and others.

Finally the vote was taken. Voting was by name, the delegates with advisory votes also being asked their opinion. The C.P. of Germany did not vote (five votes). All the rest voted unanimously for the resolution.

The Communist International was born amid jubilant shouts and the sound of the "Internationale," with unprecedented enthusiasm, on March 5th, 1919, at nine o'clock in the evening.

REVOLUTIONARY LESSONS

A short selection from the 1917 writings of
N. LENIN

Paper 1s. Post free 1s. 2d.

HEADING FOR WAR

By T. BELL

Paper 1s. Post free 1s. 2d.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

A new translation by E. and C. PAUL

Paper 4d. Post free 5d.

Order through your Bookseller

MODERN BOOKS LIMITED
26 Bedford Row, London, W.C.1

Or at American Prices from
WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
35 East 125th Street, New York

The Foundation of the Comintern and the Spartakusbund

Hugo Eberlein (Max Albert)

WHEN, ten years ago, the representatives of the world proletariat met in Moscow to found the Communist International, the Spartakusbund had fought its first heroic battle against Noske's November republic. It had not succeeded in changing the imperialist into the civil war, in crowning the revolution with victory. The young Party, founded on 30th December, 1918, evidenced all the symptoms of the "infantile disorder." The Spartakusbund, which had broken completely with reformism during the war, was wholeheartedly and vigorously in favour of the Russian revolution. It was prepared to take the road of Bolshevism, in which, however, it saw only action, armed insurrection, a life and death struggle against reformism, against its governmental power and its white guard mercenaries. The real kernel of Bolshevism, the Leninist theory of the role of a revolutionary party and its relation to the masses, the strategy and tactics which lead to armed insurrection, was, it is true, understood by many members of the Bund, but the great mass of workers belonging to it, ready to face death for the revolution, were bound in no strict organisation governed by the Leninist theory of the revolution and the Party. Early in 1919, the Communist Party was not a party in the Bolshevik sense, in the sense of the revolutionary idea of the Party which has since become the common property of Communists. History had not yet given it time to study the experiences of the Russian revolutions. A few days after its foundation, the threat of counter-revolution forced it to take up the struggle. Without the blood shed by the Spartakists for the German proletariat in 1919, a German Communist Party would have been impossible. Without the lessons of the Spartakist struggles, the revolutionary masses of Germany would never have realised the necessity for a Bolshevik Party. Lenin's remark that the workers learn chiefly by their own experience was justified in the foundation of the C.P.G.

At the beginning there was no centre keeping all the sections of the Spartakusbund together and directing their actions. Connections with provincial organisations were very weak. The great increase of revolutionary workers in the Spartakus organisations meant that, in the fire of the struggle, organisational unity could not be maintained and strengthened. Every member bore a tremendous burden of work and responsibility, which was increased because of the lack of any concrete political plan for carrying on the fight.

So it happened that when, early in January, the invitation arrived from Moscow to send delegates to a preparatory conference to discuss the situation in the international, the provincial organisations could not be consulted as to the delegates, nor give them the support required by the importance of the conference. As far as I know, there are no documents relating to that period, and I have to rely on my memory for the events which led up to my being sent as a delegate.

* * * * * *

The invitation to the C.P.G. to take part in a preliminary conference on the question of the foundation of a new international arrived in Berlin early in January, 1919. As far as I remember, the invitation was addressed to the Central Committee, to Rosa and Karl. One night, as I was accompanying Rosa from the editorial offices of "Rote Fahne" to her house in the southern district, she told me that the invitation had come, and discussed the question of who should be sent. She and Karl Liebknecht were not to be considered, for it was impossible for them to leave Berlin. Apart from that, Rosa thought that the C.P.G. should be represented at this Conference by a German comrade whose poli-

tical judgment would not be influenced by previous disagreements with Russian comrades. She referred now and again to the differences of opinion between herself and Leo Jogisches, and the Bolsheviks. Rosa suggested that I should go.

WHEN SHOULD THE COMINTERN BE FOUNDED?

During our conversation, she referred to the importance of the conference in the following terms: the Bolsheviks will probably propose that a new international should be founded immediately, even if only a few delegates turn up. The foundation of the Communist International is obviously and unconditionally necessary, but it should not be premature. The Communist International should only be definitely founded when, in the revolutionary mass movements sweeping over almost all the countries of Europe, Communist Parties have arisen. It is also particularly necessary to choose the exact time of its foundation so as to accelerate the separation of the revolutionary masses from the United Social-Democratic Party. Rosa therefore suggested that at the Conference I should propose the establishment of a commission consisting of representatives of the different countries, and that the inaugural Congress should take place some time between Easter and Whitsun. . . .

Three days later Rosa and Karl were dead. We all felt the pain of the irreparable loss of our leaders—there were no discussions among us in those days. Then there was a meeting in the Kochstrasse, in which Jogisches, Karski, Pieck, Levi and Eberlein took part (Meyer was under arrest). I reported to the comrades my last conversation with Rosa, and Leo Jogisches, who shared her opinion, confirmed it. It was agreed that I should be delegate, on the unconditional mandate that I put forward the opinion of Rosa and Leo. A few days later there was another meeting which I did not attend, but Ernst Meyer was present. Shortly after I began the journey to Moscow. I travelled from the Charlottenburg station with Leviné, who was arrested at Eydtkuhnen. Machine-gun fire sounded at the Alexanderplatz . . . . Spartakus was sending revolutionary greetings to the Communist International. . . .

LENIN'S VIEWS ON THE NECESSITY OF THE C.I.

On my arrival in Moscow I had a personal interview with Lenin. I gave a detailed report on the situation in Western Europe, and carefully and patiently Lenin tried, from my description, to build up a picture of the position. He asked me a number of questions about the ideas and organisation of the Spartakusbund, its strength in the factories, its influence in the trade unions, the organisation of the armed insurrection in Berlin, etc. He seemed very pessimistic about the anti-parliamentary and anti-trade union decisions of the inaugural party congress, which he considered absolutely incorrect. When I told him the opinion of Rosa Luxemburg and the Spartakus centre on the question of founding the Comintern, he was not greatly surprised, and said that he had expected such an attitude. He discussed it as follows: from the tactical point of view, these arguments have something in them, but nevertheless the International must be founded immediately. The advancing revolutionary movement, the effect of the Russian revolution on the most advanced sections of the proletariat, the recognition by large numbers of workers of the bankruptcy of the Second International, and above all, the historical necessity of leading and coordinating the revolutionary action of the proletariat, made such a step essential. He added: "But I think it extraordinarily difficult to found the International without the agreement of the C.P.G." He proposed that the question of foundation should be brought up towards the end of the conference. In the days before the opening of the conference, which only constituted itself a congress on the third day, there were a number of meetings with the Russian delegates to the Conference, in which comrade Bukharin particularly took active part, and which gave opportunity for a lively exchange of opinion. Positive results could only with difficulty be attained, for it was not my personal opinion, but my mandate and the possibility of Berlin agreeing, that counted. But during the whole time, Lenin did not doubt for a minute that the Spartakusbund would become a part of the new international, and that after its foundation differences of opinion would be only of an incidental character. Lenin and the whole

Russian delegation considered the Spartakusbund as the most important and advanced revolutionary party in western Europe. This was expressed in the resolution on the "attitude to the various socialist tendencies and to the Berne Conference," which contained the following passage:

"3. Communists. In the Second International, where they defended the Communist-Marxist attitude to the war and to the tasks of the proletariat (Stuttgart, 1907; Lenin-Luxemburg resolution), they remained a minority. The left-radicals, (later the Spartakus group) in Germany, the Bolsheviks in Russia, the "tribunists" in Holland, the youth group in Sweden, the left wing of the youth international in a number of countries, formed the first basis of the new International. True to working class interests, they put forward, from the beginning of the war, the slogan of changing the imperialist war into a civil war. They have now constituted themselves as the Third International."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPARTAKUS BUND

In accordance with Lenin's appreciation of the importance of the Spartakusbund, I was elected to all the Commissions and to the Conference Presidium. At Lenin's suggestion, the question of the foundation of the International was not raised during the first days of the full sessions. On all questions, whether of the role of the Third International, its construction, or the tactics to be employed in western countries, such unanimity was displayed (in which I shared) that the "Spartakus debate" which was very short, had rather a formal than a political significance. I was, of course, obliged to give the position of our Central Committee. In the only printed report of the Conference ("The Foundation of the Third International," First Conference of the Communist International held in Moscow from March 2-6th, 1919, Vienna, 1919), my speech is reported as follows:

"When the question as to whether the present assembly should be proclaimed as the conference of the International arose, only a few voices were heard against it, and the representative of the Spartakusbund expressed a doubt whether the time had arrived for the formation of the Third International. He referred to the warning example of Zimmerwald and Kienthal, which gave a picture, not of unity, but of decay, and the organisation fell to pieces. The opinion of the German comrade was that the position of the yellow Berne International was not in itself sufficient reason for the foundation of the Communist International, which could only live on the support of the workers of all lands. As however, there was a unanimous vote (with one abstention) it was decided to constitute the conference as the Conference of the Communist International, and the German comrade could not but welcome it, and join it in the name of the German revolutionary proletariat."

This report cannot lay claim to full correctness. [Comrade Eberlein's contention needs historical examination. He himself is responsible for the correctness of the report.—Ed.] Unfortunately there are no typewritten reports.. But the printed report fails to give my personal statement that I was fully agreed with the conference, and that, had I a free hand, I should have voted for the immediate establishment of the Communist International. Lenin's arguments had convinced me. The difference between my opinion and my mandate was expressed by the fact that I did not vote against the resolution, but withheld my vote. Besides which I emphasised that the Spartakusbund recognised the necessity of founding the Communist International, but considered that the time then was, tactically, unfavourable. I certainly did not draw the parallel with Zimmerwald and Kienthal in that way, for it was contrary to my opinion. Nor did I use the words "can only live." This incorrect report was no doubt due to technical conditions, and to the fact that the speeches were not taken in shorthand, but, as it were, reconstructed. When I ended my speech with the statement that I was firmly convinced that the Spartakusbund would fully agree to the decision of the Congress, Lenin said to me, "We, too, were firmly convinced of that, otherwise we would not have determined on the immediate foundation of the International."

* * * * * *

Since Rosa Luxemburg had taken the real intellectual lead in the Spartakusbund, it is not surprising that its early relations with the C.I. corresponded in essentials to her political ideas.

Rosa Luxemburg, and our small circle had from the very beginning of the war realised that a break with the Second International was historically inevitable. That this declaration was not made earlier is in my opinion due to the fact that before the war there was no definite left fraction, and Karl Liebknecht the standard-bearer of the fight against opportunism, was irresolute in the first war weeks. Liebknecht's attitude on the outbreak of war is well known. Although while hotly opposing the ratification of war credits within the Party and the Reichstag social-democratic fraction, he felt himself obliged to maintain discipline outside. Immediately after the outbreak of war, Rosa was considering the publication of a manifesto to the German workers which should include the question of the International. Why this was not done is told by comrade Markhlevsky (Karski) :

KARL LIEBKNECHT AND THE WAR

"The war broke out and from the first day comrade Luxemburg started propaganda against the war. She thought that she would succeed in uniting a circle of German comrades to work in common. It seemed to her that it was first of all necessary to have a manifesto, signed by a number of comrades popular among the workers Jogisches immediately declared that it would be of no use, but still we made the attempt. But only seven answered Rosa's invitation to meet at her house and discuss the question, and of these only two were prominent party members, Mehring and Lensch. The latter at first promised to sign, but later withdrew his support. The manifesto could have been signed only by Luxemburg, Zetkin and Mehring, which was, of course, unthinkable and the plan had to be given up. A reader, not very well versed in German affairs, might ask: "And Liebknecht?" Unfortunately Liebknecht was still hesitating and only decided some months later to take up the fight against the war. This fight had to be carried on by conspiratorial methods, and only a few were ready for this. The group which did take up the fight consisted of comrades Luxemburg, Jogisches, Mehring, the two Dunckers, Ernst Meyer, Wilhelm Pieck, Eberlein, Lange and myself —we were, I think, all."—("Communist Int ernational," No. 3, Markhlevsky: "Rosa Luxemburg and Jogisches.)

Without Liebknecht's signature the manifesto could not be published, We had to wait. Rosa seized the first opportunity of raising the question of the International in our group, and of putting it before the German workers. The opportunity came at the calling of the first Zimmerwald Conference. Rosa Luxemburg, in prison, wrote, "The Crisis of Social-Democracy," with an appendix containing "Directions for the tasks of international social-democracy." Known as the Junius pamphlet, these theses were for the enlightenment of the Spartakus group, and were also intended to differentiate them from the centrists Haase, Ledebour, etc. The demand for the foundation of a new, Third International formed the main point of the theses. The decisive paragraphs run as follows:

"11. The Second International has been blown up by the war. The inadequacy of its organisation has been demonstrated by its incapacity to carry on an effective moral struggle against national hostilities in the war, and to maintain the united action of the workers in all countries.

"12. In face of the treachery of the official representatives of the socialist parties in the principal countries to the aims and interests of the working class, in face of their flight from the proletarian international to bourgeois imperialist policy, it is a vital question for socialism that a new international be founded which must take over the leadership and organisation of the revolutionary class struggle against imperialism.

"It should be constructed on the following principles:

(3) The weight of the workers' class organisation is in the International. The International decides the tactics of the national sections in time of war, to questions of militarism, colonial policy, trade, labour celebrations and the whole tactic to be employed in the war.

(4) Obedience to the decisions of the International overrides all other obligations. National sections who oppose the International's decisions in war, thereby place themselves outside the international proletariat and release their members from all obligations to them."

It is not the place here to enter into all the weaknesses of her pamphlet. Lenin's criticism has become common knowledge in the International. But these quotations show clearly how Rosa Luxemburg had revised her attitude towards the questions of international organisation, and of the role of the Party, in a Leninist way.*

Of course, these theses have their weaknesses, due to Luxemburg's ideas on imperialism. The causes given of the breakdown of the Second International are, from the Marxist standpoint, far behind those in the "Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party on the Imperialist War," which appeared in September, 1914.

THE SPARTAKISTS AND THE C.I.

But if those extracts dealing with the organisational structure of the new International are compared with section 13 of the "Organisation question and the name of the Party," in the Introduction to the first congress of the Communist International, the rapid revolutionary development of the Spartakusbund at the beginning of the war can be fairly well measured. The section runs as follows:

"13. The basis of the Third International is assured by the fact that there already exist in Europe groups and organisations of comrades holding the same principles and employing, on the whole, the same tactical methods. Such are particularly the Spartakists in Germany and the Communist Parties in many other countries.

"14. The Congress must set up a common fighting organ for the purpose of establishing permanent contact and for planned leadership, that is, a centre of the Communist International must be set up, for the interests of the movement in every country are subordinate to the common interests of the revolution internationally."

The history of this suggestion is told by Ernst Meyer:

"The proposal, as comparison with the final text shows, suffered but slight alteration. . . . But as against the final text it had the merit of speaking of the "foundation" and not the "creation" of the new International. This alteration was not accidental, but was suggested by Liebknecht to whom Rosa Luxemburg sent her theses from prison. . . .

Karl Liebknecht was also against the foundation of a new International. He only wanted directions for the "in spite of everything, one and indivisible International."

Unfortunately we have not Rosa Luxemburg's answer to this letter; but from the final form of the theses it appears that Rosa did not consider Liebknecht's criticism to be valid; in particular, the section on international discipline was kept.

In the first national Conference of the international group, which took place in Karl Liebknecht's office on New Year's Day, 1916, the theses were put before the delegates and accepted in principle. . . . The formal agreement to the final text occurred at the March Conference of the Spartakusbund."
("Under the Banner of Marxism," vol. II., E. Mayer: "The Origin of the Junius pamphlet.")

ZIMMERWALD AND KIENTHAL

The Junius theses determined the attitude taken up by the Spartakus delegates, Ernst Meyer and Bertha Thalheimer, at Zimmerwald. This led to a sharp break between the Ledebour crowd and the Spartakists. On most questions the Spartakus delegates supported the left under Lenin's leadership; but

* There is an inconsistency in Rosa's attitude to the organisation of the International and to the split in the S.D.P. Lenin points this out in his criticism of the pamphlet, which reproaches the author with not having stated the inevitability of the split and the connection between opportunism and socialist-jingoism. He writes: "It is an astonishing inconsistency, for in the 12 Thesis of the 'International' mention is directly made of the necessity for a 'new International' . . ." ("Against the Stream," p. 417.)

not on one important question, that of an immediate split and the foundation of the Third International, on which account they did not entirely support Lenin's platform. It was mainly due to the effect of the Junius theses that at Kienthal the differences with the left had grown weaker. On the question of the Centralism of the International, the break with the Ledebour opposition was most marked, a sign of the revolutionary progress that Spartakus had made towards Lenin in the first years of the war. (vide E. Meyer: Introduction to the Spartakus letters, 1.)

But we believe that the irresolution of the Spartakists at Zimmerwald and Kienthal had nothing to do with Rosa Luxemburg's attitude to the foundation of the Third International, and that her position early in 1919 was caused by other motives than those which affected her at Zimmerwald and Kienthal.

While in 1915 Rosa still envisaged the possibility of winning the majority of social-democratic organisations for the new International during the war, and, therefore, rejected the immediate foundation of the Third International (which is apparent in the Junius theses), at the beginning of 1919 its foundation was an obvious necessity.

From all this it can be seen that the attitude of the Spartakusbund and Rosa Luxemburg to the International must not be identified with that of the left radicals—incorrect in principle—before the war to the question of an organisational break with reformism, of splitting the party. This is further proved by Rosa Luxemburg's attitude to the political platform of the inaugural congress of the Communist Party of Poland, which took place on 16th December, 1918, that is, two weeks before that of the C.P.G. Dealing with the International, the programme declared:

"It is only in a few countries that the majority of the Party are definitely and uncompromisingly hostile to the war ideology; in other countries groups are gradually being formed to fight the social patriotic majority. The Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences were the first attempts to organise this opposition. But while the opposition of most did not start from the struggle for peace within capitalist society, among the revolutionary elements the consciousness began to grow. . . , etc.

In this way there arises the Communist International, already active in every country, the International of the social revolution."

In their pamphlet "Communism in Poland," comrades Brand and Valetsky write: "The proposed political programme of the Party which was to be founded, was sent to comrades Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogisches before the inaugural congress met in Warsaw, and met with their unreserved approval."

The criticism of Zimmerwald, which was for Rosa self-scriticism, proves that the revolutionary leader of the German proletariat was at the end of the war completely in agreement with the Bolsheviks on the principles of the International.

* * * * * *

Thus the differences of opinion between the Spartakusbund and Rosa Luxemburg, and the Bolsheviks at the foundation congress of the Comintern were not concerned with principles. Not only the course and results of the world war, but the ten years development of the Communist World Party have shown that, in everything which separated Rosa from Bolshevism, Bolshevism was right. Nevertheless "Luxemburgism," the ideas of the Spartakists are indissolubly connected with the origin and development of the International.

"LUXEMBURGISM"

By "Luxemburgism" we understand, not only its differences from Leninism, but also its determined and irreconcilable struggle against reformism. When over-zealous critics make short work of "Luxemburgism" by calling it "left Menshevism," it indicates an attitude to the Party's part which is suited to anything else rather than to making the development of the Comintern clear to party members, and to explaining, with Leninist criticism, the revolutionary tradition of the C.P.G.

What was Lenin's method? During the war he sharply criticised the Junius theses, and demanded the greatest exertion of efforts towards Marxist development of the young C.P.G., but he thought it quite unnecessary to make a mechanical comparison of the develop-

ment of the party in Russia and Germany, for the simple reason that it would have helped the young party neither to examine its past critically, nor to take that path which was necessary to transplant Leninism into the life of the revolutionary fight in Germany. The fact that Leninism has the uncontested and incontestable leadership in the revolutionary world movement is due not only to the triumph of Bolshevik principles in the Russian revolution, but also to the special conditions under which Bolshevik ideology and organisation grew up in Russia.

"On the other hand, having come into existence on this granite theoretical foundation, Bolshevism went through fifteen years (1903-1917) of practical history which, in fertility of experience, had no equal anywhere else in the world. In no other country during those fifteen years was there anything approximating to such wide revolutionary experience, such a variety and rapidity of shifting forms in the movement—legal and illegal, peaceful and stormy, open and underground, embracing small circles and large masses, parliamentary and terrorist. In no other country, during so short a period of time, has there been concentrated such a multiplicity of forms, shades and methods of struggle, embracing all classes of modern society. To this it must be added that the struggle, maturing with particular rapidity because of the backwardness of the country and the heavy yoke of Tsarism, assimilated eagerly and successfully the latest developments of American and European political experience." ("Left Wing Communism," p. 12.)

Between 1903 and 1917 Bolshevism developed that all-embracing theory, strategy and tactics of the seizure of power as we understand it to-day. And that it had to become the international ideology of the revolutionary proletariat is due to those same causes adduced by Lenin why the Russian workers were the first to seize power. Just as that was no "accident," but a necessary result of diverse and unequal capitalist development, so too, it was no accident that the formation in Germany of a revolutionary Party, in Lenin's sense, took longer than in Russia, and had to tread, and is still treading, a more painful and laborious road.

So, when reviewing the ten years' history of the Communist World Party, one must understand and consider it in its totality. There are defeats as well as victories, in the history of the Comintern. In the critical, and often agonising process of the birth and development of the Comintern, there is reflected the transformation of the oppressed and enslaved proletariat into the ruling class of modern history. Every stage in that history is dear to us, and must be studied carefully by us and particularly by our younger Party comrades, so that, in the next stage, we shall know how to carry out a correct revolutionary policy. At the foundation of the Comintern Bolshevism, Lenin, formed the General Staff of the new army of the proletariat, determined on victory—Spartakus, Rosa Luxemburg, the first revolutionary battalion of Western Europe.

The Formation of the Communist International

J. Fineberg

THE historian of the Communist International, with all the material and documents before him, will be able to record with precision the minor as well as the outstanding events connected with its inception and birth. In these few lines I can only recall from memory the impression I had on the occasion of these historical events.

Looking back on the past ten years, in the endeavour to re-establish in my mind the occurrences of that time, I find that, so crowded with events has the period been, both in and around the Communist International, that its actual inception seems to have receded into the distant past.

I had the good fortune to attend the meeting at which the decision was made to take measures for the creation of the Third Communist International. The picture of that gathering that rises before my mind's eye is one shrouded in gloom. One day in January, 1919, I was informed that the meeting would take place that evening, and was invited to attend. At the hour appointed I went to the Kremlin, and was shown into a vast chamber almost in darkness. In one corner, lit by a single electric lamp, was a table and some chairs screened off from the rest of the room by a rich screen. Out of curiosity I looked behind the screen, and to my astonishment I saw a richly emblazoned canopied bed. It so happened that the consultation before the birth of the Communist International took place in the royal bedchamber of Nicholas the Last.

As far as I can recall, there were only four comrades present at that meeting: Comrades Lenin, Chicherin, Sirola of Finland and myself. We drew up to the table in the corner of the room, and the light from the single lamp seemed only to deepen the shadows around us. On the wall over the table hung the well-known painting of a young girl reclining at the mouth of a cave, reading a book resting on a skull. The whole surroundings seemed to clothe the proceedings in an atmosphere of mystery and portent. Actually, there was no particular secrecy about the matter. A day or two afterwards the decision was broadcast to the world. The gloom is to be explained simply by the fact that Moscow was obliged to economise in electricity in those days. But having arrived in Russia only a few months previously, I was still full of impressions of the revolution and somewhat inclined to take a romantic view of things.

Besides, the matter to be discussed was of outstanding historical significance. The Russian proletariat was struggling to consolidate its power in the midst of the close ring of the counter-revolution. Outside of the ring, in other countries, the proletariat was in revolt against the bourgeoisie, whose power had been shaken. The parties of the Second International, having betrayed the proletariat in the world war, had now openly come out as the saviours of capitalist society and with their own hands were massacring the workers in order to stem the tide of revolution with a rampart of workers' bodies. In Germany the Spartakus-Bund was battling manfully against the forces of the Butcher Scheidemann; in Austria the proletariat was in revolt, and even in England soldiers were in open mutiny. The Social-Democratic Parties and those sections of them which had remained loyal to the principles of international proletarian solidarity were floundering in this maelstrom, unable to control it.

In these conditions comrade Lenin had come to the conclusion that the time had arrived when the work commenced at Zimmerwald and Kienthal must be completed. The Second International was completely exposed. The international proletariat could now have no doubts that it had joined forces with the in-

ternational bourgeoisie to crush the proletarian revolution. They must be called upon once and for all to break with this treacherous organisation and to unite their forces under the banner of a new, revolutionary, international organisation, that would lead them in the struggle successfully commenced by the Russian proletariat for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

It was in this sense that comrade Lenin explained the reasons for convening the meeting. He submitted a draft of the manifesto to be broadcast to the workers of the world, and suggested that it be signed by the representatives of the Russian Party and of the sympathetic foreign parties, who were then in Moscow. After some discussion comrade Lenin's proposal was agreed to. At the same time a draft was accepted of an invitation to be sent to the parties that were in opposition to the Second International to attend the inaugural Congress of the Third International, which it was decided at this meeting to convene in Moscow in March.

Although I had no mandate from my party, the British Socialist Party, to pledge it to the formation of a new International, nevertheless, I signed the manifesto in the name of the party in the conviction that it would approve my action. After expelling the jingo Hyndman and his followers, the British Socialist Party had fought to counteract the war fever among the working class that was fanned by the bourgeoisie aided by their social-democratic lackeys. It had responded to the call of the revolutionary wing of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences, and only the physical impossibility of sending delegates prevented it from being represented at these conferences and supporting the revolutionary wing. On my departure for Russia it had instructed me to express its complete solidarity with the Russian Bolshevik Party. I was convinced that logically it must endorse my action in joining its name to this act of initiating the Third International.

The manifesto and the invitation were broadcast by radio, and in Moscow preparations were proceeded with for the holding of the Inaugural Congress in March.

Unlike subsequent Congresses, the Inaugural Congress, as far as I can remember, took place on, or very near, the appointed date. But also unlike other Congresses, we did not expect, nor did we receive, many delegates from abroad. In fact, the only delegates that I can recall who came directly from abroad were comrade Eberlein, representing the Spartakus-Bund, comrade Rutgers, representing the American Propaganda League and a section of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, and several Finnish comrades. The other foreign parties represented at the Congress were represented by members of those parties then in Moscow.

On the same grounds that prompted me to sign the invitation to the Congress, I took it upon myself to represent the British Socialist Party at the Congress, and subsequent events proved that I was right in doing so. After the First Congress the B.S.P. took the initiative in convening a conference of the revolutionary parties and groups in Great Britain for the purpose of forming a Communist Party. As the outcome of that conference, the Communist Party of Great Britain, which affiliated to the Communist International, was formed.

The main point of discussion at the March Congress was the question as to whether that Congress should indeed be the Inaugural Congress of the Communist International, *i.e.*, whether the International should be declared formed at that Congress, which should be counted as the First Congress, or whether it should be regarded merely as a preliminary conference to discuss the advisability of forming the Communist International. The Russian Communist Party, led by Lenin, and the overwhelming majority of the delegates present were in favour of the immediate inauguration of the International. To the disappointment of all, the representative of the Spartakus-Bund hesitated to cast his vote in favour of this proposal without direct instructions from his organisation, and urged the postponement of a decision until a future conference. This was a serious obstacle, for the Spartakus-Bund was, next to the Russian Communist Party, the largest proletarian organisation actually engaged in the revolutionary struggle. The newly formed Communist International would be far less influential without the affiliation of the fighting

German organisation than if it had it in its ranks.

Long and earnest were the appeals of the other delegates to comrade Eberlein to alter his attitude, but his sense of duty to his organisation would not permit him to budge from his position. Lenin's logic, however, proved to be more sound and far-sighted than that of comrade Eberlein's. He argued that the Spartakus-Bund could not fail to join the Communist International if it were formed. He proposed, therefore, that, notwithstanding comrade Eberlein's reservations, the Third International be formally declared established, firm in the conviction that the Spartakus-Bund and all other revolutionary proletarian organisations would rally to its banner.

This proposal was carried with acclamation by the Congress; the Third International was declared formed, and that gathering was declared to be its First Congress.

Lenin's forecast of the attitude of the revolutionary proletarian organisation in other countries towards the Communist International soon proved to be correct. A little more than a year later the Second Congress was held, and was attended by delegates from all countries, who, in order to reach Moscow, had to break through the barbed wire entanglements with which the bourgeois governments had blockaded Soviet Russia. More than that, the flowing tide of revolution that carried these revolutionary organisations into the Communist International also swept with it the flotsam and jetsam of the disintegrated Second International. But the Second Congress put up a grating in the shape of the Twenty-one Points to keep out undesirable elements, and at subsequent Congresses a good comb was fashioned to comb out such as had managed to penetrate through the grating.

Since it was formed ten years ago, the Communist International has witnessed many arrivals and departures with every rise and fall of the revolutionary tide. But its core, the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, remains steadfast like a rock on the sure foundations that Lenin laid.

THE ENGLISH EDITION of the *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL* (New Style) is published twice monthly.

Subscription rates 8s. per annum in England, $2 per annum in U.S.A., post free through any bookseller.

Ten Years of the "Communist International"

THE celebration of the Comintern is also the celebration of our journal. In March, 1919, the Communist International was founded, and on May 1st of the same year the first number of the "Communist International," the organ of the E.C.C.I. appeared. The editorial and publishing offices were in Smolny, Petrograd, in the one-time centre of the October, the world revolution. At the top of our first number there was printed the manifesto of the inaugural congress of the Comintern "To the proletariat of the whole world," followed by the Executive's manifesto on May Day. For this number Lenin wrote his article, "The Third International; its place in history," in which he proclaimed to the workers of the world, who with hope and anxiety were watching the Russian revolution, threatened on all sides by enemies; "as a new type of State, the Soviet Republic cannot disappear." Zinoviev wrote on the "Prospects of the Proletarian Revolution"; Maxim Gorki wrote an enthusiastic article, "Yesterday and to-day"; Rudas on "The Proletarian Revolution in Hungary." Besides many other articles, the first number also contained most important material on the inaugural congress and the early activity of the C.I., including an appeal to the workers and soldiers of all countries on the Hungarian revolution, greetings to the workers of the Bavarian republic and letters to the Hungarian and Bavarian Communists.

In the first years of the Comintern, the "C.I." was its only regular publication, and had therefore to be its theoretical organ and its vehicle for the publication of Comintern documents. Until the end of 1924, it appeared very irregularly. Up to the end of 1923 only 29 numbers had appeared, containing altogether 7,955 pages. During 1924 it was also found impossible to issue the journal regularly. This began on January 1st, 1925, and from then the paper appeared regularly every month, as had been announced in 1921, after the Third World Congress. The same number which made this announcement also stated that, since the world congress had decided upon a special publication, "International Press Correspondence," the "C.I." would in future be devoted only to questions of theory, tactics, and organisation. The promise made of the regular publication of the "C.I." was not then kept, and this was partly due to the fact that after the appearance of "Inprecorr" the "C.I." was, for a time, pushed rather into the background. The jubilee number which appeared on the fifth anniversary of the Comintern (the double number 31-32 of 1-3-24) and which was partly devoted to Lenin's death, contained a number of contributions concerned with the Comintern celebration (including Zinoviev: The first five years of the Communist International, Klara Zetkin: From the International of words to the International of deeds; Sen Katayama: The Comintern and the Far East, Kuusinen: Under Russia's Leadership) but nothing, not even a notice, on the five years existence of the journal, on its work and tasks.

It was only during the course of the year 1924, so important in the development of the Communist movement, and in connection with the first Trotskyist crisis and the first right danger in the whole Comintern, which aroused the first great and lively discussion on an international scale and indicated the urgency of the need for firm ideological leadership, that the necessity for the regular publication of the "C.I." was apparent. And so from 1st January, 1925, it appeared regularly every month. Apart from the twelve monthly numbers, there was also during that year a special number "Problems of the East."

But it soon became evident that even regular monthly publication was not enough to make the "C.I." a really guiding organ of the C.I. The number of problems, the rapidity of development, and the necessity for fruitful and quick discussion and enlightenment was too great to be met by a monthly journal, and it was decided to make it a weekly publication.

This was done in the autumn of 1926. Since September, 1926, our journal has appeared weekly in the Russian and German languages, and fortnightly in English and French. Weekly publication in the latter two languages is at present impossible because of the small circulations.

THE GREAT INCREASE IN COMINTERN PUBLICATIONS

During the ten years' existence of the Comintern and the "C.I.," the Communist movement and the extent of its propaganda have grown tremendously. To-day the "C.I." is by no means the one theoretical organ of the Communist movement. A number of the Comintern sections—apart, of course, from the C.P.S.U.—have their own theoretical organs, and there are a great many "Communist Reviews" in many countries and tongues. The "Unter dem Banner des Marxismus" ("Under the banner of Marxism") also exists, devoted particularly to theoretical scientific work. But, overlooking this, the development of our journal from irregularity to regular weekly publication shows that, although there has been such growth in the publications of the Comintern, our "C.I." has lost none of its importance. On the contrary, the more the Communist movement progresses, the more varied and urgent its problems, and the greater the amount of periodic and non-periodic literature, the more necessary grows the publication of a central organ for the Comintern, whose task it is to sum up the experiences of the world Communist movement, to review all its work and to direct it, on an international scale, along the lines laid down by the E.C.C.I. In addition, the Russian edition of our journal has to establish contact between the Comintern and the organisations and membership of the C.P.S.U. The leading role of the Party in the country of proletarian dictatorship and in the world party of Communism gives special importance to this aspect of our journal.

After the Russian, the German edition of our "C.I." has the largest circulation. Then, with a big drop come the French and English editions. Considering the huge area to be covered by the English edition, the English "C.I." should have a much larger circulation. The French edition, too, is used for countries where French, while not being the national language, is the one used in connection with the rest of the world. Greater circulation of the French, but more particularly of the English edition, is of the greatest importance from the standpoint of the Comintern's work in countries outside Europe. Our circulation is still far too "European." The development of the Communist movement in Latin America will, within a fairly short time, make a Spanish edition necessary, which will be particularly useful as no theoretical Communist paper is published in the Spanish language.

THE URGENT NEED FOR SYSTEMATIC CO-OPERATION

Obviously the publication of a journal such as ours in more languages, and, so to speak, for the whole world, presents many difficulties. If it is to be the real organ of the E.C.C.I. the editors must be the same for all editions, and must work at the offices of the E.C.C.I. But editing and printing are done in Moscow, Berlin, Paris and London. This, in addition to the long distances to which the "C.I." has to be sent, particularly the English edition, gives rise to many great difficulties of a purely technical nature, which can never be entirely overcome. This only makes still more necessary the utmost possible support of the Comintern sections, not merely by organising an effective system of circulation, but also by providing regular, reliable and prompt co-operation. It is the duty of all Comintern sections and Party writers to see that the "C.I." becomes more international than it is at present. How useful and necessary it is was shown last year on the occasion of the Fourth World Congress. Both in theoretical preparation for the Congress, and in working out its results, our journal did great work, and supplied extremely useful material on all questions dealt with at the Congress. All its work and services in the past prove that, if all Comintern sections and all the comrades concerned were to carry out their duty to our journal properly, it will remain and improve, as the central organ of the Comintern, the leading fighting Leninist journal of the Communist World Party.

Ten Years of Comintern Publications

M. Krepps

THE years of the peak point of the revolutionary wave, 1919 to 1921, did not leave a large amount of literature behind them. Of the far from attractively produced publications of that period the first place was occupied by translations from the Russian of *State and Revolution, The Coming Catastrophe* and *Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?* by Lenin, and later the publications from Smolny, which made their way with difficulty through the cordon of enemies. And these constitute the first slender pamphlets of Bolshevik post-revolutionary publication in the West.

Only rarely preserved, isolated specimens are left to remind us of the first attempts of the press propaganda of the Comintern during the years of civil war. These quite numerous brochures, printed largely on cigarette paper or news paper, and almost on packing paper, in German, French, English, Czech, Roumanian, Greek, Polish and other languages, made their way from hand to hand over thousands of miles, by the most unexpected and tortuous of ways, to those who eagerly awaited them. And did not many of the comrades in Britain, France, Italy receive those little packets of reports and resolutions of the First and Second Congresses, or the first numbers of the "Communist International," rich in their content, and printed on fine silk paper so as to render them easier of concealment?

How great was the demand for literature is evident from the fact that *State and Revolution* was translated in a very brief period into all the widely used languages, as also were the *A B C of Communism,* the *Russian Communist Party Programme,* the *Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R.* When, in 1922, the larger parties began to build up their own legal publications departments, the first books issued found a wide demand, not only among the Party members and the working class but also far beyond their confines. It was not for nothing that the French edition of the theses and resolutions of the Third or Fourth Congress of the Comintern were on sale in all the bourgeois bookshops of North America.

The slogan of "The Struggle for the Masses" and the task of organisational and ideological Bolshevisation demanded that the Comintern and the C.P.'s of the leading capitalist countries should considerably extend their production of literature and should establish literary bases for the theoretical education of Party members.

In 1923 began an unbroken growth of activity, both quantitative and qualitative, in the publication of Communist literature, in spite of the repressions and obstacles of this or that social-democratic, democratic, Fascist or colonial regime.

In its development that growth reflected all the inequality of development of the Communist and revolutionary movement in various countries and all the heterogeneous political-economic and cultural-historic pre-requisites of the class struggle in those countries. In such countries as Germany, where before the war social-democracy had built up a rich Marxist literature, the Communist publishing companies occupied first place, surpassing the traditional social-democratic publishers in the quantity, the realism, the theoretical level and the make-up of the books they published. By occasionally publishing the classic works of Marx and Engels in a revised and mutilated form, the social-democratic publishers only pay tribute to the demands of their own left-wing, which still pretends to be Marxist. In the majority of countries the task of supplying the workers' movement with propagandist and agitational literature naturally lies entirely on the shoulders of the Communists.

The unfailing source for the propagandist activities of the Communist Parties is the continually growing stream of Marxist-Leninist scientific research and scientific publication work, both in the ranks of the larger C.P.'s and, in particular, in the U.S.S.R., a work which is profoundly interesting in its char-

acter and which answers to the primary demands of the international workers' movement.

The Marx-Engels Institute, the Lenin Institute and the Communist Academy give, and promise to give much more, valuable material for translation into the languages of other sections of the Comintern. Already such a gigantic enterprise as the international publication of a complete authoritative edition of the works of Marx and Engels is in process of realisation; already translations in four languages of the thirty volumes of Lenin's works, published in Russian by the Lenin Institute, have seen the light. There is no doubt that the five-volume collection of Lenin's works promised by the Institute will be quickly translated by the Communist publishers into the majority of the written languages.

A selected edition of the works of Marx and Engels would find widespread distribution, and the necessity of such a publication has long since been obvious and has found reflection in the decisions of the Comintern.

An indication of the certainty of their widespread distribution is found in the result of the German revolutionary Marxist publishing company, the Verlag für Literatur und Politik, and the "Marxist Library" already well-known in the International, the first volume of which was issued at the end of 1926. Since that date sixteen little books have been issued, and this library has become a valuable equipment of every active Communist. Since the end of 1927 the "Marxist Library" has been published in France, where eight volumes have been published, and also in Britain, America and Japan; only very recently have publishers in Mexico and the Argentine also begun their publication.

The "Marxist Library" is characteristic of the international level of the Marxist-Leninist theoretical book. In addition to these, and to the agitational brochures and works devoted to special problems of world policy and the workers' movement, no small place in the production of the Communist publishers is occupied by investigations, reports and reminiscent impressions devoted to the struggle and the construction proceeding in Soviet Russia.

Books throwing light on the problems of the Comintern, its decisions, and reports of its Congresses, Plenums and commissions, are appearing to a greater or less extent in all the well-known languages.

Revolutionary novels and memoirs are carving out a broad highway for themselves.

Translations of the works of Lenin occupy quite a separate and incomparable place, both as regards numbers of languages and of editions and issues.

Naturally the publishers have yet much work to do in order to give the international proletariat everything of Lenin's. There is still much leeway to be made up in all spheres.

The number of Marxist manuals which have found or could find international circulation is quite inadequate. The task of working out and popularising the basic problems of Leninism must also be enlarged and developed. The publication of a series of works commenting on the programme of the Comintern is entirely a task for the future.

An extraordinarily small amount has been done so far for the unmasking and the dissection of social-democracy as the agent of the bourgeoisie and a most dangerous enemy of the coming proletarian revolution.

The publication of a series of works devoted to an analysis of the present condition of capitalism is a task of moment.

One of the big tasks of immediate importance is that of making the masses of the C.P.'s familiar with and fixing their attention on colonial problems. The same has to be said of the task of continually illuminating the threatening danger of war.

If there are not a few tasks awaiting the Comintern in the direction of enlarging the character of the productions of the Communist publishers, the number in the field of distribution is still more considerable.

In the work of distributing their productions, the bourgeois ideologists, literateurs and publishers exploit, first and foremost, expert advertising. In the work of distributing Communist propagandist literature the chief weapon is the Party organisation and the entire Party mass with its immediate environment.

Our task is not only to learn to publish well and to publish what is most necessary, but also to ensure its wide distribution. In essence, together with the successes in the task of strengthening the organisational basis of the Party, in the task of winning the trade unions and attracting the unorganised into active struggle, a good test of the degree of Bolshevisation of this or that Party is the level of its achievements in distributing propagandist literature.

Reasons of space prevent one from citing concrete figures, but we can say that in the distribution of propaganda literature Germany holds first place. In that country the Party has succeeded in creating reasonably good machinery and the attention of the Party masses is sufficiently fixed on the necessity of constant theoretical study and on the task of agitation among the non-Party masses with the aid of press material.

The situation is otherwise in France, where, despite the existence of well-organised publishing firms, the Party has not succeeded in appreciably extending the distribution of literature. For the purpose of comparison it is worth mentioning that the Communist publishing firm of the Italian emigrés, also established in France, distributes its literature with much greater success. Whilst it is true that the French worker takes a different attitude towards books from that of the German worker, the fact that the Italians succeed in distributing books in France much more than do the French themselves hardly testifies to the ability of the French Communists to make use of their Party literature and to carry out propaganda on its behalf.

Of the Anglo-Saxon world one can only say that whilst during the last two years considerable successes have been registered by the Communist Marxist publishing firms in Britain, and especially in the United States, in regard to the distribution of literature one very considerable defect has to be put to their debit: the inability (especially of the British) to pass beyond the bounds of their own country, to penetrate into the corners of the colonies and to pour books into the dominions.

One has but to mention that only single copies, not only of Comintern literature, but of theoretical literature generally, find their way into Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and India. It was not without reason that the Communists in Johannesburg decided not to send a comrade in prison the British edition of "Materialism and Empirio-criticism." They were afraid to risk it; there was only one copy in the whole of South Africa. Even though this may be an exaggeration, it is quite a probability.

The situation is considerably more difficult in those sections of the Comintern which have been completely driven underground by the Fascist regime. None the less, certain of these sections have given splendid examples of ability to combine legal and illegal possibilities and tackle the problems of widespread distribution and successful publication of mass propagandist literature.

The colonial and semi-colonial countries are quite a new sphere, and a very fruitful one. Here the neglect of propaganda in the colonial countries, which was the Second International's glittering "virtue," has had heavy consequences. During the past year, the demand from the colonies and semi-colonies for red books has grown appreciably; the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia of India, and of Japan even considerably earlier, the national intelligentsia of the Arabian East are all demonstrating increased interest in Marxism and Leninism, the U.S.S.R. and the Comintern. Of course, the influence of the Chinese revolution and also the wave of emancipation movements of the Arab peoples, as also the growth of the revolutionary movement in India, all have their share in this. The Japanese publishers are issuing—it is true, in a form badly emasculated by the censor—literally everything which the large-scale left-wing publishers in Europe are putting out. In this respect Japan comes before China, which has now lost much of the funds of propagandist literature which were so plentiful during the Wuhan and Canton periods. None the less, despite the ferocity of the Kuomintang reaction, Communist books are still multiplying in China.

The intelligentsia of India are using literature in English, and the C.P. has so far been too weak to create literature comprehensible to

the masses of workers and peasants in even a few of the innumerable tongues which those masses speak. The Communist Party of India is now endeavouring to fill this breach, having instructed a number of comrades to enrich the native languages with an adequate terminology and to translate the chief productions of Marxist literature and the most important documents of the international Communist movement into those languages.

The situation is approximately the same in the East, where the sole published edition of Lenin in Arabian has been a translation of *State and Revolution,* issued by the Wafd publishing firm in Egypt in a translation which is brilliant as literature, but inaccurate as a translation. The publishing problem of the Arabian East is rendered more complicated by the fact that although there is a single Arabian literary script, it is accessible only to the educated sections of the population, as the masses of the various Arabian countries speak separate dialects which are very distinct one from another. Here, as in India and Indonesia, as in South America and Mongolia, as also essentially even in certain European countries, the task consists not only in enriching the languages and translating into them the *18th Brumaire* of Marx or the Programme of the Comintern, but also in the parties themselves creating divisions of their own popularisers, agitators and propagandists, who have been leavened with the yeast of revolutionary Marxist and Bolshevik literature, and who have to create, and are already partially creating, an idiomatic literature for the masses. There are still few such workers in the parties, especially in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, too few mass propagandists who know Arabian or Spanish, Malayan or Mongolian, and can talk to the masses or write for the masses on their most urgent problems in the language of Marx and Lenin, the language of the Comintern.

But the sources are not exhausted, all the forces are not mobilised, the possibilities of those cadres of theoreticians, propagandists and literateurs which the Comintern already has at its disposition and which every day has fresh forces added to them are by no means fully exploited.

One of our most important tasks is to harness all our forces, which are growing up every day in the theoretical and practical school, to know how to find within every party such books and such authors as can be exploited internationally, to compensate for the comparative scarcity of proletarian intellectual workers (writers, artists, translators, etc.) by their international exploitation, to assemble them around the agitation and propaganda committees, and publishing firms, to organise their work.

Another of the many vital tasks of international and national Communist publishing activity is to afford systematic assistance to the Communist publishing firms of all the world, and to conduce to their more active participation in the work of preparing the Communist Parties for the forthcoming battles.

PUBLISHED BY MODERN BOOKS,
LTD., 26 BEDFORD ROW, W.C.1, AND
PRINTED BY DORRIT PRESS (T.U.)
68-70, LANT STREET, S.E.1, ENGLAND.