

July, 1939

The **Communist**

International

Vol. XVII

No. 7 1939

Sixpence

**From the Bourgeois to the
Proletarian Revolution**

Terror in Spain

L. MARTIN

**The Significance of
Lenin's and Stalin's Teaching
on the State**

KURT FUNK

**The Great Bourgeois
Revolution in France and
German Intellectual Life**

P. DENGEL

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. XVII No. 7

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

VOL. XVI

JULY, 1939

No. 7

CONTENTS

Editorials

From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution	723
Twenty-Five Years Ago—And Today	730
The Colonial Agitation of German Fascism	733
Opening a Conversation	736
Under the Leadership of the Reactionary Bourgeoisie	738
“Leaders” Who Don’t Believe in Victory	741
Modigliani, the Attorney of Anti-Communism	744

Theory and Practice of the Labor Movement

Terror in Spain	L. MARTIN	747
The Significance of Lenin’s and Stalin’s Teaching on the State for the International Working Class	KURT FUNK	752
The Great Bourgeois Revolution in France and Ger- man Intellectual Life	P. DENGEL	763
The Tasks of the Anti-Japanese National United Front	BO GU	773

In the Soviet Union

The Rise of the Free Soviet Peoples	A. DUVAL	779
---	--------------------	-----

From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution

ONE hundred and fifty years ago the people of France arose to sweep away a rotten social system. The blows of the bourgeoisie and the peasants, the workers and intellectuals smashed the rule of the nobility whose narrow, crumbling structure deprived the newly arising world of the light and air it required for its development.

When, on July 14, 1789, the Bastille, that gloomy state prison in Paris, was stormed by the popular masses and broken open, when the prisoners came up from the dark dungeons into the light of day, everyone felt the symbolical meaning of this event. The Bastille of the nobility's rule had collapsed; the peasant serfs, the townsmen fettered by tariff barriers, guild regulations and aristocratic despotism came up out of the dark vaults of the old feudal order into the light of day to build a new society.

During the night of August 4, all feudal privileges were abolished by decision of the National Assembly. Like withered leaves, serfdom, feudal jurisdiction, peasant contributions to the landed property of church and nobility, the aristocrats' monopoly of all offices in the state and the army, of appointments and sinecures, the barriers between the separate estates, the innumerable special rights, the corrupt justice aimed against the people, the feudal and guild restrictions were all swept onto the garbage heap of history, all those privileges and institutions whose unimpeachability was the dogma of the ruling class.

In their place were proclaimed the *rights of man* and the *equality of all citizens* was recognized. A new society,

bourgeois society, matured in the womb of the old feudal order, was born. The force of the people's revolution was its midwife. The burning castles of the noble oppressors of the peasantry lit up its young countenance. Tocsins and revolutionary songs greeted it. Heroic fighters for freedom defended it against the powers of the past. Armed revolts sang it an unforgettable lullaby.

Today, to be sure, the bourgeoisie takes pains to deny its revolutionary origin. Emerged from the revolutionary overthrow of old relations of domination the bourgeoisie has itself become old and reactionary. The bourgeoisie which erected its social order in tremendous class struggles against the feudal lords curses the proletarian class struggle. Having gone to the barricades for freedom and progress, they now seek to strangle freedom and prevent progress. The bourgeoisie, which preached the war for freedom against all oppressors, strangled Spanish democracy and received the Spanish fighters for freedom with the butt of a gun and barbed wire. The bourgeoisie, which proclaimed the right to revolt, in the name of "law and order" now sics its bloodhounds on the oppressed who defend their human rights.

Today the class rule of the bourgeoisie weighs heavily upon the nations as did once the class rule of the feudal nobles, paralyzing, strangling, spreading the pestilent breath of putrefaction. Capitalism which tore down dungeons 150 years ago and freed the road for human development is today the worst dungeon and the worst obstacle to human development. Today, cadaverous odor and corruption, degeneration and crime rise

from the musty vaults of capitalism as they once did from the musty vaults of feudalism. Like feudalism in its time, capitalism has become putrefied.

This *decadence of the bourgeoisie* finds its crassest expression in the fascist system of domination. The most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie, whose open terroristic dictatorship is *fascism*, have proclaimed unrelenting war against the heirs of the bourgeois democratic revolution. The fascist leaders describe as their "historic" task the destruction of all achievements of the French Revolution, the abolition of all that the French Revolution has given to the world.

The Hitlers and Mussolinis, the Goebels and Rosenbergs have often declared that their struggle is directed in the first instance against the ideas of August 4, 1789, that it is their "mission" completely to extirpate these ideas, to tear out of the book of history everything that suggests freedom, equality and democracy. Alfred Rosenberg, the "ideologist" of German fascism, has more than once declared himself in solidarity with the feudal lords, the oppressors of the peasants and those who despised the burghers, and who emigrated from France in 1789 in order to plot war against its people. He has glorified the French feudal lords, these corrupt idlers, bloodsuckers and traitors to the country, as the "last representatives of the Nordic race of nobles" in France, and he has represented the victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution, the victory of the French burghers and peasants, as the "racial decline" of France.

There is not a serious historian who dares to deny or excuse the dreadful dissipation of the feudal lords who pillaged France until 1789; even the arch-reactionary Prussian historian Sybel, who approaches the French Revolution with nothing but hatred and lack of understanding, has asserted in his *History of the Revolutionary Period*:

"It was only a vanishing minority of the large proprietors who concerned themselves with their estates and their

inhabitants. Anyone who could hurried to the pleasures of the Court or the capital and only returned to his estate in order to replenish his purse emptied in debauchery. There they lived in niggardly and grubbing retirement . . . shunned by the peasants as inexorable creditors. . . . Of intellectual interest there was as little as of agricultural activity. . . . The number of exceptions to this lamentable rule was so small that they exerted no influence on the condition of the country."

And, for the fascist Rosenberg, this rabble is the flower of the "Nordic race of nobles"; in their name he blusters against the French Revolution!

There are good grounds for the German fascist fraternization with the ghosts of the old feudal lords and their recognition in them of models and fore-runners. The conditions produced by fascism have many similarities with the conditions prior to the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The decaying capitalism which the fascists defend has many similarities with decaying feudalism; no matter how basically capitalism is differentiated from feudalism, they are alike in their putrefaction. In the description of a historian we read:

" . . . how, according to this system, the state interferes in everything, how no community dare rebuild a fallen church spire, improve a damaged parsonage, a bad road, a dilapidated bridge, without having to await magisterial approval for a couple of years."

This description is found in Häusser's *History of the French Revolution*, but it could just as well have been taken from the reports of a fascist country. We read a complaint concerning the authorities in which it says:

"The entire faulty appointment to these offices, the uncertainty of the jurisdictional limits and competence, the surplus of offices. . . . They favor the encroachments of the small despots, they are shunned by public opinion and must be suppressed because they are incompatible with the well-being, freedom and dignity of the people."

Is this an outcry against fascist officialdom? No, it is a paragraph from the book of grievances of the Third Estate of Rennes before the French Revolution. We read a summary of the general demands of the people:

“Unanimously they long for the institution of a constitutional state of justice. . . . Guarantees for security of person and of property, freedom of the press, inviolability of letters, responsibility of the ministers, equal distribution of taxes. . . .”

These demands of a people are not taken from an anti-fascist document of today, but from the book of grievances of the Third Estate before the French Revolution. We read on:

“The whole state apparatus is mercilessly condemned; no warrant of arrest, no state prisons, no secret police, no extraordinary courts, no arbitrary arrests, no secret trials. . . . That is what is heard on all sides.”

In fascist Germany or Italy? No, in feudal France before the bourgeois-democratic revolution!

You can understand the hatred of the fascists for a revolution which raised and realized such demands, demands which today are once more a stirring actuality. One can understand this hatred so much better if one visualizes the nature of the *proclamation of the rights of man*, that proclamation in which it says that all men are free and equal, that all men have the right to resist oppression, that all sovereignty arises from the people. Every word of this proclamation is an accusation against fascism, an accusation against the reactionary bourgeoisie which denies this document of its ascent to power. One can understand the rage of the fascists when from the demands of the city of Paris these words stare them in the face:

“We order our representatives who come to exercise the sovereign rights of the nation to unyieldingly resist everything which might trample upon the dignity of free citizens. . . . The nation

alone can grant taxes, it has the right to determine their amount, to fix their duration, to indicate their purpose, to order an accounting thereon and to draw up their imposition. . . . The natural, civil, religious freedom of every man, his personal security, his complete independence of any authority whatsoever, other than that of the law, preclude every inquiry into his opinions, speeches, writings and actions so long as they do not disturb public order and encroach upon another’s rights.”

One can imagine with what feelings the fascists hear the words with which on April 24, 1793, Robespierre demanded the extension of human and civil rights, his demands being summed up in four articles:

“Article I. The people of all countries are brothers and the different nations must help each other according to their abilities just like the citizens of one and the same state.

“Article II. He who oppresses a nation thereby declares himself the enemy of all nations.

“Article III. Those who bring war upon a nation in order to prevent the progress of freedom and in order to destroy the rights of man must be fought by all other nations not as ordinary enemies but as murderers and rebellious brigands.

“Article IV. The kings, the aristocrats and the tyrants, to whatever nation they may belong, are revolting slaves against the sovereign of the earth, the human race, and against the lawgiver of the universe, nature. . . .”

Against all these ideas of the French Revolution, the fascists rise as “murderers and rebellious brigands.” They hate and fear these ideas that continue to live, though already 150 years ago the bourgeoisie was neither willing nor able to realize them. But they oppose as mortal enemies not only the ideas but also the real achievements of the bourgeois-democratic revolution: they wish again to transform the toilers into bondsmen and serfs, to destroy democratic rights and freedom of the press, to nullify the freedom of assembly and the right to combination, to replace the

sovereignty of the nation with the leader principle, to abolish the principle of equality of all citizens, to make state prisons and secret police, extraordinary courts, and arbitrary arrests the basis of the regime, and to impose all-powerful authorities upon subjects without rights. In the countries where they rule they have carried all this through; now they wish to impose this system also upon the other countries.

Just as 150 years ago the reactionary powers of Europe formed a "holy alliance" against the French Revolution and conjured up a world war, so today the fascist powers wish to destroy the freedom of all nations and to transform the world into one solitary prison.

And just as that time the partisans of the French counter-revolution became traitors and supported the mortal enemies of their country, so today the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie in France, England and other countries are ready to conspire with the fascist aggressors against their own people.

And just as then the counter-revolution sent its agents into the revolutionary camp where they masqueraded in part as especially radical and drowned the clinking of the foreign coin with noisy phrases, so today also the counter-revolution pays its agents in the camp of the democratic and proletarian movement.

And just as then it was impossible to prevent the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution over decaying feudalism, so also now the victory of the *democratic forces over fascism, the victory of the socialist forces over capitalism is irresistible.*

The bourgeois-democratic revolution was victorious because it was the struggle of the new, forward-surging productive forces whose development was hampered by feudalism, the struggle of the young capitalist mode of production against an obsolete self-sufficing economy, the struggle of a rising social class capable of development, the bourgeoisie, against a declining feudal nobility clinging to the past. Feudal relations with

their estates and guilds, their customs barriers and privileges, their stationary character and serfdom had become too narrow for the productive forces that had sprung up within their confines; they had to be burst asunder and they were burst asunder.

"All stable and stereotyped relations with their attendant train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions are swept away, and the newly formed becomes obsolete before it can petrify. All that has been regarded as solid crumbles into fragments; all that was looked upon as holy, is profaned; at long last, people are compelled to gaze open-eyed at their position in life and their social relations." (Marx and Engels: *The Communist Manifesto*, p. 29.)

The society of free and equal of which the most consistent and noblest Jacobins dreamed did not emerge from the bourgeois-democratic revolution because the economic basis for such a society was at that time wanting. The petty bourgeois and proletarians who gave their blood for the revolution on the barricades and at the fronts of the war for freedom could not be the real victors, though through the overthrow of feudalism they also opened their own road to the future; the real victor was that class which held command over the decisive means of production of the new society: the bourgeoisie. *Capitalism* emerged victorious from the bourgeois-democratic revolution and achieved stupendous accomplishments which nevertheless contained within them the germ of decay.

Capitalism has increased the productive forces enormously. It has enriched mankind with basic inventions and discoveries. It has brought countries and continents closer together, broken through the barriers of self-contained cultural spheres and has laid the foundation for an all-embracing human culture. It has hastened the tempo of development to an unprecedented extent and has given the masses of the people the possibility to combine, to organize, and to participate consciously and actively in events.

Nonetheless, it has once more con-

demned the overwhelming majority of mankind to misery and servitude in favor of a small minority. It has instituted a new, relentless class rule and has called into being new unheard-of class struggles. It has indeed largely harnessed the forces of nature, enormously increased the wealth of material and cultural possessions and awakened the broadest masses of the people to social consciousness; at the same time, however, it has revealed its complete incapacity planfully to organize economic life and to subordinate the productive forces to human reason and to the human will.

And just as feudal production and property relations were gradually transformed into fetters upon production and had to be torn asunder to permit the further development of the productive forces, so is now the case with the capitalist property and production relations.

“Bourgeois conditions of production and communication; bourgeois property relations, modern bourgeois society, which has conjured up such mighty means of production and communication—these are like a magician who is no longer able to control the spirits his spells have summoned from the nether world. . . . The productive forces . . . have grown too powerful for these relations, they are hampered thereby. . . . The bourgeois system is no longer able to cope with the abundance of the wealth it creates.” (Marx and Engels: *The Communist Manifesto*, pp. 32-33.)

This growing inner contradiction of the capitalist mode of production has led to the *transformation of capitalism from a driving force of development into an obstacle to development*, to its putrefaction. A new revolution has become necessary and unavoidable to eliminate dying capitalism and to subordinate the forces of production to the reason and the will of the whole of society.

Just as 150 years ago the nations of Europe were threatened with suffocation because the main producers were peasants bound by serfdom to the land and backward artisans restricted by the guilds, so today the nations of the world

are threatened with suffocation because the main producers are proletarian wage slaves.

As at that time salvation and progress only consisted in the fact that capitalism shook off all fetters and transformed the serfs into wage workers, free to move about and standing on a higher level of culture, so today salvation and progress can only consist in the taking over by society as a whole of the means of production, of truly free and equal people satisfying human requirements by means of their social production and producing social wealth in ever growing measure.

The *working class*, the largest, most powerful class, most capable of development in modern society, is destined to replace the reactionary, ossified bourgeoisie clinging to the past just as once the bourgeoisie replaced the feudal nobility.

In order to prevent this necessary development and to maintain dying capitalism, the reactionary bourgeoisie has appropriated the maxim represented by the feudal nobility before the bourgeois democratic revolution: “After us the deluge! May everything go to wrack and ruin, after us; may everything sink into barbarism—as long as we still have this day and hour!” The reactionary bourgeoisie is determined to give up everything that the bourgeois-democratic revolution brought into the world in the way of general human progress, freedom and culture only to save capitalism in its most hideous shape from unavoidable decline.

The reactionary bourgeoisie no longer wishes to know anything about the banners and bright sails with which it once sailed out upon the sea of history; it only wishes to preserve the treasures in the hold of the rotting ship, treasures which do no one any good, which are kept from the masses of humanity. It no longer wants to hear anything about the human rights which it once proclaimed, about the democratic achievements, the soaring hopes, of its past revolution. And in place of the Bastille which it tore down, it is erecting the

new frightful Bastille of its open terrorist dictatorship.

In the struggle against this betrayal by the bourgeoisie it is the *working class which defends the achievements of the bourgeois-democratic revolution*. Against the fascist dictators and their reactionary allies in the other countries the working class defends the civil liberties of bourgeois democracy; it defends freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, the right to organize; it defends the peasant's right to the product of his toil and the means of subsistence of the urban middle classes; it defends the freedom of thought and of science; it defends the right to vote of citizens and the right of self-determination of nations.

But at the same time the working class fights for the realization of those exalted dreams of humanity which the boldest and most consistent men of the bourgeois-democratic revolution had in mind without being able to realize them. The human rights which were proclaimed in 1789 were not realized by capitalism but were trampled in the dust. Sneeringly it turned away from the demands which Robespierre summarized on February 5, 1794 in the following beautiful words:

"We want to put morality in place of egoism, principles in place of habits, the rule of reason in place of the slavery of tradition, the scorn of vice in place of the scorn of misfortune, the desire for fame in place of greed for money. Upright people in place of 'good society'; truth in place of luster, greatness of men in place of the abjectness of the great, an exalted powerful, victorious and happy people."

Capitalism could and would not fulfill these demands.

"We know today," Friedrich Engels writes in *Anti-Duehring*, "that this kingdom of reason was nothing more than the idealized kingdom of the bourgeoisie; that eternal justice found its realization in bourgeois justice; that equality reduced itself to bourgeois equality before the law; that bourgeois

property was proclaimed as one of the essential rights of man; and that the government of reason, the social contract of Rousseau came into existence and could only come into existence as a bourgeois democratic republic." (p. 24.)

Nevertheless, the dream of human rights has not disappeared. The working class has picked it up and transformed it into reality in its state, in the socialist Soviet Union. Just as the cultural heritage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution lives on and is further developed in socialism, so many of the unfulfilled demands and hopes of the bourgeois-democratic revolution are realized for the first time in socialism.

The society of truly free, truly equal people stands before us in the shape of the socialist Soviet Union. The new socialist human rights are anchored in the Stalin constitution of the Soviet Union, guaranteed by the socialist economic system, by the socialist society: the right to work, the right to education, the right to rest.

The noble demand for the unity of the people, for the fraternity of nations has been realized in the political and moral unity of the Soviet people, in the fraternal union of all Soviet nations. The exalted, powerful, victorious and happy people, which Robespierre envisioned, today bears the features of the great and free Soviet people.

The Jacobins had to fail because in their fight they went beyond the limits of the production relations. The Bolsheviks through socialization of the means of production have immeasurably extended the boundaries of the production relations and thereby have given the ideas of humanity of 1789 the basis which they need for their realization.

The reactionary bourgeoisie seeks to undo the "sins of its youth," the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The working class defends the positive achievements of this revolution against the degenerate descendants of the men of 1789, against the fascist aggressors and the reactionary traitors to the country. In this struggle, it marches toward the proletarian revolution in order to real-

ize the socialist human rights all over the world and to create an exalted, powerful, victorious and happy human race. The socialist Soviet Union stands as its model in this struggle.

One hundred and fifty years ago the French people placed themselves at the head of humanity. *Today the great, glorious Soviet people stands at the head of humanity.*

Twenty-Five Years Ago—And Today

TWENTY-FIVE years ago humanity was confronted with the greatest crime in the history of the world. The imperialist World War was let loose upon the nations by a gang of power-hungry and money-greedy capitalists.

Despotism stood opposed to despotism, injustice to injustice, force to force. Dealt short during the partition of the world, the German imperialists wanted to seize central Europe, conquer the Balkans, bring the Near East under their influence, subjugate the Ukraine and entrench themselves on the banks of the Black Sea. The Russian imperialists wanted to enlarge the decayed tsarist empire, demolish Turkey and occupy the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. The French imperialists wanted to regain Alsace-Lorraine and insure their hegemony over Europe. The English imperialists wanted to repulse their German competitors and round out and consolidate their world empire.

Some small nations like the Serbians waged a war of national liberation; but this could not change the predatory imperialist character of the war as a whole. This war was concerned not with freedom and democracy, not with the defense of nations against an aggressor threatening their national independence, not with "ideological fronts," to apply a current catchword; it was concerned only with the barely disguised claims to power and possessions of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the "Central European Powers" and the "Entente." It was nothing but lies and deceit when the English and French bourgeoisie tried to delude people into believing that they had entered the war for the protection of western democracy against German militarism, or when the German bourgeoisie shamelessly asserted that it was guarding liberty against tsarist barbar-

ism. When the peoples of Russia cast off the yoke of tsarism and capitalism, the imperialists of the Central Powers and of the Entente fought shoulder to shoulder against the Russian Revolution.

The first mortal victim of the World War was the Second International. The Social-Democratic leaders in France and in England, in Germany and Austria, renounced all trace of internationalism and placed themselves at the disposal of "their" imperialist bourgeoisie. They split the international working class and concluded a "civil peace" with the imperialist bourgeoisie in order to drag the workers into the imperialist war of conquest.

Only the Bolsheviks opposed the imperialist bourgeoisie with determination, *only the Party of Lenin and Stalin* mercilessly exposed the imperialist, robber character of the war and set up as a goal for the proletariat in each country the defeat and overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war and revolution, and the abolition of capitalism, the source of the war. A few brave and unswerving internationalists in other countries, like Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, adopted a similar position and opposed the imperialist robbers and their war, even though without Lenin's clarity and consistency. Through their struggle against the imperialist war and the bloody split of the working class, the Bolsheviks laid the foundation stone for a new, genuine unity of the proletariat, for a new indestructible international.

The war ended with the defeat of the Central Powers, with the victory of the working class in Russia and with the ruin of the peoples of all other countries.

The wretched, the bleeding, the hungry and epidemic-infested peoples cried out

for a new world, for the destruction of those responsible for the war, for the realization of a social order capable of guaranteeing peace, freedom and culture. On one-sixth of the earth, this wish of the peoples was fulfilled; capitalism was abolished under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Socialism was realized and therewith freedom, peace and culture were guaranteed. In the other countries, the working class did not succeed in achieving the victory of socialism. The same Social-Democratic leaders who, in the service of "their" imperialist bourgeoisie, brought about the bloody split in the international working class, placed themselves once more at the disposal of this bourgeoisie and opposed the revolutionary workers with honeyed words and bloody weapons.

In Germany, Austria, Italy and other countries there was no firm and monolithic party, tested in battle, at the head of the revolutionary workers, such as the Party of Lenin and Stalin which, through its bold, correct and consistent policy, was able to beat the agents of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the labor movement and to win the majority of the working class. The Social-Democratic agents of the bourgeoisie in Germany, Austria, Italy and other countries retained the upper hand and prevented the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution; more than that, they even prevented the full development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The large landowners and big capitalists whose property they defended against the revolutionary masses, the generals and officers with whom they united against the revolution, the bloodhounds which they let loose against the workers, were the fascist explosive in the foundation of the bourgeois-democratic republic.

During the days and years in which the Social-Democratic leaders, standing shoulder to shoulder with the reactionary bourgeoisie, strangled the proletarian revolution at its inception, *the road was cleared for the second imperialist world war.*

The World War came to an end but

imperialism remained. In those countries where imperialism got the worst of it, it assumed an especially aggressive character. In these countries it bred fascist gangs of murderers with whose aid it destroyed democracy and compelled the people, by means of silent forced labor, to forge the weapons of a new war.

German, Italian and Japanese imperialism have set themselves the goal, not only of compelling a forcible redivision of the world but also of putting an end to all liberty in the world and of bringing about the unrestricted barbaric rule of a small clique of capitalists over the entire globe. The struggle of the German, Italian and Japanese imperialists for world rule is at the same time a campaign of destruction against the democratic liberties of all nations, no matter how limited and slight they may be.

The aggression of the fascist states has started a second imperialist world war. This war would have begun sooner and would have been long since transformed into an unimaginable world slaughter had there not been a powerful force for peace in the world that did not as yet exist in 1914: the socialist Soviet Union.

In fact, the nations owe it exclusively to the existence and policy of the Soviet Union that the second imperialist war has not until now become a world war and that the possibility still exists of preventing the threatening world war.

The existence of the Soviet Union, a powerful state, in which the socialist revolution has been victorious, and in which socialism is gradually passing into communism, places serious obstacles in the path of the imperialists. The victorious socialist revolution that arose out of a world war does not merely confront them as a fearful premonition of the future but as a gigantic reality. And this gigantic reality confronts not only the imperialists but the people too, gives them courage to oppose aggression and lends them confidence and self-reliance.

The policy of the Soviet Union was and is a unique and indefatigable service

for peace. It opposes the aggressors with utmost determination. It helps the assaulted nations that defend their independence. With unswerving consistency, it tries to erect a real peace front, strong enough to call a halt to all further aggression. In contrast to the rapacious outrages of the fascist aggressors and as differentiated from the deceptive maneuvers of the reactionary ministers of the non-aggressive bourgeois states, only the policy of the Soviet Union embodies the elementary desires of the nations and the profoundest wishes of all honest friends of peace.

We no longer live in the world of 1914. Today there is a Soviet Union, the powerful state of victorious socialism, which does not threaten any people and any state, to whom all oppression and conquest are alien, and whose policy unreservedly embodies the people's will for peace. Today there are states like France, England and the U.S.A. whose bourgeoisie wish to maintain the status quo for whatever selfish reasons and strive to prevent a world war. And today there are states like Germany, Italy and Japan whose imperialism is not simply a continuation of 1914, but which has assumed the frightful character of a destroyer of all freedom, culture and human dignity. If it could attain victory, this fascist imperialism would bring about the decline of humanity into barbarism.

This fascist imperialism which threatens the independence and national existence of all peoples was and is in any case *unequivocally and incontestably the aggressor*. It has unequivocally and incontestably attacked Ethiopia, Spain, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Albania. It and it alone has unequivocally

and incontestably unleashed the second imperialist world war. It and it alone is to blame for the inability of the nations to continue to live in peace and for the fact that, day in and day out, the world war is knocking at the gate.

In face of this aggression by the fascist states, it is not enough to chatter about peace and to cry as often as possible: "Down with war!" In face of this fascist aggression, it is deceiving the nations to tell them that peace may be saved by yielding and making concessions to the aggressor; it is a betrayal of the nations to tell them that it is best not to defend oneself against the aggressor. *Today, only one thing can save peace: the establishment of a peace front so strong and firm that the fascist aggressor can foresee his certain doom in case of a new attack.* Only thus and in no other way can peace be saved. Every other road leads to world war.

In 1914, only the Bolsheviks showed the nations clearly, resolutely and consistently the way out. This persecuted illegal party was unable to prevent the war, but it was able to end it with the revolution. Every one who honestly wanted peace placed himself at its side.

Now again, the Bolsheviks are the ones who clearly, resolutely and consistently show the nations the way out. But today they speak in the name of the most powerful state in the world, the socialist Soviet Union. *And today the war can be prevented if the international working class energetically and uniformly opposes the fascist aggressors and their reactionary accomplices, if all who honestly desire peace place themselves unreservedly on the side of the Soviet Union.*

The Colonial Agitation of German Fascism

IN THE months of May and June, two organizations which are among the most important instruments of fascism held their congresses. The functionaries of the "Reich Colonial League" assembled in Vienna; the "German Institute for Foreign Countries" met in Stuttgart. Authoritative persons of the fascist leading circle participated in both congresses. These conventions served to test the state of fascist undermining—work in those countries whose undermining is of strategic importance to fascism. They gave the activity of the agents of German fascism abroad new emphasis and its next objectives.

That the "Reich Colonial League" deliberately assembled at Vienna is an indication of the role that annexed Austria plays in Germany's European colonial empire. The selection of Vienna as the meeting place was supposed to be symbolical of the fact that German fascism has set itself two colonial tasks which are not supposed mutually to exclude but rather supplement each other.

"Inland colonization" means in fascist vocabulary the annexation of hitherto independent countries in Europe and their exploitation by German imperialism. This "inland colonization" is supposed to constitute the foundation for overseas colonization. What fascism takes away in energy from the oppressed nations of Europe who have lost their independence is supposed to enable it to achieve additional goals, is supposed to enhance its weight on the European continent as against England and France, and is to become decisive for the negotiations on the redistribution of the colonial possessions in favor of German fascism. Under the rule of fascism, the labor power of the German people has

been harnessed in the service of the most unscrupulous imperialist policy of conquest. The natural resources and the labor power of the European colonial and semi-colonial countries of Germany, according to the plan of fascism, now have the task to increase this potential force, aside from the immediate strategic importance which the possession or the dependence of certain countries have for the realization of its plans of expansion.

Rear Admiral Raeder, who spoke at Stuttgart, emphasized the value of the "German Institute for Foreign Countries" as a center for the many-sided activity of the fascist foreign agents. That the chief of the German navy took this occasion also to speak of the "political task" before the German navy is evidence of the deliberateness with which the fascist regime is employing all its auxiliaries to prepare for further imperialist expansion. The units and vessels of the navy and merchant marine of Germany are mobile propaganda centers of fascism which attempt to bring the necessary support to the outposts of colonial expansion, to the commercial enterprises and the organizations of the "Germans abroad."

The "dynamics" which Germany often and eagerly displays as its specific feature is also active in its struggle for colonial possessions. Nothing would be more false and therefore more dangerous than the assumption that the colonial policy of German fascism confines itself to demanding officially and directly the return of the former German colonial possessions within a period suitable to it. That the "return" and the granting of "satisfaction" represent only part of Germany's imperialist demands has been

recently stated with sufficient clarity in the publications and speeches of the specialists on German colonial policy. The danger for world peace which lies in the German colonial claims does not confine itself to the fact that one day one may be confronted by carefully formulated German demands; it lies in the comprehensive colonial undermining work now in process and which is preparing the ground for greater onslaughts.

Many branches of this manifold activity have already become such an everyday phenomenon that they may develop further, undisturbed by public attention. Relatively little is said about the intensive undermining work in South Africa and Tanganyika, for example, outside of the circle of those immediately affected. Recently, however, the German radio has indicated what importance German imperialism attaches to the activity of its agents in these territories; it established a regular propaganda and news service in Afrikaans, the language of the South African Boers. The propaganda of German fascism has therewith gone a substantial step further than heretofore. It attempts to directly influence the Boers in order to win them directly as an aid for the German imperialist colonial interests.

But that is only one of the visible threads of the far-flung net of Germany's colonial undermining work.

At the end of May, English newspapers drew attention to the attempts of the former Reichsbank president Schacht to establish new connections for fascism in India. This representative of a state power, which in Europe has annexed mighty industrialized countries like Austria and Czechoslovakia and whose industries are being systematically reduced to mere appendages and auxiliary tools, appeared in India as a missionary of a power which ostensibly is interested in the technical development of India and in raising the living standards of its inhabitants. Schacht thereby embodies a further side of the fascist foreign apparatus whose specific tasks consist in the slipping in of Germany in such places of the British Em-

pire which may become important for weakening English influence and for disorganizing communications within this empire.

Schacht is not the only one on the road as a traveling salesman. Besides the personal visits of fascist ministers like Goebbels to Egypt, the extended trips abroad of fascist "journalists" serve highly effective purposes. Schwarz von Berk of the Berlin *Angriff* traveled about in Egypt, Singapore, Hong Kong, Australia, and other parts of the British sphere of influence during the past year and a half, certainly less for the purpose of using this trip for articles which are to serve for colonial propaganda among the German people than rather primarily for reconnoitering and cultivating connections for German fascism.

If in estimating the perspectives of German expansion policy it is often pointed out that fascism will lack real power to achieve such far-flung and ramified objectives, yet it should not be underestimated that this undermining work, chaotic and vast as it may at first appear, is subordinated to a relatively purposeful imperialist policy of conquest. Fascism fans many little flames in order to manacle the forces of its opponents. It speculates on confusing and disorganizing the forces of its opponents by means of its manifold attacks and intrigues. Finally, it speculates on the inclination of reactionary elements of the ruling classes of other nations to purchase the use of a part of its possessions by concessions to the fascist disturber of the peace. In order to extort concessions in Europe, it temporarily assumes the appearance as if its interests are limited to Europe, or even only to parts of Europe. This does not prevent it, at the same time, from pressing and boring at vulnerable places in overseas areas, in the expectation of getting concessions in Europe all the sooner. In the last analysis, however, the European possessions which German fascism extorts, gets underhandedly and annexes, are always considered only as strengthening the foundation from which to wage the struggle for domination overseas.

This explains the two-sidedness of the task which the imperialist German colonial policy has set itself. This is the relation which the so-called "inland colonization" and the colonial claims overseas have to one another. They are parts of one and the same expansion plan of German imperialism which is directed toward conquest of "living space." "Living space" is the pseudonym for imperialist colonial exploitation by fascist methods. "German living space" is, as the *Angriff* wrote June 10, 1939,

not a Central European or European affair, but a "world affair."

This certainly makes it clear that a rebuff to German fascist aggressions, subduing the imperialist expansion drive and the salvation of general peace has likewise become a world affair. It must become the common cause of all the forces that are directly or indirectly threatened by the German expansion drive and directly or indirectly are already exploited by it.

Opening a Conversation

THE German fascist press explicitly greeted the attitude displayed by Bevin, the British trade union leader, at the annual meeting of the Labor Party. It found his "demand for concessions on the colonial question" just as noteworthy as Faure's plan to "prevent war under all circumstances" by "economic concessions." The groups around Bevin in England and Faure in France appear all the more sympathetic to the German fascist press inasmuch as they carry on a particularly intensive incitement against the Soviet Union. For all these reasons, German fascism wishes to carry on "conversations" with them. It expects to get so much out of this that, again and again in its publications, it found it advisable to go into the points of contact that exist between the two partners.

The *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which was shoved forward for sounding out and greeting purposes, was followed by the *Berliner Börsenzeitung*, which wrote about an "anti-fascist blood-poisoning" of the French Socialists and the English labor movement. Taking their cue from Bevin and Faure, the mouthpiece of German finance capital behaved deliberately, like a guardian angel which was warning the British and French workers against the English Tory and French capitalist and chauvinist. Hitherto not one of the great international questions have been solved by "the purely negative policy of anti-fascism," this paper wrote and quite plainly extended a feeler toward that camp in the Socialist and Labor International and in the International Federation of Trade Unions which, in the name of international "appeasement," are in favor of bold concessions to the aggressor states.

Goebbels himself came into the scene

and threw a few bouquets at Bevin and Faure, expecting that the continuation of this play will first paralyze the defensive power of the international working class and later produce very tangible material results for German fascism. In this rose-colored light of the theater, German fascism approaches the little rose-colored banner of the capitulators in the Second International and illuminates the painted sky of "Agreement" which Bevin, Faure, Spaak, Ilg, Stauning & Co. have erected with plans of a "distribution of raw materials," and the like. "Lack of insight," "obstinacy," "defiance" and "malice" of the "plutocrats," Goebbels says obligingly, are the "actual reasons and causes of European disorder." And after this conciliatory bow he invites Messrs. Bevin, Faure & Co. to unite against "a common foe," and to come out together for a "new order among nations."

Hitler also gave his speech, which he delivered in Kassel at a "warriors day," a tone intended for the ear of Bevin and Faure. His enumeration of the "war aims of English imperialism" corresponded exactly to the "arguments" with which the "pacifists" and those "ready for agreement" on the other side prevent the organization of resistance against the aggressors.

Why does German fascism undertake this peculiar conversation just at this time? After attempting to analyze public opinion in England, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote that it is clear that only a dwindling minority in England is ready to recognize the "rightful German claims," that is, the demands of German imperialism. German fascism seeks and finds this minority not only in the ranks of the arch-reactionary

bourgeoisie but also in the circles of the Labor Party and International Social-Democracy. In this way, it would like, to begin with at least, to thwart the united display of the forces of the working class in the front of resistance to German aggression.

But besides this, it expects that the plans of "appeasing" the aggressors, which have been projected and are being propagated by the above-mentioned circles of international Social-Democracy, will provoke a broader current of capitulation. The circles around Bevin and Faure and the open Trotskyist agents of German fascism make manifold use of the same terminology as that of German fascism. They all try to slander the defense against German aggression as an ostensible defense of the interests of English finance capital. All of them plead for "concessions on the colonial question" because ostensibly German imperialism has a "right" to colonial possessions.

Who else can be interested in such a slanderous distortion of the meaning of the resistance against the aggressors and claims of German fascism than this very fascism itself? Whom else can such a discrediting of the efforts to create an unconquerable anti-aggression front serve than the aggressor himself?

By splitting and mutual incitement of those affected by its policy, German fascism again tries to gain time and terrain, in order to defeat separately the individual camps of its opponents. In this way it gained state power in Germany. In this way it won a series of foreign diplomatic positions. It found "understanding" for its efforts to revise the Versailles Treaty. It found spokesmen for its "Great German" predatory raids. It also found representatives of the standpoint that Central Europe must be a German domain. And now it finds in the camp of international Social-De-

mocracy support for its imperialist colonial claims.

Bevin, Faure & Co., who are too concerned about this "living space" which German imperialism claims, boldly pass over the life interests of the colonial peoples for whose "cession" they raise their voices. They evidently find it in order to exchange nations and countries like commodities between great imperialist powers. It does not matter to them that every people "ceded" to German fascism is thereby condemned to a fate worse than that of galley slaves. They, who never yet manifested any understanding for the democratic liberation movement of the oppressed colonial peoples, have nothing to say against the fact that German fascism now deliberately announces its colonial claims and, as can be seen from its support of the Japanese robber war in China, slips in where forces are at work to suppress the democratic development of colonial peoples.

The German colonial claims and the undermining work of German fascism in the colonial countries contain for the international working class the danger of strengthening its main enemy. They signify for the present colonial peoples the danger of establishing a new, difficult obstacle which confronts them on their road to freedom and independence. It signifies for the numerous peoples, at present independent, the danger of enslavement. And finally, they increase the danger of a new imperialist world war. For these reasons the attempts to inaugurate conversations between German fascism and reactionary Social-Democratic politicians whose result is supposed to be "concessions on the colonial question" deserve the sharpest rebuff and rejection by all opponents of fascism, and in the first instance by the international working class.

Under the Leadership of the Reactionary Bourgeoisie

THE congress of the Socialist Party of France, which behind the screen of "reconciliation" between Leon Blum and Paul Faure launched a new assault against the united front of the workers which is far from solid as it is, answered the decisive political questions of the day none too clearly. It is true that the resolution jointly presented by Leon Blum and Paul Faure and adopted by the majority recommends a policy of resistance against fascist aggression and demands the realization of a peace front, including the Soviet Union, but this decision also merely characterizes the tail-ending of the Socialist Party behind the majority of the bourgeoisie.

The people around Paul Faure made a lot of noise about the "independence" of the Socialist Party, but this "independence" is directed exclusively against the Communists and reveals itself more and more as complete dependence of most of the Socialist leaders on the current policy of "their" bourgeoisie. The authoritative leaders of the Socialist Party of France carried through the policy of "non-intervention" as long as the bourgeoisie was striving to strangle the Spanish republic and to divert the aggression of the fascist states towards the Soviet Union. They supported the policy of Munich as long as the bourgeoisie expected it to conjure up Hitler Germany's "crusade" against the Soviet Union.

Now that the bourgeoisie is confronted with and begins to understand the bankruptcy of this policy, that the fascist war bloc threatens primarily the western powers, the Socialist leaders of France and England speak in favor of the realization of a peace front, without

opposing the maneuvers of the reactionary ministers who strive for a "peace front" with a hundred loopholes. Instead of marching at the head of the nations, the Socialist Parties of France and England follow uneasily in the wake of "their" bourgeoisie. For these "labor leaders" the guiding star for their policy is not the demands of the working class, but whatever the intentions of the bourgeoisie happen to be.

Of course, we greet the fact that the Socialist Party of France speaks in favor of the policy of resistance to fascist aggression and that Citrine also has suddenly become sympathetic to international trade union unity—but no confidence can be placed in this policy in the wake of the bourgeoisie. This can be done all the less since the opponents of this policy in the ranks of the Socialist Party were not defeated but, on the contrary, gained new positions, and since the "reconciliation" between Leon Blum and Paul Faure covered up the advance of hostile views in the party.

The Trotskyist Deixonne and his supporters at the congress openly spread the propagandistic lies of the fascist aggressors. They declared that the entire blame for the war danger should not be placed on the fascist dictators. They faithfully repeated the assertions of Goebbels' press that there was no fascist war bloc confronting a democratic peace front, but an "autarchy bloc" confronting a "plutocratic bloc." They demanded a redistribution of the raw materials and "living space" (they even appropriated this fascist slogan!) in favor of the fascist "have nots." Neither in their language nor in their demands have they denied

the school of fascism—with the result that two of their people were permitted into the party leadership.

The Paul Faure group represented substantially the same demands. It was therefore entirely understandable that the Trotskyist Deixonne asserted with satisfaction that he regards Paul Faure's views "with hearty sympathy." The speakers of this group declared that the policy of Munich had "saved peace"; we must continue to deal with the fascist aggressors as in the past; we must sit down at a conference with them and satisfy their desire for raw materials and colonies.

Roucaÿrol, one of the most prominent spokesmen of this group, said outright that even an "entente" with the fascist states should not be rejected. If we block the road to fascism, we will one day become an "instrument of international capitalism." Finally, he asserted cynically that the policy of national defense requires the unity of the French people, and since the party condemned this unity of the French nation, propaganda for national defense against the fascist aggressor was no longer necessary.

The Trotskyist Deixonne likewise asserted that it was necessary to renounce a "strong foreign policy" in order to carry through a "Left" policy inside the country, *i.e.*, a policy of isolating the Socialist Party. And the Trotskyist Soules laid all the cards on the table when he demanded that the party must follow a policy of conciliation in the international sphere and offer opposition to capitalism only inside the country.

Distinguished Socialists like Zyromski, Grumbach, Jules Moch and others opposed these demands which serve only the fascist aggressor, but the "reconciliation" between Leon Blum and Paul Faure knocked the weapon out of their hand. Paul Faure and his people readily made concessions in that part of the resolution dealing with foreign policy in order to gain concessions on decisive questions of internal policy and stronger positions in the party apparatus. They

know full well that it is not so much this or that *word* in the resolution that counts, but *deeds* that decide. It is a fact that they strengthened their positions in the party apparatus. It is a fact that they disrupted the collaboration of Communists and Socialists in non-partisan organizations, while collaboration with the Trotskyites continues unchallenged. It is a fact that the tendencies of self-isolation of the Socialist Party have considerably increased.

The Trotskyites and capitulators in the Socialist Party of France know full well what the real meaning is of their much vaunted "independence" of the party, their renunciation of the People's Front, their position against the Communists. This glorified "independence" is in reality nothing but the increasing independence of the party apparatus from the masses and thereby the increasing *dependence on the policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie, whatever it is at the time.*

The Trotskyites and capitulators have made no secret about it; they have openly admitted what they are after with this "Left" policy of isolation, of "independence" from the masses of people. They have declared that this policy is contrary to resolute resistance to the fascist aggressor. They have declared that this "Left" domestic policy requires a policy of agreement with the fascist aggressor. They have triumphantly asserted that the Socialist Party of France solemnly renounces the assumption of leadership of the nation in the struggle against the fascist aggressor, which means, in other words, *that it leaves the leadership of the nation to the bourgeoisie.* By their actual disruption of the united front, they have prevented the working class from taking the leadership of the nation out of the hands of the reactionary bourgeoisie.

Finally, through their anti-Communist campaign they are driving the party more and more to turn itself entirely into an instrument of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Under the cloak of "Left" phrases they carry on a systematic policy of enfeebling the working class, in

order to ultimately force the workers to subordinate themselves to the reactionary bourgeoisie on all decisive questions and to withdraw without a struggle before the fascist aggressor.

The "reconciliation" between Leon Blum and Paul Faure has made it difficult for the Socialist workers to see through these intentions of the Trotskyites and capitulators inside the Socialist Party of France. However, it may be assumed that the storm of political events will rapidly dispel the fog which the congress of Nantes produced, and that the Socialist workers will recognize in time the road on which Paul Faure and his people want to lead them—the road of *capitulation before the fascist aggressor and before the reactionary bourgeoisie*.

The Socialist workers of France will even find this road propagated in the *speeches* of the Trotskyites and capitulators at the congress. They will recognize the aim of these people all the more clearly if they observe their *deeds* with greater vigilance.

The Socialist delegate Grumbach employed a good metaphor when he characterized the clamor of the Trotskyites

and capitulators for peace at any price. He spoke of the fact that a doctor tries to discover the germ of the disease in order to cure the patient, whereas the quack recommends the patient to repeat the magic words: "I don't want to be sick any more." While the political quack repeats the magic words: "Let us save peace!" the political doctor endeavors to find the germ that causes war. *This germ that causes war is Hitler, is Mussolini, is the fascist regime!*

It is the same with the question of unity. Whereas the quacks monotonously repeat: "Unity of the Party!" the revolutionary doctor looks for the germ which is producing confusion and disruption in the ranks of the Socialist Party. *This germ is Deixonne, Paul Faure, the clique of Trotskyites and capitulators, the poison of the reactionary bourgeoisie which has penetrated the labor movement.*

If we want to prevent war, we must fight against the war germ, against fascism.

If we want to realize the unity of the working class, we must remove the germ that causes splitting and disruption, Trotskyism and the capitulators.

“Leaders” Who Don’t Believe in Victory

“CAN Labor win at the next elections? I don’t know.” Who said that? The leader of the London Labor Party, Herbert Morrison, at the annual conference of the Labor Party in Southport. (See *Manchester Guardian*, June 2, 1939.)

Herbert Morrison is one of the most prominent members of the Executive Committee of the London Labor Party. At its annual conference he had the task of opposing those who stood for the unification of all anti-Chamberlain forces, and to vote them down by mobilizing the votes of the trade unions and by sheer weight of the machine. In this he succeeded even as the Executive Committee succeeded in obtaining confirmation of the expulsion of Cripps and his associates by the annual conference.

However, the great political questions which inexorably await solution and the political impotence and inner weakness which the leadership of the Labor Party displays are not conjured out of the world by such ballot victories. A prominent leader of the party upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for the existence or non-existence of English democracy, and with it a great deal of responsibility for the course of international developments, calmly utters the simple phrase: “Will we win? I don’t know!” Mark you well, this is not said perchance by a leader of the English Conservative Party whose pro-fascist policy has been such a mortal threat to peace that the nations must occupy themselves exclusively with their defense against the threatening disaster. “I don’t know!” Thus speaks a representative of the party on which devolves the task of cooperating in the defense against the frightful consequences conjured up by the policy of Chamberlain and com-

pany. Thus speaks the representative of a party which believes itself called upon to further develop democracy toward socialism and to eliminate, as the same Herbert Morrison said, the ultimate causes of fascism and war, the economic causes.

In all probability there will be general elections to the House of Commons this year. They will determine whether the reactionary group around Chamberlain will remain at the helm for another five years. If the Chamberlain line is upheld in the elections, there exists the danger that additional thumbscrews will be placed upon English democracy for the next five years and that still other nations will fall victim to a cold-hearted, cynical barter with the fascist robber states. At present, a fateful struggle is raging in which the highest values of humanity are at stake. Yet before the battle is decided, indeed, even before the actual campaign in England is really under way, one of the leaders of the party which stands at one of the most important sectors of the front bluntly announces that he does not believe in victory.

Is that the attitude of a leadership which is unshakably convinced of the correctness of its aim and road, and which is in a position to imbue the English masses of the people with that glowing faith in their own cause without which no decisive victories in the history of humanity have ever been won? An English soldiers’ joke has given rise to the expression: He who goes into battle and then runs away, only remains alive to fight on another occasion! The leaders of the Labor Party don’t even enter the struggle. Still, if they believe they can keep on living peacefully and postpone the decisive struggle against Chamber-

lain's system for at least five years, then they must indeed be blind. Then they are unable or unwilling to understand the signs of the times.

Where the by-elections to the House of Commons have been fought out by the Labor Party with the old sterile slogans and methods, they reveal one common feature: a great reduction in the votes cast for the government candidates with a simultaneous loss of votes for the Labor Party. In the by-elections at Southwark the government forfeited 46½ per cent of its votes and in the by-elections at Ashton 36 per cent. Yet the number of votes cast for the Labor Party in these voting districts, as compared with the general elections of 1935, was reduced by 27½ per cent and 29 per cent respectively. These elections only express a tendency that was already long apparent. The *Times*, in face of this, was able to declare derisively that apparently the voters are of the opinion that the policy of both parties, i.e., of the government as well as of the Labor Party, is one and the same.

He who remembers the protracted support the leaders of the Labor Party gave to Chamberlain's "non-intervention policy" in the Spanish war, and their joy upon the conclusion of the Munich agreement, need not wonder concerning the attitude of the English voters. The voters are evidently unwilling to trust the vague declarations of the Labor leaders as long as they do not propose clear and effective measures of defense against the most pressing dangers and show in action that they really want what they say. Still, the skepticism and contempt of the voters for the most important opposition party in England as well as for the Chamberlain government threaten to turn into apathy toward the parliamentary system in general.

The spectacle of a politically bankrupt government on the one side and an ineffective, lame opposition shirking responsibility on the other side, strongly tends to discredit not only both major parties but parliamentary democracy in general.

Already ominous voices are heard that use the continuing international crisis

and the strike of the English voters to demand a change of the parliamentary system. As the most significant mainstay of English democracy, the English labor movement has every reason to follow these fascist tendencies with the greatest vigilance. Democratic institutions possess living reality only when they are supported and defended by the masses of people themselves. When large sections of the people neglect to exercise the most elementary right, the right to vote, then fears are in order, not only concerning victory in the coming elections, but concerning democracy itself.

An objective examination of all by-elections since the general elections to the House of Commons in 1935 shows that the change in sentiment reflected in them was not enough to overthrow Chamberlain and to assure a majority for the Labor Party when it carries on alone.

The leaders of the Labor Party cover their rejection of a broad front against Chamberlain with radical-sounding phrases and speak of the replacement of capitalism by socialism, which only requires a clear majority for the Labor Party. How and by means of what concrete measures socialism will be helped to achieve victory as a result of a clear Labor majority in the House of Commons—this they veil in silence. The English electorate remembers all too well that MacDonald was an even greater master of vague phrases on socialism but directed his practical policy according to the dictates of the City of London.

Before they put their overwhelming trust in the leadership of the Labor Party, without the basic transformation of society remaining an empty fantasy, they want to be sure the Labor leadership is in position to ensure democracy and peace for the world. The masses of the English people said to the leaders of the Labor Party: "You tell us that our house must be renovated from top to bottom. Show us first that you can extinguish the conflagration raging around us and threatening our houses, too." The nations have always nursed

a mistrust of people who boast of their great talents without practically demonstrating them.

History cries out to the English working class: Help save the world from war, from fascism, now, at this moment! The leaders of the English Labor Party reply: Not now, in five years we'll build a brand new world in which there can be no fascism and war. Don't the fools see that each day is an irretrievable loss?

Besides, the English people have every reason to examine critically certain programmatic statements of prominent Labor leaders as to how they picture the building of a "new world." Apparently the leadership of the Labor Party has not yet understood the fundamental truth that as long as fascism holds half of Europe in its iron fist, a real understanding between all European states is out of the question. Bevin, the leader of the English Transport Workers Union, said, at the annual conference of the Labor Party, that it is not enough to oppose the further expansion of fascism. He spoke of the need for a "more just distribution" among all nations of the world's sources of raw materials, especially of those of the British Empire. When called to order by one of the delegates, Bevin naively declared that such an offer would be addressed not to Hitler but to the German people. The German

people are chained hand and foot and are not now a partner in any plans for an understanding between nations. Utterances concerning the "just distribution of raw materials" do not signify an offer to the German people, but to Hitler's war power which threatens the world. The Nazi press also interpreted Bevin's speech in this sense.

Generally, where does Bevin get the right to assume that the German people, as distinct from its rulers, will accept such offers at all? The masses of German people reject the shameful suggestion that they should help to forge more firmly the chains from which they want to free themselves by building up a German colonial empire. The day that German democracy returns to life, it will render thanks for being asked to become part of an international concern for the exploitation of colonies—just about as much as the colonial peoples of the British Empire who refuse to have anything to do with any "reconciliation of nations" a la Bevin at their expense!

If Bevin and other leaders of the Labor Party are really in earnest about helping the German people, they can make no better contribution than by an effective struggle for democracy in England and real peace in the world. This peace can only be an anti-fascist peace. Otherwise there will be no peace.

Modigliani, the Attorney of Anti-Communism

THE Second International and its affiliated parties are experiencing a severe crisis. This crisis is not merely or primarily the consequence of the undeniable reverses suffered by the international proletariat since the rise to power of fascism in Germany. It is in much greater measure a reflection of the deep-going process of clarification that has set in among the working class of the capitalist world and which, even if it does not develop in a straight line and in all countries equally, justifies the hope that we are on the verge of a change in mass sentiment and a new upsurge of mass activity.

This clarification is being accomplished substantially in the discussions on the most important questions of the day: struggle against fascism or capitulation; war and peace; international unity of action of the proletariat; attitude toward the Soviet Union. The more the working masses become aware that fascism will not only not be "appeased" with concessions at the expense of the freedom of other nations, but that this only increases its rapacity; the more the workers understand that their unity is one of the decisive questions affecting the fate of our epoch; the more unmistakable the stand of the proletariat is on the question of the defense of the nation against fascist aggression and the more it realizes that the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union is its most intimate concern—the more often do the masses come in conflict with those leaders of the Second International and Social-Democratic Parties who on these vital questions represent a standpoint in contradiction to the interests of the workers. It is these conflicts that evoke and sharpen the crisis in the Second International.

It is clear that the process of differentiation and clarification is not limited to the ordinary members of the Social-Democratic Parties but also embraces prominent leaders of these parties who give more or less conscious expression to the pressure of the masses for clarity and action. At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Second International held at Brussels May 14 and 15 of this year, it was Pietro Nenni, the Secretary of the Socialist Party of Italy, who made a sally on behalf of the establishment of international unity of action of the proletariat. In his explanation published in *Nuovo Avanti* of May 20 under the heading "Quo Vadis Internazionale?" ("Whither Goest Thou, International?"), Nenni pointed to the "lost opportunities" for the development of a broad mass struggle and particularly to the feeble aid of the Second International to heroic Spain, and went on to say:

"What can be done against the fascist danger? We have called on you repeatedly to take the initiative for a great world movement for the unity of the anti-fascist and peace forces, reaching from the Catholics and liberals to the Communists. You have refused to take any kind of initiative. Consequently, the others do it. On the first of May the Communist International addressed you and the International Federation of Trade Unions and proposed a conference of the workers' organizations of the world to work out a concrete plan of action against the fascist warmongers. You meet this proposal with the silence of the grave. But in the present situation, no one has a right to reject such an appeal unless he himself takes the salutary initiative to place himself at the head of the proletariat. . . ."

This earnest exhortation of Nenni's

so enraged Modigliani, who until recently belonged to the leadership of the Socialist Party of Italy, that in a lengthy article also entitled "Quo Vadis Internazionale?" (*Nuovo Avanti*, May 27, 1939), he bluntly accuses Nenni of wishing to "Bolshevize" the Second International. In other words, for Modigliani, every one who stands for labor unity is a "Bolshevik." Modigliani is completely unaware that with this "frightful" accusation he gives Bolshevism a clean bill of health, that it, and only it, came out actively for the unity of the working class, that, however, Social-Democracy of all shades, as represented by Modigliani and his ilk, wishes to perpetuate the split among the working class. Modigliani's purpose was naturally not to testify publicly that Bolshevism fights for the true interests of the international proletariat.

With his accusation, Modigliani went right down the road of the anti-Comintern powers who notoriously justify all their aggressive acts against other nations with the struggle against "Bolshevism." The situation today is such that whoever rejects the unity of the workers and adopts a position against the Soviet Union unavoidably and, willy-nilly, brings grist to the mills of the fascist war incendiaries.

Modigliani undertakes the neck-breaking attempt to whitewash the Second International of the accusation made against it of "lost opportunities" for rousing the broadest masses and to put the responsibility for the defeat of the working class upon the Communist International. He believes he can talk away the proposals of the Communist International for the common struggle of all workers against fascism and war by brushing them aside as a "maneuver." But a lie does not last longer and does not gain in force of conviction by chewing it over to the point of vomiting. Right after the outbreak of the mutiny of the generals in Spain, the Communist International warned and hammered home to the working class that the Spanish people and its proletariat are faced with a difficult war for their national

freedom which would demand many sacrifices, a war against the fascist armies of invasion which could be won only if international and consistent aid is rendered them.

The Second International did not grasp the proffered hand. Ministers who were and are members of this International explained with innocent mein that the Spanish war is the internal concern of Spain and that one should not "intervene." In vain did the Communists warn against burying one's head in the sand and to recognize that after all foreign fascist armies were carrying on war on Spanish soil. The Socialist Ministers did not wish to be convinced, the Second International did not wish to institute common, consistent, worldwide action; they permitted the Spanish masses to carry on the fight by themselves and bleed to death. Now the Hitler government organ *Voelkischer Beobachter* (May 31) writes quite openly and cynically:

"Already at the end of July, 1936 [the Spanish war, it will be recalled, broke out on July 18, 1936—*Ed.*] the Fuehrer placed his aid in the struggle against Bolshevism at the disposal of General Franco and from then on German soldiers have been fighting shoulder to shoulder with Spaniards and Italians. . . ."

Thus it was not the Communist International that "maneuvered" but those who refused to acknowledge the presence of the fascist armies of invasion and who played around with the fate of the Spanish proletariat.

Or perhaps Social-Democratic Ministers and party leaders have not extolled Munich to the skies as the beginning of a new "peaceful era" in the relations between the robber states and those threatened by them, and thrown to the wind all warnings of the Communist International and its appeal for the union of all peace forces? Today everybody sees whither the road leads. But the Modiglianis and associates are still shameless enough to carry out all kinds of obscure maneuvers to frustrate the approaching unity of the workers and all those de-

siring peace. In their enmity for labor unity, in their extreme and impotent hatred for the powerful land of socialism, the Soviet Union, in their servility toward fascism, the Modiglianis are actually nothing more than henchmen and accomplices of the war instigators and their invading troops.

Modigliani, of course, is against *every* war. In the name of "consistent Socialist principles" he advises the workers to bow their heads without resistance and opposition when fascism attacks and subjugates them. Should the working class accept this standpoint, it would only throw all borders wide open and invite their own oppressors not to stand on ceremony, but to conquer everything they like. If it complied with Modigliani, the working class would not achieve socialism, but would be supporting the worst enemy of socialism. Hundreds of thousands of Italians living in France have understood this very well.

The National Council of the "Unione Popolare Italiana" in France, which numbers about 50,000 members, and to which belong Socialists, Communists and non-party people, has unanimously accepted a resolution in May published in *Nuovo Avanti* of May 27 which, among other things, says:

"... The Unione Popolaire will continue the struggle on the front of world peace with ever greater energy. . . . If, however, the fascist war of aggression should break out, in spite of the will of the nations, then the Unione Popolaire will urge all Italian immigrants to enroll on the side of the French people and democracy, to support the Italian people in its struggle for the defeat of fascism. . . ."

Such a position is not to Modigliani's liking. Because the Socialist Party of Italy has not decided to capitulate in the face of fascism, Modigliani in protest recently withdrew from its leadership, that is, he fled from the possible responsibility of a defeat of fascism if it invades France.

Modigliani is the embodiment of that pseudo-radical mentality of capitulation that is advantageous neither to the proletariat, socialism or peace, but is useful solely to the fascist slaveholders, to the imperialist warmongers. This "will to capitulate" only stimulates the aggressors' will to war, to robbery and conquest; it contributes even less to the salvation of peace and to the successful struggle for socialism, but solely to the salvation of the warmongers.

There are not a few such Modiglianis in the ranks of the Second International. They are the ones who disintegrate this International and hamper the unity of the working class. It will depend upon the fighting spirit, upon the consistency and perseverance of the Social-Democratic workers and those Socialist leaders who have recognized the meaning of the fighting unity of the workers whether the proletariat will rapidly play the role in keeping with its numbers and organization or whether it must suffer further reverses.

All signs indicate that the Social-Democratic masses are also finding their place and that they will drive from their ranks all preachers of capitulation and all those who wish to perpetuate the split of the working class, so that they may not be swerved from the road of the stubborn, persevering, dogged fight, the road to victory.

Terror in Spain

WHAT FRANCO'S "PACIFICATION" AND "RECONSTRUCTION" LOOK LIKE

BY L. MARTIN

GENERAL FRANCO, the executioner's assistant to Hitler and Mussolini, has subjected the entire territory of the Spanish republic to his dictatorship.

Fascism has begun the "pacification of the country" with innumerable murders, with the activity of the hundred court martials of Madrid, with penning up tens of thousands of men and women in concentration camps and with numerous "suicides."

Franco has inaugurated the so-called "reconstruction of the country" with the slave labor of the 600,000 soldiers who are regarded as prisoners of war in repairing the streets, bridges and railroads; with the abolition of the wage and working conditions won by the workers during the time of the republic; with increasing burdens and taxes; with robbery of the peasants, who are deprived of the land and stock which they had received by the decree of October 8, 1936; with the withdrawal from circulation of the Republican currency without indemnification of the holders; with the institution of "voluntary" labor service, and with the surrender of the riches of the country to Italy and Germany.

Franco seeks to cultivate a "Great Spanish" chauvinism and to prepare the ground for his imperialist aims by violating the feelings and destroying the liberties of the Basque country and Catalonia and by destroying all legally established political and social acquisitions of the time of the republic.

But, in spite of all these measures, the masses of the people give expression to

their anti-fascist intentions and their determination to continue the struggle. And daily Franco meets with an ever-growing, sullen but steady opposition which strives to rise to the level of organized anti-fascist actions.

In his activity, Franco does not forget what the past has taught him, when the fighting spirit and the fighting ability of the Spanish people made it possible for the revolutionary movement to re-establish itself rapidly. He therefore seizes upon more bloody and energetic measures than have ever been employed by a tyrant oppressing the Spanish people. In these measures, we see the embodiment of the entire experience of Spanish reaction augmented by the methods of the Gestapo and O.V.R.A.

A few hours after Franco's entry into Madrid, made possible by the treachery of Casado, Besteiro and Miaja, the commander of the troops of occupation issued the following order:

"All officials of the Province must present themselves to the military court within two weeks in order to make deposition concerning the facts of which they were witness since July 18. Within the same length of time all the military must appear before the military tribunal on San Bernardo Street in the building of the Constitutional Court of Justice. All watchmen who have worked under the Republican regime must make deposition before the military tribunal. Everyone who owns documents that belonged to the Republicans like newspapers, pamphlets, leaflets, throwaways and publications of all kinds is duty bound to turn

them over to the military and courts of justice."

Since the publication of this order, repression has been spreading everywhere. An American correspondent wrote: "In only five days more than 40,000 arrests were made." But the terror has many varieties; one of these is described with cynical delight in the newspaper *La Voz de Espana* by a former war correspondent in the fascist army who calls himself "Tebit Arrumi":

"A group of people was gathering on Carmen Street and as I approached I saw that it concerned several of the many great leaders who had committed suicide in fear of Franco's justice."

Since then the murderous fascist rogues have been speaking systematically of "suicide." In a single day forty-five prisoners "committed suicide" in the concentration camp at Alicante. Other "suicides" are found on the highways after having been recognized by the Falangists from their locality and dragged out of the concentration camps in cars belonging to the Civil Guard.

Daily the Franco press publishes lists of arrests. For instance, on May 26 and 27, the newspaper *El Diario de Burgos* published a list of forty-five imprisoned in Madrid, twenty-two in Valencia and fifteen in Cartagena. On the same day, the newspapers *La Vanguardia Espanola* and *El Noticiero Universal* of Barcelona published a list of forty-one prisoners and another one of eighteen; the papers add: "Numerous extremists have been likewise arrested at Figollo, Santa Coloma, Premia del Mar, San Vicente and Granollers." And so it continues day by day. Besides, on May 20 the entire fascist press published two decrees by which the leaders of the Italian and German state police were granted the Grand Cross of the Order of the Red Arrow.

Parallel with this wave of terror is carried through the robbery of the peasants and the workers. In the course of the war, the republic had given the peasants 4,086,386 hectares of land and credit to make the cultivation of this

soil possible; the credits amounted to 140,000,000 pesetas. Franco's occupation of the entire territory of the republic has flung the peasants back into their old misery and left them landless. All the land is being returned to the thirty-eight big landlords who have already become lords of 33.39 per cent of the total area of the country.

As for the industrial workers, their condition is indicated in a speech which the Minister of Industry and Commerce made on May 10 at Bilbao on the occasion of the opening of a blast furnace and the erection of the new artillery work shops of the "Belga" firm:

"The government will give work, but it will demand productivity and self-sacrifice from the workers and plants. The easy living of olden times is at an end and now begins a time of sacrifice and devotion."

The true meaning of these words is shown by a Ministerial decree whose most important points are the following:

1. Private enterprises may dismiss all workers if after July 18 they have committed acts for which they can be charged with one of the following offenses:

a. Public appearance against the "National Movement," in military, civil, commanding positions or in trade union leadership.

b. Former activity as trade union delegate and leader or control commissioners of the Marxist organizations in factories and industries.

c. Actions which are subject to criminal prosecution.

d. Threats against the employer, leader, director or other workers or their relatives, as well as every attack on private property or on the property of the plant.

2. The dismissals are to be carried out within three months from March 28.

3. The enterprises and employers are duty bound to record the names of these workers and the reasons for their dismissal to the labor court within forty-eight hours.

This is a whole plan for extirpation whose execution is incumbent upon the employers and the labor courts. As stated in a communication by the Chief of Police of Barcelona, this extends into all branches of industry:

"From now on all owners of restaurants, cafes, bars, beer parlors, etc., must submit a sworn statement covering the entire personnel working for them. The officials of these businesses must obtain permission from the Chief of Police for their continuation on the job." (Published in *La Vanguardia Espanola*, Barcelona, May 28.)

Other sections of poor people suffer likewise under the despotism of the fascist dictatorship. On a hundred pretexts, Spanish citizens are mistreated and robbed. A characteristic instance is published in *La Vanguardia Espanola* of May 28:

"Antonio Seres Plana, a citizen of Barcelona, was pointed out to the police as having ordered the janitress of his house to tear down placards of the glorious national movement. Upon decision of the commanding general of the area, he was fined 20,000 pesetas and was ordered to paste up identical placards on the same spot where the placards had been torn down."

Another instance is given in the newspaper *El Diario Vasco* of San Sebastian:

"The civil governor of the province has imposed a fine of 100 pesetas on fifty-eight merchants because they refused to pay the so-called relief tax."

In Catalonia and the Basque country, which had their own laws under the republic, the suffering of the people is increased by means of national oppression. The autonomous organs of the Catalonians and the Basques, their language and their traditional customs are no more than a memory of their past freedom. Fascist propaganda describes the Basques and Catalonians as adherents of secession from the rest of the country, as enemies of Spain. With this arbitrary accusation, with this dema-

gogic pretext of struggling against the "breaking up" of Spain, Franco justifies the cruel struggle against both of these peoples.

Simultaneously with its efforts to unleash chauvinistic sentiments against the Basques and Catalonians, fascism wishes to engender an imperialist intoxication and evoke illusions concerning the "transformation of Spain into a world empire." Hand in hand with this goes military armament in the service of the Axis powers.

In face of these cruel, sweeping measures, the Spanish people show their strong anti-fascist sentiments by their sullen resistance and even though the treachery of Besteiro-Casado-Miaja and the sudden collapse this caused had made the preparation of the anti-fascist forces for the struggle under the new circumstances more difficult, even though the gang of traitors delivered up thousands of the best cadres of the anti-fascist movement to fascism, resistance is spreading. The mass sentiment is characterized by the fact that the workers don't join the fascist organizations, not only in the territory recently occupied by the fascists, but also in the territory long ago occupied, as in Biscaya. No less characteristic was the refusal of the farmers of the Province of Saragossa to supply the markets, and the steps taken by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce to appoint representatives in several businesses because these kept their commercial transactions hidden.

That Franco knows the sentiment of the great majority of the country is shown by some extracts from his last speech:

"Victory will come to naught if we let ourselves be carried away by the tension and unrest of the first period and if we permit freedom of action to the never-satisfied, the vengeance seekers and egoists. Let us not suffer from any illusions. The 'Jewish Spirit' which made possible the union of big capital with Marxism [what is meant is the union of the bourgeois republicans with the workers and peasants] cannot be uprooted in a day and continues to live in

the minds of many." (From the speech at the victory march in Madrid.)

And his own organ, the newspaper *Unidad* of San Sebastian, for May 22 warned of the danger and pointed to the anti-fascist sentiments of the masses of the people:

"It is not difficult to predict that the day when demobilization shall be completed the inclination to emigrate which is deeply rooted in many parts of Spain will be especially acute for some time."

But despite all his exertions, the author of this article is unable to hide the fact that the masses do not want to live under Franco's regime.

"For there will be people who shrink back from the difficult life that awaits them. People will appear who think they can remake their lives outside of Spain, and there will be no dearth of people who wish to emigrate for shady political reasons."

The author of this article could not have spoken more clearly. But, if this is not enough, let us listen to the words of a still more authoritative writer: Jimenez Caballero, the "theoretician" of Spanish fascism, who wrote on May 25 in *Unidad* of San Sebastian:

"The war continues. It continues silently on an invisible front. It is a war as inexorable as was the one under which we have suffered until April 1. It is the same war; the enemies are the same. It is the same canaille that does not give in as long as it is not definitely defeated.

"At one time these enemies tried to influence the old guard of Jose Antonio [Primo de Rivera] by visible or secret means.

"Another time they try to poison the old historical wells of Carlism and the thousand-year-old loyalty of Navarre.

"Still other times they try to play the old notes of the melancholy clavier that was known as the re-establishment of Canova at the end of the last century. And still another time the enemy forces try to agitate the proletarian base that we have not yet reconquered and to play the old songs about social struggles.

"Then the enemy endeavors to mix into our Catholicism through secret by-

"This invisible penetration of the untiring and insidious enemy lays hold of Catalonia and the Basque country and plays the romantic harp of secession, of autonomy, of their past language and particularist laws."

And finally he completes the picture of the inner struggle in his own camp, of the resistance of the masses and the hatred of the oppressed peoples of the Basque country and Catalonia, with the following words:

"Spaniards, be careful. Look ahead, my brothers. The war is not over. Though you hear no shots, know that shots are still fired and that underground mines are being prepared in order to blow to atoms the bodies of the defenders and the souls of construction.

"Know that today the front is invisible. Its name is intrigue; it is whispering. Whispering and intrigue in politics, in social questions, in religion, in national questions."

All these difficulties become sharper in view of the miserable economic situation. Franco can offer the masses very little, if he can offer them anything at all. That is why he meets with growing difficulties.

The Spanish people continues the struggle. In the lead are the Communists, who try even under the most difficult circumstances to regroup the anti-fascist forces, to organize resistance and to prepare the transition to broader forms of struggle.

A heroic people that has fought, arms in hand, for thirty-two months and was master of its fate will never submit to fascism. This heroic people that carries on its struggle under the most difficult conditions has the greatest claim to international support.

Consistent aid for the Spanish people in order to drive fascism out of the country and to re-establish their freedom and independence is an extraordinarily important task for all anti-fascists.

The war for the freedom of the Spanish people against the fascist conquerors has called forth a great upsurge of international solidarity. However, the aid to the Spanish republic by the anti-fas-

cists of the other countries fell short of the requirements and possibilities. That the international working class and the anti-fascist world movement did not stake everything on assuring the victory of the Spanish fighters for freedom has contributed to the defeat of the Republicans.

It is now a matter of paying off a part of this debt and of taking up with greatest determination the struggle against the terror in Spain, against the activity of the Spanish fascists in other countries, and to save the Spanish fighters for freedom in emigration. Every anti-fascist must feel the burning shame that so-called democratic states have nothing more than barbed wire and forced labor for the truest and most courageous defenders of democracy. Every anti-fascist must regard it as his duty of honor to come to the aid of these heroes who meet the right asylum of

so-called democratic states in the shape of police clubs and jailors. Every anti-fascist must do everything in his power to render to the Spanish emigrants at least a portion of the thanks which they have so highly earned. Hospitality, the right to work in freedom—that is what the anti-fascists in all countries must fight to win for those who defended the freedom of all nations in Spain and who obstructed the advance of the imperialist war with their lives.

It is up to all organizations of the workers and toilers, all anti-fascists and honest people to come to the aid of the Spanish fighters for freedom and to guarantee the preservation of their physical and moral fighting power.

The Spanish people fulfilled and continues to fulfill admirably its duty in the struggle of the nations against fascist barbarism. Let the nations not forget their duty toward the Spanish people!

The Significance of Lenin's and Stalin's Teaching on the State for the International Working Class

BY KURT FUNK

THE COMMUNIST PARTY of the Soviet Union, more than any other party in the world, gives the international working class that which is most essential: the living example of a flourishing socialist society and therewith the certainty that socialism, for which generations of workers of all countries have struggled, has already become an impregnable reality.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is today the leader of a people consisting of many fraternally united nationalities whose labor has transformed one-sixth of the earth into the richest and most powerful country in the world. With the scientific presentation of its road to power and to the victory of socialism, it gives the international working class the theoretical weapon whose correct application will make possible and guarantee victory over imperialism. From the first to the last page, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)** gives a clear and convincing portrayal of the incessant struggle for the defense and continual development of the teaching of Marxism in all stages of the long road to emancipation of the toilers from the yoke of capitalism.

The only party of the international working class which has achieved victory over the bourgeoisie and has realized socialism is also the only party which has developed the relationship of the working class to the state on the

basis of the principles of Marx and Engels. The Party of the Bolsheviks, imbued with the living spirit of Marxism, has relentlessly swept aside the confusion of pseudo-scientific theories of the state and disclosed to the proletariat the road to the conquest of power. Precisely through its theoretical formulation and practical realization of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, the Party has laid the foundation for the international working class to recognize the necessity of taking the decisive step out of the maze of bourgeois conceptions of the state.

The study of the *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)*, which contains the further development of Lenin's teachings on the state under the conditions of the realization of communism, will stimulate the most active among the international working class to think about the significance of these teachings for their own struggle. It will stimulate them and give them the power to tear asunder the web of bourgeois theories and conceptions which still continue to fetter the working class of the capitalist countries.

The bourgeois "theories" of the state, which have been dragged into the labor movement and cultivated by the Social-Democratic falsifiers of Marxism, are gags and fetters. They hamper the proletariat at every step of its advance. They chain it to outmoded institutions and formulas. They place it in helpless dependence on the bourgeoisie at the very moment when everything depends on

* International Publishers, New York.

bold action and advance. They drag the proletariat back just when it is prepared to occupy its rightful place.

In Germany, Italy and Austria, in Czechoslovakia and also in Spain, the working class is paying in precious blood for the practical consequences of the bourgeois Social-Democratic and Anarcho-Syndicalist "theories" of the state which benefited fascism, most bitter enemy of the working class and its rise to socialism. In various democratic countries, such "theories" hindered the working class in developing and utilizing its power in the struggle for the maintenance and extension of democratic achievements. They forced the working class to stay within the confines of the bourgeois state and paralyzed its struggle for socialism. In all capitalist countries, the bourgeois, Social-Democratic and Anarcho-Syndicalist "theories" contribute to the fact that the working class has not yet been able to display its full power in opposition to the further extension of the second imperialist war which is now in progress.

The workers, the toilers, the intellectuals who are now turning to the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* and Stalin's Report to the Eighteenth Congress in order to acquire an understanding of the principles which equipped the Bolshevik Party and enabled it, by working out and following these principles consistently, to conquer the difficult road from dark capitalist Russia of the tsar to the completion of the construction of socialist society, will gain two-fold from their study: Their faith in the certain victory of socialism throughout the world will become confident and unshakable through the exalted example and historical achievement of the Bolsheviks; their equipment for the struggle against their own bourgeoisie will be renewed through the knowledge which the struggle of the Bolsheviks brings to them.

Every worker devoted to the cause of socialism, every real Socialist who is searching for the path that will lead him out of the debris which blocks the road of the working class by falsified, fossilized or diluted pseudo-Marxist

theories of Social-Democratic and bourgeois origin, can find it indicated by the Bolshevik Party which acts on the principle: "Marxist-Leninist theory is not a dogma but a guide to action."

In *State and Revolution* Lenin wrote:

"Those who recognize *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists; . . . A Marxist is one who *extends* the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. . . . The essence of Marx's doctrine of the State is assimilated only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a *single* class is necessary not only for class society in general, not only for the *proletariat* which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but for the entire *historical period* between capitalism and 'classless society'—communism. The forms of the bourgeois state are extremely varied, but in essence they are all the same; in one way or another, in the last analysis, all the states are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*. The transition from capitalism to communism will certainly create a great variety and abundance of political forms, but in essence there will inevitably be only one: *the dictatorship of the proletariat*." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 33-34.)

The theory of Lenin and Stalin, which has demonstrated its victorious power by surmounting and conquering all obstacles, grew and matured through the experiences of 1905, of February and October, 1917. It was steered in arduous mass work in periods of reaction as well as in periods of progress. It stood the test in the storms of the imperialist war as well as in the waves of civil war and intervention by foreign powers. Its firmness could neither be undermined from within by the Trotskyist and Bukharinite agents of capitalism and fascism nor be injured by the venomous attacks of the reactionary Social-Democratic politicians from without. The prophets who year in and year out prophesy the imminent collapse of the Soviet power have been put to shame.

The Party of Lenin and Stalin has not only carefully administered the heritage which was bequeathed to it in the concise, fundamental thoughts and state-

ments of Marx and Engels on the state; it has consistently and brilliantly enriched it. *The Communist Manifesto*, *The Civil War in France*, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science* and the writings and letters criticizing the Social-Democratic Party programs are building blocks in the revolutionary state theory of the working class. They were taken up by Lenin and Stalin with the greatest care and cleansed of bourgeois "ornamentation" in which Social-Democratic theoreticians had "enveloped" them. They are essential parts of the monumental work which Lenin and Stalin performed.

In his lecture "The State," which he delivered in July, 1919, at Sverdlov University, Lenin described the question of the state as "a most complex and difficult one, perhaps one that more than any other has been confused by bourgeois scholars, writers and philosophers." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol XI, p. 639.) By word, writing and deed, Lenin and Stalin made the question of the state into a central question of the proletarian class struggle, solved by the means of Marxism-Leninism and one which the international working class could solve. The mastery of Lenin's and Stalin's teachings on the state is of decisive importance for the fulfillment of the great tasks of the working class today.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LENINIST THEORY OF THE STATE FOR THE WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

Under fascism the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie confronts the working people in its most acute form. But even though the capitalist class character of this dictatorship is notorious, various and conflicting conceptions prevail among the working class concerning the contents and nature of the fascist dictatorship itself.

Naturally those who exercise the fascist dictatorship are interested in disguising their regime. In this they are like their predecessors, the possessors and wielders of state power under bour-

geois democracy, under the feudal state and more ancient states which, as a rule, assumed mythical religious or juridical disguises in order to prevent their subjects from becoming conscious of the nature of their state.

Frederick Engels, who has given us a fundamental, scientific investigation and exposition of the origin of the state in his work *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (in his lecture "The State," Lenin called it "one of the fundamental works of modern socialism, every phrase of which can be accepted with confidence"; Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 642), contrary to the speculative theories on the state, established as a result of his investigations that:

"The state, then, is by no means a power forced on society from outside; neither is it the 'realization of the ethical idea,' 'the image and the realization of reason,' as Hegel maintains. It is simply a product of society at a certain stage of evolution. It is the confession that this society has become hopelessly divided against itself, has entangled itself in irreconcilable contradictions which it is powerless to banish. In order that these contradictions, these classes with conflicting economic interests, may not annihilate themselves and society in a useless struggle, a power becomes necessary that stands apparently above society and has the function of keeping down the conflicts and maintaining 'order.' And this power, the outgrowth of society, but assuming supremacy over it and becoming more and more divorced from it, is the state." (*Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Ch. Kerr ed.; p. 206.)

Engels further described what constitutes this power:

"The creation of a public power of coercion that did no longer coincide with the old self-organized and armed population. . . . It is not composed," wrote Engels, "of armed men alone, but has also such objects as prisons and correction houses." (*Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 207.)

Concerning the extent of this "public power of coercion" Engels finally wrote:

"It may be very small, almost infinitesimal, in societies with feebly developed class antagonisms and in out-of-the-way places. . . . But it increases in the same ratio in which the class antagonisms become more pronounced, and in which neighboring states become larger and more populous. A conspicuous example is modern Europe, where the class struggles and wars of conquest have nursed the public power to such a size that it threatens to swallow the whole society and the state itself." (*Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 207.)

In his book *The State and Revolution*, Lenin has drawn extraordinarily significant conclusions from these ideas of Engels. He wrote:

"This was written no later than the beginning of the nineties of the last century, Engels' last preface being dated June 16, 1891. The turn towards imperialism—meaning by that the complete domination of the trusts, the omnipotence of the big banks, a colonial policy on a grand scale, and so forth—was only just begun in France, and was even weaker in North America and in Germany. Since then 'rivalry in conquest' has made gigantic strides—especially as, by the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century, the whole world had been finally divided up among these 'rivals in conquest,' i.e., among the great predatory powers. Since then, military and naval armaments have grown to monstrous proportions, and the predatory war of 1914-17 for the domination of the world by England or Germany, for the division of the spoils, has brought about the 'devouring' of all the forces of society by the rapacious state power to the verge of complete catastrophe." (*"State and Revolution," Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 12-13.)

In his introduction to Marx's *Civil War in France*, Engels irrefutably characterized the nature of the state in class society as follows:

"In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy."

Thereby he emphasized the class con-

tent as the essential thing as against which the form of the state plays a secondary role. In the statements quoted above Lenin demonstrated the specific role of state power in the epoch of imperialism. To comprehend the function of the fascist state, this understanding is indispensable.

If we strip the fascist state of the ideological trumpery which it uses to mislead the exploited and oppressed masses, then it stands revealed as the *open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist, most imperialist elements of finance capital* as it was defined in the resolution on Comrade Dimitroff's report at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

The fascist state presents itself to us as a machine of hitherto unknown proportions, as the accumulation and concentration of the most modern instruments of power and suppression. This state advances the claim to "totality" inside the country and imperialist domination over the surrounding world.

It grabs everything in the sphere of education, cultural activity, sports, etc., that was still open to private initiative. It subjects the press, the theater, the radio, literature to a relentless "coordination." Its organs of power reach right down into the factories, into industry and agriculture, in order to have the greatest possible assurance for the complete execution of its orders and for the suppression of all attempts at resistance, opposition or independent activity by its "citizens." It has intervened in capitalist economy in order to make it completely serve imperialist aims by means of "plans" which first and foremost are carried through at the expense of the workers and employees, the artisans, small business people and peasants.

The state apparatus and its appendages—the fascist organizations and institutions—expand uninterruptedly. The more it extends and expands, the more it estranges itself from the masses of the people; the more the exploited and oppressed classes become conscious of the contradiction which exists between their interests, i.e., the common interests of

society, and the interests of the ruling elements which are expressed in the fascist state power.

In the fascist state, the great majority of its "citizens" are robbed of democratic rights which they had won through bourgeois democracy. The fact that the state has the form of a "republic"—as in Germany—or the form of a "constitutional monarchy"—as in Italy—changes nothing. Neither is anything changed by the "constitutional guarantees" which have been given formally in Germany, in Italy and likewise in the European colonial territories of these two fascist states, in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, etc.

After the class struggle, which has assumed and been forced to assume constantly sharper forms within the framework of bourgeois democracy, has temporarily produced the defeat of the aspiring, oppressed classes, the ruling bourgeoisie makes the most ruthless use of its position. It thereby does not in any way renounce the seemingly "democratic" appearances, in those cases in which the use of them promises to deceive or corrupt part of the oppressed classes. Thus, plebiscites are held whose outcome is certain in advance and moreover are no longer able to change the facts. "Substitutes" for parliaments and people's assemblies are provided just as "substitutes" for the right to organize are furnished. The right to organize and vote are replaced by the duty and compulsion to participate in "elections" and fascist organizations.

The task of this state is, as stated in the Resolution on the Report of Comrade Dimitroff to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, to carry through "extraordinary measures for despoiling the toilers, of preparing a predatory, imperialist war, . . . and . . . preventing revolution."

We must still investigate to what extent the establishment of this open terrorist dictatorship was facilitated by liberal or other bourgeois and Social-Democratic or anarchistic theories of the state which have gained influence over the labor movement.

First, it must be made clear that without overcoming certain Social-Democratic conceptions of the state the working class cannot find the road to the abolition of the fascist dictatorship.

Today numerous Social-Democratic leaders still refuse to recognize in the fascist state an apparatus of capitalist power; instead, they chatter of "personal dictatorship," of dictatorship in general, and move solely in the orbit of those bourgeois liberals who periodically issue pompous protests against "every dictatorship whether from the Left or from the Right."

The Second International cannot be induced to adopt a uniform position against fascism because leading Social-Democratic politicians either manifest more or less sympathy for one or the other of the various fascist regimes which they have differentiated according to detailed gradations, or because they are directly obligated to one or the other fascist regime. (There are examples of this, among others, with regard to Japan, Hungary, Poland and Italy.)

German Social-Democracy, which, after all, was destroyed by the most reactionary variety of fascism—German fascism—has been unable to realize a clear position on the fascist state, grounded in class understanding, either before the establishment of the fascist dictatorship or in the succeeding years, because of its tie-up with the bourgeoisie.

Friedrich Stampfer reports in his book *Fourteen Years of the First German Republic* that the Social-Democratic Prussian Premier, Otto Braun, in July, 1932, had facilitated the negotiations of the then Imperial Chancellor Papen with the National-Socialists, "by going on sick leave. He was really sick and, in addition, convinced that the experiment of a parliamentary government with the National-Socialists would have to be made." In the sense of an out-and-out bourgeois conception of the state which predominated in the German Social-Democracy, such experiments were concerned with "maintaining democratic rules of the game" and not with class and power questions on which the wel-

fare of the working class and the people depend.

Otto Wels, the Chairman of the German Social-Democracy who recently took the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Swedish Social-Democracy to declare as correct the policy of the parties of the Second International during the first imperialist World War, attempted in 1933, only a few months after the formation of the fascist government, to assure a loyal relation of Social-Democracy to the fascist state by giving up all that still reminded one of class struggle and socialism in Social-Democracy. At that time, the Social-Democratic leadership attempted to combine a "loyal opposition" on questions of inner policy with an attitude of fundamental agreement with the foreign policy of the fascist state, and to purchase for itself, at the price of accepting all suppressive measures, without struggle, the right to be part of the parliamentary window-dressing.

That this position toward the fascist state is most closely tied up with the entire position of Social-Democracy on imperialism and with the question of its relation toward the bourgeoisie in its own country is clearly evident from the further development of Social-Democratic theoreticians. Friedrich Stampfer, who recently boasted that he had broken with Marxism "inwardly" thirty years ago, went so far, in various articles discussing matters of program, as to compare the "Weimar Republic" with the present fascist German state, divorced of its class content. As a result of this peculiar "self-criticism" of Social-Democracy's coalition policy, he could propagate a future state which would represent a cross between bourgeois democracy and the fascist state apparatus, *i.e.*, a "strong federal power," a president independent of the direct expression of the people's will, eliminating "criticism and obstruction" of government activity and building up the elements "of a strong legal order" against the pressure for self-administration, etc.

Like Stampfer, Otto Bauer, the theoretician of Austro-Marxism, was impressed

to an increasing extent (increasing to the extent that German imperialism spread out in Central Europe) by the allegedly "progressive role" of the fascist state. These two and other Social-Democrats created the fiction of a "progressive" role for this state, especially in its relation to capitalist economy, hence at a point where the reactionary character of the fascist state is most evident. Here again the Social-Democratic theoreticians treat the "state in itself" divorced from the finance capitalist forces which direct it.

Instead of understanding that injection of the fascist state into capitalist economy, which is falsely passed off as "planned economy," is a form of the sharpening competitive struggle between definite circles of trust, monopoly and bank capital against other circles of capitalist economy, and that it serves the primary purpose of enabling German imperialism to acquire the necessary ability to compete in the struggle which Engels far-sightedly called "conquest competition," Bauer bestowed the title of "social guidance of the process of production" on this activity of the fascist state and thereby gave his followers the cue to dream of "fascism leading up to socialism."

Although the fascist state (which, as we see, Bauer equates with society) was established as a reactionary barrier to the only possible revolutionary solution of the contradiction in which the material productive forces of society have come with the existing production relations (property relations), the above-mentioned Social-Democratic theoreticians see in it a progressive driving force.

In his book *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science* Engels, already before capitalism entered the stage of imperialism, sarcastically ridiculed those "Socialists" who thought they could perceive socialism in the act of taking over factories or industries by the bourgeois state. He writes:

"... recently, however, since Bismarck adopted state ownership, a certain spurious socialism has made its appearance—

here and there even degenerating into a kind of flunkeyism—which declares that *all* taking over by the state, even the Bismarckian kind, is in itself socialistic. If, however, the taking over of the tobacco trade by the state was socialistic, Napoleon and Metternich would rank among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian state, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, constructed its own main railway lines; if Bismarck, without any economic compulsion, took over the main railway lines in Prussia, simply in order to be better able to organize and use them for war, to train the railway officials as the government's voting cattle, and especially to secure a new source of revenue independent of Parliamentary votes—such actions were in no sense socialist measures, whether direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious. Otherwise, the Royal Maritime Company, the Royal Porcelain Manufacture, and even the regimental tailors in the army, would be socialist institutions." (*Anti-Dühring*, International Publishers, Footnote, pp. 305-306.)

At the end of his report on the Third Five-Year Plan to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), Molotov said:

"Capitalism, including capitalism in fascist garb, is powerless to match our planned economic system. Because of its system of private property, capitalism, including capitalism in fascist garb, is in its very essence incompatible with economic planning. Therefore, when national-economic planning began to display its miracle-working powers, capitalism had already definitely become a survival of history, a brake on history, a reactionary phenomenon of our day." (*The Soviet Union in 1942, the Third Five-Year Plan*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 74.)

According to this, it is precisely state interference and attempts at regulation that especially give the Marxist arguments for the necessity of abolishing capitalist production relations in general and for the abolition of the most reactionary capitalist state power, the fascist state. However, the Social-Democratic confusion on the question of the state, particularly the direct aid of some Social-Democratic theoreticians who dare

to describe the fascist state as a "progressive form of social organization," serves the reactionary attempts to befog the working class and dim its understanding of the capitalist character of the fascist state.

But the fascists fear nothing more than the class approach of the workers to the questions of the state. Thus, a certain Andreas Pfenning, in an article in the fascist periodical *Volk im Werden*, attempts to prove by the sweat of his brow that the beginning of all evil is the recognition that "the realm of the social is always in a certain contradiction to the realm of the state," whereby the scientific thinking which moves along these lines "acquires, to an increasing degree, a revolutionary, state-destroying character."

Therefore, this Pfenning designates as the center of the fascist movement "the idea of political totality," *i.e.*, the prohibition of the recognition and designation of class contradictions as such, *i.e.*, the suppression of the consciousness that the fascist state is pre-eminently a capitalist class state.

From this, in turn, it follows that those in the camp of the working class, under the influence of fascism and its "people's community" or "totality" phraseology, who attempt to obscure the capitalist class character of the fascist state or who openly deny this class character, work consciously or unconsciously as agents of fascism and rob the working class of its most important weapon.

ANTI-MARXIST INTERPRETATIONS OF THE STATE IN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The anti-Marxist theory and practice of the relationship of the working class to the state, as shown here by examples from Stampfer and Bauer and likewise represented by Henri de Man and Hampl, by influential labor leaders and certain French Socialists—regardless of shades of difference—can be reduced to a common denominator: the denial of the character of the bourgeois state as a machine for the maintenance of the rule of the bourgeoisie. From this follows the peculiar attitude toward the fascist state

which in a number of cases had led to succumbing to fascist ideologies. From this follows, on the other hand, the denial of the necessity for the working class to shatter the bourgeois machinery of state in order to enable it to build socialism.

Under the influence of fascist and other tendencies arising from capitalism, voices have arisen in recent years, in different Social-Democratic Parties, demanding that Social-Democracy turn completely away from the basic Marxian tenets on the state and that it return to and develop further Lassalle's theories. As a matter of fact, the contradictions between the two are so deep and in the course of the last decade "revisionists" have so repeatedly tried to supplant or "refine" Marx with Lassalle, that it is time to uproot these back-to-Lassalle theories.

From the very beginning the Bolshevik Party has waged a decisive struggle against diluting the teachings of Marx and Engels with the "ideas" of Lassalle or Bernstein. It did not permit the introduction of anti-Marxist contraband through the back door of private "philosophical" systems. It understood and defended Marxism as a world view, as a comprehensive teaching. The second section of Chapter IV of the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* on "Dialectical and Historical Materialism" gives us an impressive account of this.

It was different in the other parties of the working class movement even prior to the first imperialist World War. At that time, in the strongest and leading Social-Democratic Party, the German, a revisionist Right wing openly spread Lassalle's theories in opposition to Marxism. But Social-Democratic theoreticians like Kautsky, who originally fought on the basis of Marxism, also fell more and more into a theoretical liberalism which developed into open renegadeism. The Left wing of German Social-Democracy itself permitted its representatives to borrow from eclectic systems in place of an all-sided defense of consistent Marxism. Even the most distinguished and devoted fighters

against reformism, Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring, did not understand the danger that must arise from the surrender of Marx's and Engels' teachings in favor of Lassalle's constructions.

At the Second Congress (1903) of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, the Bolsheviks secured the inclusion of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the party program. The opportunists, who were strongly opposed to this, appealed to the fact

"... that the programs of a number of foreign Social-Democratic Parties contained no clause on the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that therefore the program of the Russian Social-Democratic Party could dispense with it, too." (*History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 40.)

Actually, the official Social-Democratic theoreticians of the West passed over in silence everything that Marx and Engels had written on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the organization of the proletariat as the ruling class, the class character of the bourgeois state and the correspondingly necessary class attitude of the proletariat to the bourgeois state.

In his book *The State and Revolution*, Lenin carefully traced and explained the development of the theory of the state by Marx and Engels. But the theoreticians of the Western European Social-Democratic Parties, who were succumbing to bourgeois influence more and more, treated Marx's and Engels' teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat, their references to the experiences of the Paris Commune, as a sort of slip or, like Kautsky, as an "insignificant phrase" which "Marx once used in a letter in 1875."

In 1891, in a study criticizing the Social-Democratic draft program, Engels attacked the tendency prevailing in German Social-Democracy:

"... as if the Republic could be established there in a peaceful, good-natured way, and not only the Republic but Communist society." (Engels: *Programmkritiken*, p. 65.)

At that time, the theories of a "free state," "free popular state," among

others, had already established themselves so firmly in German Social-Democracy that they had become an integral part of the theoretical stock of the party. The renunciation of the dictatorship of the proletariat was the logical outcome of the liberal approach to the state which found its most extreme expression in the theories of Lassalle, in which the state was defined not as the instrument of power of the ruling class, but as "the unity of individuals in an ethical totality, an entity which multiplies a million-fold the forces of all individuals included in this association." In this conviction, Lassalle described the state in the "Labor Program" as the organ of human society for the struggle with nature, whose purpose it is "to lead human nature to a positive and progressive development."

Lassalle's theories of the state made him an admirer, and finally a direct agent, of Bismarck's Prussian military machine. He became the propagandist for state-supported "producers' cooperatives." In his Rousdorf speech, he announced that the Prussian king "had recognized our [*i.e.*, Lassalle's] teachings and the justice of our demands." It was precisely these out-and-out bourgeois conceptions of the state that led Lassalle to direct collaboration with Bismarck and which Cunow, the theoretician of social-imperialism, referred to with satisfaction, saying that they were constantly gaining ground "among the German workers," *i.e.*, within Social-Democracy. On the other hand, Marxist principles were taboo in the leading circles of German Social-Democracy and Cunow could endeavor to dispose of them as a "vulgar Marxist anti-state theory."

Generally, the opportunist theoreticians of German Social-Democracy liked to refer to their position toward the state as "practical politics" or as "positive," while they tried to label the revolutionary Marxist conception of the state as "anarchistic." Lenin wrote concerning this:

"The usual criticism of anarchism by

present-day Social-Democrats has been reduced to the purest philistine banality: 'We recognize the state, whereas the anarchists do not!' Naturally, such banality cannot but repel revolutionary workers who think at all." ("State and Revolution," *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 59.)

With the development of imperialism, the influence of opportunism extended and deepened within the working class. The theories which promised a peaceful transition of imperialism to socialism resulted in an uncritical, absolutely anti-Marxist attitude toward the bourgeois state which was eventually understood by Kautsky and the "Austro-Marxists," too, in the sense of the above quoted Lassallean conception and no longer as the instrument of suppression by the ruling class.

The thinking of authoritative Social-Democratic politicians passed so unmistakably into the orbit of imperialism, so naturally did they move about within the confines of the bourgeois state, that they no longer differentiated between the bourgeois and the socialist state; and, as happened in a special issue of *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, immediately after the World War, they regarded the socialist character of the state merely as a matter of state form. In this special issue, for example, the question was put:

"Can, then, a socialist economic and state body renounce colonial possessions? It cannot."

To the present-day reader, the following sentences will sound like forerunners of the colonial arguments of National-Socialism:

"England already owns a fifth of the entire globe; Germany owned one-fortieth. Not only in the economic interest of Germany must we therefore raise the claim to colonial possessions but for the sake of a just equalization in the interest of socialism and human culture."

These same imperialistically infected German Social-Democrats, who, it is true, theoretically still admitted the existence of classes, without in the mean-

time being willing to lead the class struggle for the capture of state power in their own country, went so far as to describe the German capitalist state as a "unity" so that, in the name of this "unity," they could proclaim to the world the imperialist interests of German finance capital.

The above-mentioned special issue of the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* which appeared in 1919, declared point-blank: "It is necessary to distinguish between rulers and ruled among nations as well."

It would not be in accord with the facts to assume that the group within German and international Social-Democracy who gathered around the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* occupied an exceptional position, because its most prominent representatives, such as Winnig, became outright banner bearers of fascism, or like Noske and Severing, became retainers of fascism. Under the influence of imperialism, new batches of bourgeois ideologists continued to crop up in Social-Democracy. And, at present, when certain Social-Democratic publicists look about for factors that helped to put German fascism on its feet, they need only to become better acquainted with the forerunners of the theories of Stampfer and Bauer to get at the source.

Already during the first imperialist World War, Cunow attributed to German imperialism that "progressive role of fascism," which was one of Otto Bauer's many discoveries. This is supposed to consist of the temporary liquidation of a number of state boundaries through annexation and the replacement of independent national states by imperialist colonial domains. Cunow expresses it in the following sentence:

"Therefore the so-called right to state or national independence, too, is merely an ethical-esthetic fiction without historical foundation." (*Neue Zeit*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 178.)

And the assertion that the bourgeois (fascist) state is called upon to play the role of an instrument for "social guidance" of capitalist economy had its fore-

runner in Kautsky's theories on the "modern state," which ostensibly differentiates itself from earlier kinds of states in "that the utilization of the state apparatus for the purposes of the exploiting classes is not part of its nature." Democracy which, according to Kautsky, is suspended "above classes," to a certain extent offers its own possibilities for the destruction of the roots of the political power of the big exploiters.

"The more this is the case," wrote Kautsky, "the more the democratic state ceases to be a mere instrument for the exploiting classes. The state apparatus then begins to turn against them under given circumstances, thus functioning in direct contradiction to its activity up to this time. It begins to be transformed from an instrument of oppression into an instrument for the emancipation of the exploited." (Kautsky, *Historische Materialismus*, Vol. II, p. 599.)

At a time when Italian fascism had already exercised state power for many years, and when the outlines of extensive reactionary and forcible measures of the bourgeoisie against the working class were already threatening in Germany, Kautsky calmly philosophized about such a democratic, automatic road to socialism and declared oracularly:

"The question whether the capitalists will venture an armed attack upon democracy, according to this, reduces itself to the question whether they will find an adequately armed power at their disposal for this purpose."

Even at that time Kautsky knew how to comfort and reassure one:

"In an industrial country, such a large number of declassed elements in the prime of life are not to be found for capitalist purposes. In Italy, conditions were particularly favorable for fascism." (*Ibid.*, pp. 476-77.)

From these prophecies, cruelly derided and refuted by events, one can see to what kind of terrible confusion and serious consequences the denial of the

class character of the bourgeois state must lead.

Lenin, the brilliant Marxist thinker, on the basis of the laws of development of imperialism discovered by him, developed perspectives for the evolution of the bourgeois state which certainly did not correspond in any way with Kautsky's rosy optimism, but which, instead, placed the necessity of the struggle for power clearly before the proletariat and equipped it ideologically for this struggle. In *State and Revolution* Lenin wrote:

"Imperialism—the era of bank capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, the era of the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-capitalism—has particularly witnessed an unprecedented strengthening of the 'state machine' and an unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, in connection with the increase in repressive measures against the proletariat in the monarchical as well as in the freest republican countries." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 32.)

While the Social-Democratic state theories and utopias disarmed the proletariat and rendered it defenseless in face of an enemy concentrating its forces to strike, Leninism armed the working class for battle. While the Social-Democratic theoreticians passed consistently from denial of the role of the bourgeois state as an instrument of oppression to the surrender without a struggle of the gains of bourgeois democracy and partially to a recognition of fascism, the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the state gave the proletariat all the ideological prerequisites for recognizing and attacking the enemy in his own positions.

By falsifying the basic teachings of Marx and Engels on the state as the instrument of the domination of one class, their teachings on the Paris Commune and the necessity for the dictator-

ship of the proletariat, for the transition from capitalism to communism, the Social-Democratic opportunists opened the door to the penetration of bourgeois state theories in the labor movement. Lenin and Stalin, who consistently adhered to the teachings of Marxism on the dictatorship of the proletariat and brilliantly developed them, led the Russian proletariat to victory over tsarism and the bourgeoisie and established the first socialist state. Thereby they laid the unshakable practical and theoretical foundation for the victory of the international working class over the bourgeoisie, for the triumph of socialism throughout the world.

Today, when the workers of the capitalist countries look for a firm support in the midst of the chaos of state theories dressed up in modern garb and disseminated by the Social-Democratic leaders, they do not find it in the opportunist practicality of Stauning, Grimm, Fauré and others. They find it and a guide to action only in Lenin's and Stalin's teachings on the state that prove reliable even in the most difficult situations in which the workers may find themselves as, for example, under fascism, because they reveal the nature of the bourgeois state as Lenin did in *State and Revolution*, because they arm the proletariat for the struggle against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and because they have placed a weapon in the hands of the working class through the teaching and the example of the dictatorship of the proletariat which assures final victory.

[NOTE: A second article to be published soon will describe the role played by Lenin's and Stalin's teachings on the state in defense of democratic gains in bourgeois democracy and how the state of the proletarian dictatorship insures the construction of socialism and the realization of communism.]

The Great Bourgeois Revolution in France and German Intellectual Life

BY P. DENGEL

FASCISM is possessed by a bestial hate for the great French bourgeois revolution, for the principles of August 4, 1789. In words of much the same content, both Hitler and Mussolini place before fascism the task of extinguishing these principles in the people's consciousness and of destroying everything that was created in relation to it. Fascism in Germany and Italy has indeed destroyed every democratic right of its inhabitants; it mutilates and destroys even those organizations created by itself as soon as they manifest the most elementary germs of democratic life.

Fascism in Germany has abolished even the formal equality before the law, not only by its racial laws, but also by the decrees that remove fascist party members from the jurisdiction of the regular courts. It takes up the barbarous ideology of decaying feudalism. It "proves" the inequality of people, not, to be sure, by the old method of appealing to God and revealed religion but by appealing to the myth of race. With this myth, fascism "justifies" the "natural order" of leaders and followers, the unconditional right of the one to command and the unconditional duty of the other to obey, and abroad, the right to dominate "inferior" peoples.

Fascism has abolished even the appearance of freedom in science and research, degraded the colleges and academies and turned over their "leadership" to jugglers and charlatans. It dictates to poets and creative artists the contents and form of their creations and persecutes every artist to the point of destroy-

ing his physical existence the instant he does not adapt himself to the horrible patterns demanded from above.

Fascism revives the "reason of state" advanced by feudal despotism which is unworthy of human beings, "Cuius regio—eius religio" (the ruler determines the religion of the subject) and persecutes those religions which do not submit to the fascist dogmas. The ideology as well as the practice of fascism is, in fact, the absolute negation of the principles of the year 1789.

Fascism which—in order to achieve power—created a suicidal movement of the petty-bourgeois masses with unscrupulous deception, hates the plebeian character of the great French Revolution. It fears the magnificent example of the revolutionary struggle of a people who no longer respected the mystical spell which surrounded the "ruling race," drove out the bloodsuckers, the traders and enemies of the people, threw them into prison and had them beheaded. It hates like the plague this revolution of an entire people, the artisans, the small merchants in the city, the peasant in the village and the intellectual, this victorious uprising of an entire people for its own rights, for its own power, for its own welfare. Even the shadow of this mighty historical event which—despite all counter-revolution—changed the face of Europe from top to bottom, inspires the fascists with panicky fear.

The fascist dictatorship is a form of the rule of the decaying bourgeois class, it is the rule of its most reactionary and chauvinist part. Nothing character-

izes more sharply the depth to which this class has fallen than the fact that it denies its own origin and wants to destroy the most beautiful historical contributions connected with its rise, that it hates the grandest event of its history and fears its subsequent effect.

No event which had its origin and its focus outside Germany has influenced this country so strongly as the great French Revolution. Despite this, the recollection of the great French Revolution was always painful to the German bourgeoisie, which was unable to solve its great historical tasks with its own power—which, at great historical turning points, showed itself incompetent and capitulated in a cowardly fashion. It created the Hohenzollern legend and made a mystery of the history of the struggle against Napoleon in order to obscure the real history and to conceal the fact that it owes its rise to the great French Revolution and Napoleon.

But the deciding factor in the hate of the present-day fascist bourgeoisie of Germany for the great French Revolution is no longer this feeling of inferiority. In order to prolong still further its existence, which has become a fetter on historical development, the bourgeoisie must extinguish even the consciousness of its origin, it must disown its own historical significance in having awakened in the individual as well as in entire communities the will to stand on their own feet, to be independent and to respect this independence in others.

The fascist bourgeoisie makes the decidedly futile attempt to turn back the consciousness of people hundreds of centuries because this consciousness which bourgeois society created itself has become incompatible with the continuation of capitalism.

The hatred of fascism for the great French Revolution includes the hatred for all progressive ideas which helped to prepare this revolution. A few of these are as old as the first germs of the bourgeois class and are not only manifestations of the 18th century. Practically all great achievements in thought and in artistic creation since the 13th

century in Italy and since the 14th century in Germany are permeated with the spirit of humanism. They are so many means of blasting an outlived ideology and dogmatism.

To be sure, there is no direct continuity; the poverty of German history did not permit this: but there is an inner continuity from Nicholas of Cusa, Melancthon, Hutten, Kepler, Dürer and Grünewald to Klopstock, Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, Herder, Kant, Fichte and Hegel. Already in the 14th and 15th centuries the works of the great thinkers and creators who came out of the German people were revolutionary and democratic, if "democracy" is not taken formally and dogmatically in the sense of petty-bourgeois democratism but as a historical, that is, changing category. And the classical German literature, philosophy and music are permeated with the anti-authoritarian, anti-feudal, libertarian, humanistic and democratic ideology of the revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The bestial hate of the fascists for the principles of 1789, for the great French Revolution, therefore, includes the bestial hate of the great achievements of the culture of their own people. The barbarous mysticism of "blood and race," of the "dynamism" of young nations is at the same time the unconditional negation of the great, decisive achievements in the development of human culture and civilization which have given the German, as well as the Italian people, such honorable places in the circle of nations. Fascism attempts to destroy in the consciousness of the people the only thing which has made it possible for the German as well as the Italian people to bear their miserable and oppressive political and social history for so many centuries. It disgraces and destroys the precious national possessions.

Most of the representatives of German classical literature and philosophy were contemporaries of the great French Revolution. There was not one among them who did not affirm the principles of August 4, 1789, not one who was not

agitated and influenced in his creative work by the world historical event. Hegel not only spoke for himself but for all progressive and independent intellectuals of Germany at the time of the great French Revolution when he stated retrospectively in his *Philosophy of History*:

"The conception, the idea of Right asserted its authority *all at once*, and the old framework of injustice could offer no resistance to its onslaught. A constitution, therefore, was established in harmony with the conception of Right, and on this foundation all future legislation was to be based. . . . This was accordingly a glorious mental dawn. All thinking beings shared in the jubilation of this epoch. Emotions of a lofty character stirred men's minds at that time; a spiritual enthusiasm thrilled through the world, as if the reconciliation between the Divine and the Secular was now first accomplished." (Translated by J. Sibree, Colonial Press, New York, p. 447.)

Goethe lets the judge who leads the Left Rhenisch refugees in *Hermann und Dorothea* speak as follows:

"For what man now thinks to deny that
higher his heart swelled,
That his breast breathed freer and beat
with loftier pulses,
When he saw the first bright gleam of
the sun that was rising;
When we heard of the Rights of Man
that are common to all men.
Freedom's sacred flame, and fair Equality's
precepts!
Each man thought he should live for him-
self henceforth; and the fetters
Seemed to be loosed for aye, that had
bound full many a fair land,
Where the chain was held in the grasp
of Greed and Idleness.
Look not nations then, in the days of
rising emotion,
Towards that city, so long the world's
great capital deemed,
And now more than before that lofty
title deserving?
And were not these men, who the her-
alds of coming events were,
Names not less than the first that be-
neath the stars are inscribed?
Rose not each man's soul and his speech
at the call of the epoch?"

Light to us seemed then e'en war's im-
portunate pressure,
For in the distance far, hope's hues
play'd gaily before us,—
Tempted our eager looks through yet
unvisited pathways.

O how sweet is the time, when join'd,
the bride and the bridegroom
Whirl in the dance, expecting the bliss-
ful day of espousal!
But yet fairer the time seemed then,
when the loftiest objects
Which man shapes in his mind show'd
nearer and ready for grasping.
Loosened then was the tongue of all:
then uttered the aged,
Uttered the man and the stripling alike
high thoughts and aspirings.

(Translation edited by E. E. Brownell,
1849, p. 26.)

Schiller—like Klopstock, appointed honorary citizen of revolutionary France—temporarily thought of entering the service of the French people. Certainly the principles of the great French bourgeois revolution could not be foreign to this poet who, in his youth, had hurled the cry of "tyrants" at the gang of German princes of the time. Even in his last work, *Wilhelm Tell*, he proclaimed the eternal natural right of every people to rise against the unbearable pressure of tyranny:

"No, the power of tyrants has its limits,
When the oppressed cannot find justice
anywhere,
When the burden becomes unbearable—
he reaches
Up to heaven, in full confidence,
And hauls down his eternal rights. . . .

As a last resort, when no other will
Longer do, the sword is given to him."

Herder was, from the very beginning of the French Revolution, its courageous supporter and as a consequence was sorely harassed by the Weimar court rabble and by the Duke himself. In contrast to Goethe and Schiller, he supported the French Revolution in its Jacobin phase as well.

"No German," writes Herder, "would be able to stand the stench which the French are enduring, having undertaken

to clean their old throne, the oldest in Europe, after more than a thousand years and which has needed a cleaning for a long time."

The old Klopstock dedicated the following ode to the French National Assembly:

"The daring parliament of Gaul already dawns,
The morning showers penetrate bone and marrow of those who wait: O come, thou new
Living sun, never even dreamed of."

In another ode, Klopstock calls upon the Germans to emulate the example of their French brothers and complains that the Germans themselves have not planted the flag of freedom. In another revolutionary ode to the German princes who were marching in the first war of intervention against revolutionary France, he called out: you want to hurl the tortured people down from the heights of its self-won freedom, "to force it to serve savages once again."

Wieland wrote in 1792:

"No matter how much reason there may be to take exception to the Jacobins, yet I cannot keep from inwardly favoring their entire cause. For, in the last analysis, their suppression would inevitably be the death of freedom and equality; and if France finally has to be one or the other, monarchy or republic, it is certainly better that one perish than that the entire people be ruined."

Inspired by the revolutionary struggle of the French people, Hölderlin wrote his hymn to the Goddess of Freedom:

". . . Happy and divinely great is your knowledge,
Queen; be glorified by power and deed.
Already the new hour of creation begins,
Already the seed, pregnant with blessings, is budding."

Kant occupied himself extensively with the great French Revolution. This philosopher, in his work *Idea for a General History in the Cosmopolitan Spirit*, which appeared ten years prior to the

great French Revolution, demanded the creation of a league of nations for the purpose of emerging from the condition of savagery in which humanity was placed by the wars and uninterrupted armaments. This league of nations would have to guarantee security and justice to every state, even the smallest, with the full power and complete authority of united humanity. In his work *The Conflict of the Faculties*, of 1798, Kant writes:

"The revolution of a gifted people, which we see proceeding at the present time, may succeed or fail; it may be filled with misery and atrocities to such an extent that every right-thinking person, if he could undertake it a second time, would hope to carry it to a successful conclusion, but would never complete the experiment at such a price—nevertheless, in the hearts of all spectators (who are not themselves involved in this drama), this revolution, I say, finds a participation which in wishes borders closely on enthusiasm and whose expression was even connected with danger, and hence can have as its cause no other than a moral basis in the human race."

This revolution, Kant pointed out, has demonstrated that every people has the right to create the civil and political constitution which it considers necessary and proper. It has demonstrated further that only such a state order can be recognized as good in the legal and moral sense which by its very nature excludes wars of aggression, and that can only be a democratic republic.

It is as if Kant had foreseen the efforts of fascist barbarism, when he declares further in this work *that this revolution can never be forgotten* because it has revealed humanity's capacity for improvement, for progress. This event, Kant continues, is far too important, far too strongly bound up with the interests of the people, for the wish not to be awakened and attempts not to be made by the nations to repeat it when faced by adverse conditions.

Fichte had affirmed his support of the French Revolution even more consistent-

ly than Kant. Because of his attitude toward the great French Revolution and its ideas he was driven out of his professorship at the University of Jena, that is, from the university of that little country ruled by the "benevolent and free-thinking" Duke Karl August, the friend of Goethe.

At that time, in the year 1779, Fichte wrote that no person who had expressed a free thought would be able to find a resting place in Germany if the French did not gain overwhelming superiority in Germany. Animated by the heroic revolutionary struggle of the neighboring people, Fichte demanded that the writers and scientists give conscious expression to political views in their works. He said of himself: they persecute in me a free thinker who is beginning to make himself intelligible and a notorious democrat; the independence which they vaguely suspect my philosophy arouses frightens them like a ghost.

And Fichte stood the test of these demands himself. In his *Speeches to the German Nation*, he was the first great bourgeois political propagandist to appeal to the German people and who found an echo throughout Germany.

In face of the lamentation of the German philistines, including Goethe and Schiller, over the "horrors" of the revolution, Fichte exclaims:

"No nobleman, no military person in the monarchic state, no business man in the service of a court which had declared itself against the French Revolution should be heard in this investigation. Only he who is neither oppressor nor oppressed, whose hands and heritage are unsoiled by the robbery of nations, whose head has not been molded from youth in the conventional forms of our age, whose heart feels a warm but quiet reverence for human worth and human rights, can be a judge here. It is true, Knight of the Golden Fleece—it was not even a question of your misery or bliss, it was a question of our rights. You think that what makes you miserable can never be right. But look at your slaves hitherto oppressed by you; they cry to us: the rich man, the privileged one does not belong to the people, he has no share

in the general human right! That is *their* interest. Their conclusions are as well-founded as yours."

As against all faint-hearted people, Fichte affirms the right of the people to revolution. To renounce this would mean to act against the spirit of mankind, would mean to renounce being a human being, to be satisfied with the level of a trained animal.

Most profoundly bound up with the great French Revolution were poets like Schubert, Voss and Bürger. In popular revolutionary verses, Bürger sings of the heroism of the French revolutionaries:

"To die for virtue, human right and human freedom,
Is highest exalted courage, is a world-saviour's death
For only the most Godly of heroic people color
For this the coat of armor red with their heart's blood."

In another poem Bürger sings:

"Freedom is threatened with lead and iron
By the proud oppressor's rage.
But I will glorify it, despite this,
And will do it with fearless courage."

An honored place among the outstanding Germans of the time of the great French Revolution belongs to Georg Forster, a highly gifted writer and thinker who, already before 1789, had come out against the "slavishness" of German literature, against its philistine renunciation of the burning questions confronting the people, against its "sublime super-eminence," against its fraternization with the dregs of the princely courts. This penetrating, widely traveled thinker exercised a great influence on no less a person than the young Hegel, to whom he gave the first hints of the dialectical movement of history. The following excerpt from a letter of Georg Forster of July 12, 1791, shows his position on the great French Revolution and, at the same time, the manner of his original dialectical thinking:

"For my part, I cannot cease mar-

veling and being extremely astonished that so much moderation, so much genuine, pure virtue is still possible in a people which, for so many centuries, groaned under the most miserable despots and deeply degraded nobility so utterly devoid of all intellectual superiority and inner worth.

"One can never speak of absolute perfection in the world. It is never to be expected that people will behave other than humanly. But when things having a certain form reach the extreme, when abuse, depravity, infamy, lack of character, in short, the utmost immorality shatters everything through this form, then one should not want these abominations to last because of the few imperfections which are noticeable in the new form which follows it. In a hundred years or two hundred years or even sooner, the imperfections of the new French state reform may develop into abuses of the first magnitude—if they have not been abolished beforehand. But until that happens, the good institutions are obviously in the ascendancy and when the evil comes out in the open and actually threatens just as great destruction as the previous despotism and aristocracy, to what will it be attributable except bitter necessity, the unavoidable law of nature by virtue of which it is impossible to abolish the effect of one extreme without going to other extremes? There is no error, no mistake, no abuse of which the National Assembly has been accused, the curse of which cannot be traced back to the preceding despotism."

In this same magnificent letter concerning the driving forces of the great French Revolution, how tremendously does Georg Forster's writing tower over the nonsense of the later bourgeois historians and bourgeois politicians. The following passage from the letter of a contemporary of the great French Revolution, written in 1791, should prove very instructive even for many Social-Democratic leaders of today:

"It is contemptible that people really imagine that only a comedy of freedom is being played in France. This comedy is being so well played that the peasant throughout France has been freed from clearly half of his burdens. Hence, he is

aware of himself, hence he is happier than formerly. He can eat his fill, he can clothe himself; he could not do this under the extortionist regime. That is why the Papal excommunications could have no effect in the midst of a Catholic country; that is why the flight of the king has no other effect than to clearly reveal the general sentiment of the nation for the present constitution, to deprive the aristocrats of all hope and to strengthen the hands of the National Assembly with the fullest confidence.

"Without any other power except this confidence, they now rule without restriction and may even suspend the executive power of the king without anyone in the entire country making a stir. That could not occur if the people were not happy.

"For the vast mass of the people who live merely from hand to mouth, two good years are more than enough to prove the intrinsic merit of the constitution. They are able to live; that is the big argument for the new constitution. Just recall how the aristocrats gradually changed their objections, how the facts constantly refuted them, how, in the beginning, they told themselves that the peasant would not be any happier under the new arrangements than under the previous ones, how they accordingly wanted to use the imperfections of representation as proof that the 1,200 representatives also were only despots; how, at the present time, they only try to arouse sympathy and compassion and give vent to impotent slanders; then let us judge how things actually look in France. However, its success will be manifest when the German troops launch their drive against the French citizens."

Georg Forster stood at the head of the revolutionary bourgeoisie in that small section of Germany where the French Revolution had unloosed direct revolutionary struggles of the people. He was the leader of the Jacobin Club in Mainz and represented the people of Mainz as a deputy in the Paris Convention. He died in Paris as a revolutionary. Engels considered him together with Thomas Münzer as a shining light of German history.

Georg Forster is an isolated phenome-

non in the Germany of his time. He was the only one who recognized the driving forces of the great French Revolution and at the same time behaved as a revolutionary toward them. Goethe came closest to him in understanding the social upheaval which had found its political expression in the great French Revolution. In the 90's of the 18th century, under the direct impact of the revolution in the neighboring country, Goethe wrote *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre*, in which he concerned himself with the problems of capitalist society in the process of breaking up.

The famous phrase which Goethe wrote down on the evening of the cannonade of Valmy, that henceforth a new age had begun, was not accidental. It followed from Goethe's recognition of the necessary victory of capitalism and the necessary decline of feudalism. But Goethe, who far surpassed Schiller, Herder, Kant and Fichte in this recognition, rejected the plebeian revolution most completely and slandered it in a series of justly forgotten dramas.

Fichte, who of all the German classicists was the most decided supporter of the revolution, who, as we saw, called himself a democrat, did not understand the social character of the revolution. In an article on Fichte, Franz Mehring says quite appropriately:

"With burning shame Fichte recognized the degeneration of German conditions whose 'simple sinfulness' he pointed out in his lectures on the main features of the present epoch. The degeneration was so great that it even lacked the practical levers of the political revolution, indeed, so that even Fichte himself did not recognize these levers as they worked in the French Revolution. Alone and misunderstood, he faced the beginnings of capitalist development in which he could perceive only relapses into the barbarism of medieval conditions."

Schiller, who in his youthful dramas had really aroused the conscience of the Germans most effectively against the atrocious conditions in their fatherland, at the news that revolutionary Paris was

dragging the traitor Louis Capet before its tribunal, wanted to bring the French people "to reason" by means of a memorial.

In his well-known poem *The Bell*, Schiller sinks to the level of the most wretched philistinism, to a contemptible slander of the great popular revolution. Klopstock withdraws his inspired odes, Kant, as we saw, does not want to believe that a "right-thinking" person would repeat such a revolution.

In their famous characterization of Goethe, Marx and Engels more or less characterized the dual nature of the attitude of the German classicists to the great French Revolution.

"Goethe conducts himself in a two-fold manner toward the German society of his time. At times, he is hostile to it—seeking to escape what is repulsive to him, as in *Iphigenie* and generally during the Italian journey. He rebels against it as Gotz, Prometheus and Faust and pours out his most biting ridicule against it as Mephistopheles. At other times, however, he is friendly to it, adapts himself to it as in the majority of the *Zahme Xenien* and many prose works; glorifies it as in the *Maskenzügen*, even defends it against the advancing historical movement as in all those writings where he has occasion to speak of the French Revolution. . . .

"Thus Goethe is now colossal, now trivial, now a defiant, jeering, world-disdaining genius, now a considerate, contented, narrow philistine. Goethe, too, was unable to conquer the German wretchedness. On the contrary, it conquered him, and this victory of wretchedness over the greatest German is the best proof that it cannot be overcome at all 'from within.' . . .

"In this dilemma—to exist in a sphere of life which he had to despise and yet to be fettered to it as the only one in which he could be active—in this dilemma Goethe constantly found himself, and the older he became the more the mighty poet retreated behind the insignificant Weimar minister."

How did this misery of Germany look at the beginning of the great French Revolution? In contrast to England and France, where absolute monarchy subdued, destroyed or robbed the nobility of

its territorial possessions, where a centrally governed state had arisen, Germany broke up into many hundred independent state formations, each with its own army, its own tariff zone, its own representatives abroad, etc. Only the Hapsburgs constituted a great power; but this great power had its center of gravity in non-German Slavic and Hungarian territories. The other German princes, including the Prussian, were in the pay of foreign powers in whose interests they conducted wars among themselves and to whom they supplied troops for cash money. As for the economic and social conditions of this Germany in the second half of the eighteenth century, Engels described them as follows in his series of articles, "The Situation in Germany":

"Everywhere a decaying and putrefying mass. No one felt happy. Handicraft, trade, industry and agriculture lay prostrate. Peasants, merchants and artisans suffered under a double yoke: the bloodthirsty government and poor trade. Nobility and princes thought that their income ought not to lag behind the growing expenditures, although they had squeezed the last drop out of their subjects. Everything was miserable and general dissatisfaction prevailed in the country. No education, no means whatever of influencing the opinion of the masses, no freedom of the press, no public opinion, no important trade of any kind with other countries; everywhere baseness and egoism—the entire population was permeated with a base, slavish, vulgar, shop-keeper's spirit. Everything was rotten, everything was shaky and close to collapse and one could not even count on a single change because there did not exist a force among the people which could have removed the putrefying corpse of the outlived institutions."

In his essay *The Status Quo in Germany*, which appeared a few years after the previously-quoted articles, Engels said:

"While a rich and powerful bourgeoisie was formed in England from the seventeenth century on, in France from the eighteenth century on, one can speak of a bourgeoisie in Germany only since

the beginning of the nineteenth century. Up till then there existed, of course, individual wealthy ship owners in the Hanseatic cities, a few rich bankers in the interior, but no class of big capitalists and, least of all, big *industrial* capitalists. The creator of the German bourgeoisie was Napoleon."

In this Germany of 300 to 400 "fatherlands" with its decay and morass of feudal society, there were scarcely the germs of a national consciousness without which there could be no talk of a powerful development of capitalism, there were no prerequisites for a bourgeois revolution. In this country, even the hope that the Third Estate might ever have the power to change the rotten conditions appeared fantastic and without any foundation.

The classicists of German literature and philosophy reflect the developed conditions in England and France more than the existence of any forces on which they could base themselves and which were set in motion in their own country. Preeminently receptive to the most progressive ideas of neighboring countries that had arisen on the basis of a progressive development of the social relations and, in many respects, developing these ideas still further, the German classicists came into collision with the conditions under which they were compelled to live. The despair over the misery of their own country found its classic expression in the philosophical idealism of Kant, Fichte and Hegel and especially in the philosophical poems of Schiller.

*"But flee from the confines of the senses.
Into the freedom of ideas
And you have escaped from the spectre
of fear."*

Schiller sang. But these flights were an escape, a desertion from the mighty historical movement.

* * *

The great French Revolution brought fresh breezes into the rank and musty air of the Germany of the time. It swept away the feudal rubbish just as radically

in the Left Rhenish provinces of Germany as in France itself after the revolutionary armies had driven the Prussian and Austrian interventionists across the Rhine.

Under the blows of the armies commanded by Napoleon, the rotten skeleton of the "Holy Roman Empire of German Nations" fell apart; the South and Middle German princes submitted voluntarily to the emperor who allowed them to round out their territories by secularizing the clerical principalities, the free imperial cities, the territories of the imperial counts and imperial knights.

In 1806, the Prussian army was annihilated at Jena and Napoleon marched as far as Tilsit. Napoleon was not only an imperialist conqueror; he was, at the same time, the executor of the bourgeois revolution in as much as, wherever he went, he swept away much of feudalism and cleared the road for capitalist development.

The German bourgeoisie has tried to mystify its origin by two legends, the Hohenzollern legend and the legend of the wars of liberation. The legend of "national revival" by the Prussian King Frederick II has already been settled once and for all by Franz Mehring. When Frederick II died, Prussia and Germany were even poorer, even more demoralized, backward and dependent on the outside than when he first ascended the throne. At the end of the "Wars of Liberation" stands the Holy Alliance, the attempt at feudal restoration.

If Germany was no longer split up into several hundred states but "only" into thirty-nine states now, it owed this work of cleaning up to the great French Revolution and Napoleon. If the peasants were completely or partially freed from feudal fetters, this was also, to a large extent, a result of the French Revolution. If there were now the beginnings of a modern industry and a modern anti-feudal code of laws in Germany, the French Revolution had played its part in this also. Patriots and reformers like Stein, Hardenberg and Scharnhorst would have stifled in the Prussian

swamp without the effects of the great revolution, and many of its reforms could be put through only under the protection of Napoleon who, for example, enforced the reinstatement of Stein as Minister.

The German bourgeoisie did not open the first great door to freedom for itself; it was burst open from the outside. Weighed down by the traditions of a decaying, oppressed, subjugated guild bourgeoisie and a ruined urban patriciate from which they arose, owing their first ascent to a foreign power, the German bourgeoisie was able to develop only a stunted, broken self-consciousness.

When capitalist society began to break through in Germany, it could no longer appear in the original form as at the time of the great French Revolution, with the claim to represent the entire people, the nation. When, in the 'forties of the preceding century, the German bourgeoisie definitely mounted the political stage for the first time, the new progressive class, the proletariat, had already fought great battles in France and especially in England. It was fear of this industrial proletariat that robbed the revolutionary energy of the bourgeoisie of any buoyancy.

This two-fold breach in the consciousness of the bourgeoisie is reflected also in the bourgeois literature of the first half of the preceding century. Although the development in Germany was influenced essentially by the great French Revolution and every thinking person had to acknowledge it, it remained more as a warning than an exhortation to the German bourgeoisie and its intellectuals. The flight into the romantic, the superficiality of "Young Germany," the self-elimination of the movement of Young Hegelians on the side-track of religious criticism, the skepticism of the magnificent figure of German literature of the time, Heinrich Heine, who was brilliant enough to recognize the necessary decline of capitalist society—all this is an expression of the fact that the German bourgeois class was incapable of a revolutionary solution to its historical task.

The heritage of the principles of 1789 had already passed over to the new revolutionary class, to the proletariat.

After Hegel, bourgeois Germany no longer produced any really progressive thinkers. Schopenhauer, von Hartmann, Nietzsche follow as "peaks" of philosophical decadence, of pessimism, of anti-humanism, slanderers of the great French Revolution and the magnificent side of German classicism. However, two men acquired the German classical heritage as well as the teachings of the great French Revolution, only to transcend both in their teaching of historical materialism, heralds of a new revolution, the proletarian revolution. These two men were Marx and Engels.

That does not mean that bourgeois humanism has ceased to exist altogether. It leads a shadowy existence in the epigones and eclecticism of bourgeois literature after 1848, in neo-Kantianism, in certain phenomena of the bourgeois youth movement of pre-war days. It is revived under the influence of the ascending labor movement, of great foreign writers of the 19th century, only to run amuck into Naturalism and Expressionism. In a few important poets—Thomas Mann, Heinrich Mann, Lion Feuchtwanger and others—it blossoms out again in full bloom.

While on one-sixth of the earth, in the Soviet Union, a revolution of a higher type has already been victorious and a new, more highly-developed humanism, socialist humanism, has been realized, Germany has been cast into a barbarism unparalleled in history by the reactionary bourgeoisie which has become fascist. The fascist menace has again made the struggle for the political principles of the great French Revolution an imme-

diately concerned: the struggle for political freedom, the struggle for individual freedom, the struggle for the national freedom of the nations oppressed by fascism. In the face of fascist barbarism, bourgeois and socialist humanism are allies, mutually dependent on one another; and socialist humanism knows that the immediate question before the bourgeois world is the reconquest of its lost freedom.

The experiences of the French bourgeois revolution, therefore, have not only a historical but an immediate interest for Germany. The humanism of the German classical literature has once more become a real weapon in the political struggle. There are tendencies in the ranks of the German anti-fascists which tie up directly with the historically conditioned weaknesses of German classical literature and philosophy, with skepticism, with the rejection of plebeianism in the revolution, with its tendency to rotten compromise.

But there can be no compromise with fascism, it must be destroyed root and branch. We must tie up with the enthusiasm with which the German classicists greeted the French Revolution, with everything in their works which consistently represents and defends the "eternal rights" of man. We must tie up with the Jacobinism in the French Revolution, with its consistency, its revolutionary determination not to spare the enemies of the people.

Once again, the German people are faced with the task of storming the Bastille. In this struggle for freedom, progressive people will become convinced that, at the present time, the ideal of humanism can only be realized by socialism.

The Tasks of the Anti-Japanese United Front

BY BO GU

THE national war of liberation of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism has hardened the Chinese nation for further struggle for freedom and independence. In the fire of war, all obstacles have been removed which hindered the inner consolidation of the Chinese people, who have been split up for centuries. Only the inner cohesion of the entire Chinese people can guarantee victory over the Japanese aggressor.

The anti-Japanese national united front was created, developed and solidified in the process of the national war of liberation against the Japanese aggressor. The collaboration of the anti-Japanese parties is developing and growing firmer, assuring the inner unity of the toiling masses. The war against the Japanese aggressor has overcome the long-standing obstacles which hindered the collaboration of the two strongest parties of China, the Communist Party and the Kuomintang.

The entire Chinese people, all parties and groups, have united under the banner of the anti-Japanese front, one in spirit and one in the will to carry the struggle against the Japanese aggressor to a victorious conclusion. The united Chinese nation bears its joys and sorrows in common. Together it is ready to live and fight for national freedom and independence.

Already in 1912, V. I. Lenin said that the great Chinese people

“... can not only bewail its centuries-old slavery, that it not only dreams of freedom and equality, but can also fight against the centuries-old oppression of

China.” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol XVI, p. 27, Russian ed.)

* * *

The main line of the anti-Japanese national united front is the common conduct of the national war of liberation against the foreign invaders, against the aggression of Japanese imperialism. The political hall-marks of the anti-Japanese national united front are the three democratic principles of Sun Yat-sen. The three principles of Sun Yat-sen express the aspirations of the entire Chinese people: national independence, democratic liberty and plenty. The realization of these three principles is necessary in China's present stage of development. Victory over the Japanese aggressor means the realization of national independence, but for the Chinese people to win its national war of liberation, it is necessary to democratize the entire state system and to improve the living conditions of the toiling masses. That is exactly why the three principles of Sun Yat-sen are the hall-marks of the anti-Japanese national united front.

In its appeal of September, 1938, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party declared quite plainly that the three principles of Sun Yat-sen are necessary in present-day China and that it will fight for the complete fulfillment of these principles. This candid statement of the Chinese Communist Party is no maneuver, as the enemies of the Chinese people—the Trotskyites and other provocateurs—assert. The Communists are struggling in deeds for

the realization of these three principles of Sun Yat-sen because the Communist Party not only esteems and takes over the best traditions and hopes of the Chinese people, but is firmly convinced that the consistent realization of Sun Yat-sen's three principles constitutes a necessary political condition for the further consolidation of the anti-Japanese national united front.

The anti-Japanese national united front in China is no temporary coalition of political parties, like the parliamentary coalitions for the support or overthrow of a cabinet. Neither is it a coalition of parties standing outside of the government, to bring about the downfall of the existing government, but it is a mighty union of the anti-Japanese forces and all anti-Japanese parties of all China for the struggle against the Japanese conqueror.

To the extent that the policy of the Chinese government is directed toward the national war of liberation up to complete victory over Japanese imperialism—which corresponds to the interests of the people—to that extent the anti-Japanese national united front supports fully and completely the policy and the acts of the Chinese government.

Among the political parties belonging to the anti-Japanese national united front, there can be no diverging interests and no separation into government parties and parties standing outside the government. They must support one another for the common goal and strengthen their unity. Although the national government of China is led by the Kuomintang, the Communist Party of China fully supports the national government and all measures which it adopts for the victorious completion of the national war of liberation against the Japanese conquerors.

The anti-Japanese national united front unites the entire population without distinction of classes and strata and rests upon the common struggle of the entire Chinese people.

Only a small group are traitors to the country and remain outside the anti-Japanese national united front. One of

the strongest sides of the anti-Japanese national united front in China is the inclusion of all classes, all sections of the Chinese people, irrespective of their nationality, their faith, their party membership, their occupation and their origin, into the national war of defense against Japanese imperialism.

All this shows the vitality, the unswerving character and the perspectives of development and consolidation of the anti-Japanese national united front.

* * *

The anti-Japanese national united front has much of a positive character to show in the course of its development and consolidation, but, as experience shows, it also ran into many difficulties.

The difficulties consisted in the fact that the anti-Japanese national united front united all anti-Japanese forces of the country and that representatives of various classes participated in it whose interests do not always coincide with the general interests of the people. This resulted in certain discords and differences of opinion in the execution of individual measures for the achievement of victory in the national war of liberation, in the realization of democracy and the improvement of the living standards of the people in the process of the national war of defense. These inner discords have undoubtedly hindered the consolidation and development of the anti-Japanese national united front.

The difficulties with which the anti-Japanese national united front had to contend also consisted in the character of the mutual relationship between the two leading parties: the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang. This can be explained by the fact that in the past armed battles occurred between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang which dragged out for about a decade and left their traces in the thinking of many people. This found expression in the fact that among the members of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party there were still people who retained their former hostility and mutual distrust,

thus hindering the members of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party from coming closer.

Such was the relationship not only between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang but, unfortunately, such is the case still between other political parties participating in the anti-Japanese national united front. The Japanese imperialists and their agents, first of all the spies and Trotskyites, make skillful use of the differences of opinion between political parties and individual anti-Japanese groups in order to disrupt the anti-Japanese national united front and to put over the outrageous policy of "subjugating China through the Chinese themselves."

To overcome similar difficulties, it would have been necessary for all political parties and anti-Japanese groups participating in the anti-Japanese national united front to respect the political and organizational independence of the other parties. The anti-Japanese national united front should not set itself the goal of restricting the political and organizational independence of individual parties and anti-Japanese groups participating in the anti-Japanese united front.

Attacks on such organizational and political independence could lead to sharpening the inner struggle, to disruption of the anti-Japanese national united front and to the destruction of the forces of the Chinese people in the national war of liberation. Mutual respect for the political and organizational independence of the political parties is the first necessary condition for consolidating the anti-Japanese national united front. The honest and genuine respect for the political and organizational independence of one party by the others extends and consolidates the anti-Japanese united front and deprives the traitors to the country of the possibility of utilizing the inner differences of opinion.

In the process of the national war of defense, in the process of the further growth and strengthening of the anti-Japanese national united front, the relationship of the political parties to one

another has changed from the bottom up.

In the situation in which the enemy unleashes a furious attack, in which the independent national existence of the Chinese people is endangered, all Chinese, all political parties and political groups feel dependent upon one another in their struggle. No one by himself can decide either his own fate or the fate of the entire nation. No one by himself can gain victory, but only the nation as a whole.

* * *

The consolidation and the political growth of the Communist Party in the anti-Japanese national united front are not only the concern of the Communist Party but are in accord with the interests of the entire Chinese people. The consolidation of the Communist Party, the strengthening of its fighting capacity in the anti-Japanese struggle are the most valuable capital, not only of the Communist Party, but of the entire Chinese nation.

The Communist Party educates its members in the spirit of understanding that the most important achievements in the work of the Communist Party consist not only in its political growth but also in the consolidation and development of the anti-Japanese national united front. Only the common struggle against the enemy, the alliance of one party with the other, can help overcome the former differences of opinion and inner contradictions which the mutual war of many years has left behind.

Only honest support of the political basis of the anti-Japanese national united front, that is, support of the three principles of Sun Yat-sen and the program of the national war of liberation, is able to unite not only the political parties but also the entire Chinese people in the struggle for its independence.

The support of the three principles of Sun Yat-sen includes the struggle against its distortion and falsification by the Trotskyites who are trying to find common features between the three principles of Sun Yat-sen and fascist

demagogy. It also includes the struggle against dragging out the active realization of the program of the war of liberation and the building up of the state.

The experiences of recent years have shown that without the existence of suitable organizational forms for the collaboration of the various political parties, those questions that are bound up with the general interests of these parties cannot be solved. The lack of suitable organizational forms reduces the possibility of collaboration and of the mutual influence of the members of various political parties and thereby hinders the consolidation of their friendly relations. Now it has become clearer than ever before that suitable organizational forms are necessary for the consolidation of the anti-Japanese national united front. The question is what organizational form is the most suitable—this question must become the subject of common consideration by the various political parties participating in the anti-Japanese national united front. Any organizational form which is in accord with the interests of consolidating the anti-Japanese national front will be accepted.

The interests of the nation demand that such collaboration between the parties be achieved also on the questions of the complete democratization of the state. Up till now, the democratic system has not been realized everywhere and on all questions—the mass of the people is not yet sufficiently organized. In addition, there are conservative attitudes among some of the participants in the anti-Japanese national united front. The fear of carrying out the complete democratization of the state and political system and the mass organizations creates still further obstacles for the consolidation of the anti-Japanese national united front and increases the inner contradictions.

The realization of a complete democratic state regime and the development of the mass movement in the country are required in the interest of victory over the Japanese conquerors. The consistent realization of the democratic rights of

the Chinese people will assure a broad mobilization and organization of the masses, their active participation in the war of national defense and their being drawn into production for the defense of the country.

Under present conditions, the mass movement of the people has changed fundamentally. The present-day mass organizations set themselves the task of actively supporting the national government, helping the army and participating in the war of national defense. The extent of mass mobilization depends upon the growth of mass organizations and the mass movement which represent the most important basis for the achievement of victory in the war of national defense.

The Communist Party stands decidedly for the unity of the mass movement of the country. The unity of the mass movement by no means signifies that only one organization can exist and all other organizations are prohibited. It does not mean that the union of the mass organizations must be compulsory; it means rather the union and unity of all mass organizations independent of their party affiliation on the basis of the common struggle against the foreign enemy. The unity of the mass movement should not only reduce the inner differences of opinion between the mass organizations to a minimum, not only unite the forces of the mass organizations but also improve and consolidate the mutual relations between the various political parties.

The unity of the mass movement helps the political parties to develop a broader struggle against the Trotskyites and the traitors within the country. All anti-Japanese political parties of the country that do mass work among the people must display the utmost vigilance to safeguard the members of their organizations and the people by all means from provocateurs, spies and national traitors. They must fight against every attempt which can lead to the disruption of the internal solidarity of the Chinese people.

The struggle against the Trotskyites

and spies is not only the affair of the Communist Party or of any other party but the affair of all true patriots. Those who attempt to utilize the Trotskyites for a struggle against the Communist Party must understand that they are playing with fire and are in danger of burning themselves. Without a relentless struggle against the Trotskyites, who strive to disrupt the national united front, without the destruction of their entire provocatory activity, the anti-Japanese national united front will, of course, be in danger. It is necessary to expose and mercilessly destroy these spies who have been sent in by Japanese imperialism.

* * *

What are the perspectives for the development of the anti-Japanese national united front? Many who have gone through the period of the Revolution of 1925-27, during which the Kuomintang and the Communist Party collaborated only very briefly, are uneasy about the fate and duration of the present anti-Japanese national united front. The Chinese Communist Party is of the opinion that the anti-Japanese national united front will last a long time and that it has great perspectives for further development. Its existence will bring the Chinese people the maximum benefit. The belief in the long duration of the anti-Japanese national united front is based on the following:

The anti-Japanese national united front arose in the process of the war of national liberation and sets itself the goal of defeating Japanese imperialism in this war. The duration of the war of national defense determines the collaboration of the Communist Party with the Kuomintang and the existence of the anti-Japanese national united front. But the long and successful collaboration of the Communist Party and the Kuomintang in the war of national defense determines their collaboration also after the war.

The new international situation likewise causes the further collaboration of these parties. The most important things

in the present international situation are, on the one hand, the magnificent victories of socialism in the Soviet Union and the tremendous sympathy and support for the war of national defense in China by the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, the strengthening of the contradictions in the world of capitalism which is divided into an extremely aggressive fascist camp and all countries of bourgeois democracy. The struggle of the Chinese people and its victory over the Japanese conqueror are indissolubly tied up with the struggle for peace in general, which is desired at the moment particularly by those nations which are threatened by growing fascist aggression. These are the new features in the present international situation in contrast to the international situation during the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927.

There is no doubt that in the process of the development of the anti-Japanese national united front difficulties and obstacles will also arise in the future. The national united front can clash with irrational conservative elements, but the great wave of the national war of liberation will sweep away all these difficulties and obstacles. The national war of liberation is protracted and exhausting but vacillations and temporary prejudices cannot long endure and are overcome, and the overcoming of such difficulties assures the further collaboration of various parties.

The correct policy of the Communist Party and the Kuomintang for the permanent consolidation and development of the anti-Japanese national united front is the best guarantee for the consolidation of the unity of the people and their victory over the enemy.

The victory of the Chinese people in the war of national defense will not signify the end of the national united front but will lead to a new higher stage of the development of the united front. Victory in the war of national defense will be based upon national solidarity, on the collaboration of the political parties, on the anti-Japanese national united front. The experiences of this collaboration teach all the anti-Japanese

parties and the entire Chinese people how necessary it is to continue national solidarity and collaboration for the sake of national renaissance and the reconstruction of a new China. After the victory in the war of national defense, China will unhesitatingly take the road to a new democratic state; this stage is necessary and cannot be leaped over.

This democratic state must display the following features: It must be an independent national state. In the internal political life of the country it must guarantee the people unrestricted democratic rights and liberties, the legal existence of all political parties that stand for national independence and the progress of the country. In this democratic state, the central and local organs of popular representation are elective. All officials are elected and controlled by the people; but those officials who do not fulfill their duties will be swept out by the people. In the internal economic life of the country of such a democratic state, the demands of the peasants for land must be satisfied in a peaceful manner. The living standard of

the workers will be considerably raised; the eight-hour day will be introduced; measures will be adopted for the protection of labor and the satisfaction of other demands of labor. The most important key positions of the country's economy must be concentrated in the hands of the state. That will be the independent, free, new China, that is, a China whose foundation is the three revolutionary principles of Sun Yat-sen.

All the prerequisites are here for the construction of such a new free China. Nevertheless, this work can be achieved only with the greatest firmness and with tremendous exertions on the part of the entire Chinese nation, with the help of the anti-Japanese national united front.

The national united front sees a great shining future ahead. It is not only a means to achieve victory over the Japanese conqueror, but also a means promising success in the building up of the new China. The preservation, the consolidation and the development of the national united front are the sacred duty of every Chinese at present and in the future.

The Rise of the Free Soviet Peoples

BY A. DUVAL

THE Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) has given all humanity an abundance of new things. The concise words of Stalin and the sober figures of Molotov's report contain a substantial realization of the boldest dreams of the best heads of humanity.

One of the questions which the Eighteenth Congress has particularly illuminated is the question of the path of liberation of the oppressed nations.

The more the freedom of nations and their right to exist as states are sacrificed to the cruel despotism of imperialist conquerors, the more the fate of nations is bargained away to an aggressor in the name of appeasement, the greater and more acute is the question of freedom, indeed, even the very existence of the small nations, confronting the overwhelming part of humanity.

What recently still appeared as a specific problem of the colonial world has become a burning issue in the heart of Europe itself: Is there any future for the small nations or are they hopelessly exposed to the loss of their national culture? In what way can they assert their national character and share in all the achievements of human progress?

To date, history knows only *one* positive answer to these questions and that is the answer given by the nations of the Soviet Union living together peacefully in the socialist state.

In the Soviet Union national oppression, special rights of one people over another, every kind of national inequality, have all disappeared into the past.

What in the land of the Hitler barbarians is considered a glorious privilege of the "Ruling Race"—to ridicule and humiliate the members of another nation—is in the Soviet Union not only a crime punishable according to the constitution, but also an act which evokes general contempt.

In the territory of the Soviet Union, the nation to which the former oppressors belonged, the great Russian nation lives in mutual fraternity with the nations that were once inhumanly oppressed by the Great Russian exploiters. The cohabitation of these nations in a single state has not only proved to be possible but has also become the decisive prerequisite for the flourishing of the formerly backward nations.

The historical results of the twenty-one years of Soviet power irrefutably answer the question as to whether it is possible for an oppressed nation to attain its liberation without separating from the state territory of its former oppressors. Lenin and Stalin have never viewed abstractly and divorced from the historical circumstances the right of nations to self-determination, a right which belongs to the principles of the Bolshevik Party. They turned against the bourgeois nationalists and the nationalistic opportunist elements of Polish Social-Democracy when, prior to the 1905 Revolution, the latter demanded the separation of Poland from the tsarist empire, for at that time Poland was an Achilles heel of the tsarist empire and the separation of Poland would not have

weakened tsarism but would have strengthened oppression in the rest of the tsarist empire.

That is why, from the first day of the October Revolution, the Bolshevik Party advised all the nations of the Soviet Union not to separate from the union with the state of the Russian proletariat. And most of the nations of the tsarist empire followed this advice and voluntarily remained in the union of the Soviet Republics. Recent history, and particularly the revelations during the trial of Bukharin, Rykov and other Trotskyist agents of fascism, have shown that the endeavors of bourgeois nationalists to wrest territory from the Soviet Union have become an instrument of war of the imperialist enemies of the land of Soviets.

Another conception, refuted by the development of the Soviet Union, had assumed a revolutionary appearance. The exponents of this conception have asserted that the socialist revolution is destined to destroy the national character of the small and culturally less developed nations as "outlived." This conception, which today reminds us immediately of the colonization principles of Hitler fascism, goes back to Kautsky. In his political report to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) in 1930, Comrade Stalin polemized against this conception. He pointed out that Kautsky once asserted that a victory of the revolution in a united Austro-German state, in the middle of the last century, would have led to the Germanization of the Czechs.

"... If Kautsky is right," Stalin said, "how can we explain the fact that such relatively backward nationalities as the White Russians and Ukrainians, who are closer to the Great Russians than the Czechs are to the Germans, have not been Russianized as a result of the victory of the proletarian revolution in the U.S.S.R., but, on the contrary, have been regenerated and have developed as independent nations? How are we to explain the fact that such nations as the Turkmenis, the Kirghiz, the Uzbeks, the Tadjiiks (not to speak of the Georgians,

Armenians, Azerbaidjans, etc.), in spite of their backwardness, have not only not been Russianized in consequence of the victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., but, on the contrary, have been regenerated and have developed into independent nations? ... Lenin never said that the abolition of the national yoke and the fusing of the interests of the nationalities into a single whole is equivalent to the abolition of national differences. We have abolished the national yoke, We have abolished national privileges and established national equality. We have abolished state frontiers in the old sense of the word, frontier posts and customs barriers between the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. We have established the unity of the economic and political interests of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. But does this mean that we have thereby abolished national differences; national languages, culture, modes of life, etc.? Obviously, it does not mean that. ... Lenin always stood for *helping* the peoples of the U.S.S.R. to develop their national culture." (J. Stalin, *Political Report to the Sixteenth Party Congress of the Russian Communist Party*. Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1930, pp. 165-7.)

Hence, neither absorption by the greater nation, nor separation, but development of the national character on a new basis, on a socialist basis.

The Soviet path to the liberation of oppressed nations is the path of socialist revolution. Its prerequisite is the dictatorship of the proletariat, which also liberated the masses of the Great Russian people from their own oppressors.

The German people, in whose name fascism is committing robbery and murder, is cruelly oppressed. The decline of its own national culture and character is no less frightful and deepgoing than the disaster which the fascist conquerors visit upon the oppressed nations. The German people must pay for the oppression of foreign nations with its own increasing oppression, with new burdens and new chains.

In the land of socialism, the situation is different.

The October Revolution not only lib-

erated the nations of the tsarist empire from national oppression. For the first time, it also provided the opportunity of a manifold national development for the Great Russian people, whose creative powers the barbarous tsarist dictatorship had condemned to a state of sterility.

* * *

What does the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) mean for the further flourishing of the peoples of the land of Soviets?

It is no longer a question of liberating these peoples from national oppression. This liberation has been long accomplished. Today, it is a question of raising the once culturally backward nations to the level of the Russian people, the Russian worker, collective farmers and intellectuals. This is not only a problem of schools; this is a far more comprehensive task. It is partly a question of raising one-time nomadic peoples, peoples whose sole form of economy was that of primitive Asiatic cattle breeding or hunting and fishing, to the level of the country which possesses the most modern industry, the highest degree of scientific development and the most perfect social order.

In drawing the culturally backward peoples into the sphere of modern civilization, it has always been alien to the Bolsheviks to resort to the methods of "missionaries" who go to the peoples in order to "convert" them, not to speak of the colonization methods of Russian tsarism or of other imperialist powers. The Bolsheviks help the culturally backward peoples economically and politically to get on their own feet, to develop their power to participate in the full life of socialism, giving and taking, to shape their lives in every respect as equals among equals.

Old Russia was a country in which the distribution of industry was adapted solely to the needs of the ruling classes and the foreign capitalists who exploited a large part of the riches of

the country. The greatest part of the giant empire remained economically unopened, and, in the last analysis, it was political considerations which opposed the establishment of industries in the national territories, above all in Central Asia. The imperialist domination of the nationalities of the tsarist empire required the concentration of industry in the European part. In the rest of the country they carried on, at best, a spoliation of the natural resources.

As a result, the distribution of industries which arose in the process of capitalist development was, to a large extent, characterized by an inequality which, on the one hand, led to uneconomical transportation of industrial products and raw materials on a huge scale, and, on the other hand, hindered the development of the national territories.

In the resolution of the Eighteenth Congress on the Third Five-Year Plan for Economic Development, the question of the distribution of new industrial investments in the Third Five-Year Plan is unfolded in its full scope. And one of the reasons cited for the new distribution of industry is the "bringing about of a further upsurge of the once economically backward territories of the U.S.S.R." The resolution on the Five-Year Plan demands that in *every Republic* the most important articles of consumption be produced right on the spot. "To ensure the further upsurge of economy and culture in the national Republics and territories in accord with the main tasks of the distribution of the productive forces in the Third Five-Year Plan" is one of the most important tasks emphasized by the resolution on Comrade Molotov's report.

Bourgeois scientists have occupied themselves extensively with the distribution of industrial location, but in judging the location of an industry the interests of a backward nation have never played a role. Today in the land of Soviets, where the economy is not determined by the profit interests of a minority but by the interests of the collective,

the question of the development of the national economy and culture of a formerly backward people becomes a decisive factor in the distribution of the new industrial investments throughout the land of Soviets.

The former contradiction between the mother country and the colonies is being overcome by means of elevating the economy and the culture of the once oppressed peoples.

The Eighteenth Congress of the C.P. S.U.(B.) illustrated this question with a wealth of material, for the representatives of the national Republics considered it their duty to report to the Party on the development of their Republics. The peoples who are closest to the Russian sphere of culture because of related languages, such as the Ukrainians and White Russians—and also other peoples of the land of Soviets—have struck an obstacle in the development of their national economy and culture which is rooted not in the relations between the Russian, Ukrainian and White Russian people but in the encirclement of the land of Soviets by capitalist states that never tire of trying to tear away parts of Soviet territory.

In forcible words, the Secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, Comrade Khrushchov, traced the development which the Ukraine had undergone since it drove out the foreign oppressors with the help of the armed Russian proletariat. The Ukraine possesses immense riches in coal and ores and its fertile soil permits the cultivation of all agricultural products of the temperate zone and even of cotton. The Don basin, one of the old industrial centers of the country, is in the Ukraine. A single mill in the Don basin, the Kirov Mill of Makeyevka, produces twice as much pig iron as all the mills of Poland put together. Japan, Italy and Poland together produce less steel than the Ukraine. That is only one indication of the inexhaustible riches of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

To be sure, the conditions of development of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic were particularly favorable since it harks back to an old economy and culture. The situation is different with the national Republics which have to reach the level of the Russian people by a longer and more difficult road, because they were more backward, because often they did not even possess the first elements of industry.

Let us look at Tadzhikistan: The industrial production of this central Asiatic country has increased 195-fold from 1913 to 1938. During the tsar's time, there were 204 workers in the entire country. Today there are more than 20,000. Thus, in one of the most backward parts of the old tsarist empire, an industry has arisen with its own national group of workers. For, where new factories are being erected, this is not done with "imported workers." On the contrary, the ordinary laborers from the locality who, shovel in hand, dig the foundation of the building are usually the first ones also to man the machines. New cities develop in the national Republics around the new factories.

But the most important and profound changes are occurring in agriculture. Let us take Tadzhikistan again. As in all central Asiatic Republics, the production of cotton occupies the center of agricultural production in this country. The irrigation systems which are indispensable for cotton production were formerly in the hands of the feudal lords, a means for the unlimited exploitation of the peasants. In the hands of the Soviet state and collective farms the irrigation systems are a means for the promotion of agriculture.

The transformation of agriculture and the progressive division of labor within the collective farms required a complete transformation of the peasant himself. The collective farmer today resembles his ancestors only in a few externals. He has become a new person. Today, his work is the work of a trained specialist and requires considerable knowledge. It no longer has anything to do with what Engels called the "idiocy of rural life." The rural life of the col-

lective farmers requires a many-sided knowledge and the drawing of the Tadjik or Uzbek collective farmer into the cultural sphere of socialism does not proceed from the city but is carried out on the collective farm itself.

We have deliberately selected two extreme examples: one of the most progressive and one of the most backward Republics of the Soviet Union. These examples can be multiplied. The same picture will be found everywhere. This development takes place faster in the territories that nature has favored, but it is perhaps even more impressive and unparalleled where great difficulties confront the transformation of life: In the extreme North and in the Far Eastern territory this is revealed with particular clarity, for the people who were becoming extinct are literally being awakened to new life.

The Third Five-Year Plan leads to the establishment of important new industrial foundations on which they emerge from the ranks of the once oppressed nations. The collective farms are reshaping the life of the village on an entirely new basis and are educating new strata of rural intellectuals. All this requires a development of the network of schools at an unparalleled tempo. The decision of the Eighteenth Congress that by 1942 compulsory education in the national Republics be extended to seven years, hence to the age of fifteen, requires a truly gigantic construction of schools and the preparation and training of thousands of new teachers.

Under the Soviet power many peoples have received books printed in their own language for the first time. They took their first steps toward modern civilization only after 1917. In all national Republics the study of the Russian language and the acquisition of the knowledge and experiences of the Russian working class are, of course, a part of the instruction of the young generation. But this does not occur at the expense of their national character. On the contrary. The people's bards, whose songs formerly could be heard in the market

places and in the villages on festive occasions, have found their way into literature. The works of the old Kazak bard Dzhambul have become the common property of all the peoples of the Soviet Union just as Gorky's works. The people's art merges with the operatic art; and from the school of the Russian classicists of music have emerged the creators of the national operas of Azerbaijan, Kirghiz and other peoples of the Soviet Union.

An animated exchange of cultural treasures, of the heritage of the past, is going on between all peoples; and, in this sense, national boundaries vanish. Today one can already say that the most outstanding contributions of the national culture of every single people of the land of Soviets have not only awakened them to new life but have become a part of the cultural treasure of the entire Soviet people.

The heroic epic of the Georgian Rustaveli, the poems of the great Ukrainian poet Schevtschenko, and the stories of the Jewish writer Sholom Aleichem belong equally to the cultural treasure of all the peoples of the land of Soviets just as do the Constitution of the Soviet Union and the model statute of the collective farms.

The Third Five-Year Plan opens up new perspectives for the national development of the peoples of the Soviet Union. Through it the formerly oppressed peoples are given all the material prerequisites for cultural competition with the most advanced nations.

Thereby one of the fundamental contradictions which splits the capitalist world into oppressed and oppressors disappears completely. The peoples who once languished under the colonial oppression of tsarism are not only free but are also approaching with giant strides the level already reached by the Russian people. Their best sons occupy outstanding positions in the land of the Soviets. There is not a profession which the sons and daughters of these people do not practice.

In Asia there are still hundreds of

millions of people for whom not even the first step has been taken toward national liberation. In Europe the peoples of three states have lost their independence in the course of a year. For them and for all those who, in the capitalist world, suffer national enslavement and degradation, the decisions of the Eighteenth Congress to raise the once backward peoples to the highest degree of human

development known to history are tokens of a better time.

For all those who love their people, its culture, its national character, the development of the peoples in the Soviet Union is a world-historical example of the will and the ability of the working class to develop its national character in the spirit of internationalism and realize socialist culture in national forms.

Published by Modern Books, Ltd.,
4 Parton Street, London, W.C.1, and
printed by Marston Printing Co.
(*T.U. all depts.*), Cayton Street,
London, E.C.1