

The **Communist**  
**International**

Vol. XVII

No. 8 1939

Sixpence

**The Crisis of the Second  
International**

**The Nature of German  
Fascism**

F. LANG

**Importance of the "History  
of the C.P.S.U. (B)" for the  
International Working Class**

P. DENGEL

**"Overtake and Surpass"**

E. VARGA



# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

VOL. XVI

AUGUST, 1939

No. 8

---

## CONTENTS

### Editorials

The Crisis of the Second International . . . . .	887
A Reply to Thomas Mann . . . . .	896
The "De-Judaization" of the Czech People . . . . .	900

### Theory and Practice of the Labor Movement

The Zurich Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions . . . . . W. FLORIN . . . . .	903
The Importance of the <i>History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)</i> to the International Working Class . . . . . P. DENGEL . . . . .	910
The Nature of German Fascism . . . . . F. LANG . . . . .	919
The Generation of Suffering and Struggle . . . . . MICHAL WOLF . . . . .	927

### In the Soviet Union

"Overtake and Surpass" . . . . . E. VARGA . . . . .	938
---	-----

### Book Reviews

Book Reviewing Is a Serious Matter . . . . . P. DENCAL . . . . .	947
--	-----

---



---

---

## The Crisis of the Second International

**T**HE latest decisions of the Labor and Socialist International and the interpretation given them by its president has fully confirmed the fact that it has ceased to consider itself as the leadership of an international labor organization whose task would be to rally the forces of all its affiliated parties for the international struggle against fascism, imperialist war and capitalism. For a long time the cracks in the structure of the Labor and Socialist International could barely be covered up. Now everyone can see them and they reveal that the undermining process within is very far advanced.

The practical elimination from the leadership of the Second International of the representatives of the Social-Democratic parties, prohibited and suppressed by fascism, is only one of the indications of the course which the Second International has taken. Another one is the official renunciation of international political decisions and, related to this, the special emphasis on the absolute "independence" of every single party.

The Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International has taken these steps at a time when numerous labor organizations of many countries are demanding that an international labor conference be called in order to create the opportunity for a comradely international discussion on the decisive questions of the common struggle against the common enemy, fascism, and against the extension of the imperialist war now in progress into a second world war. Finally, the sanction of the loosening international ties and the withdrawal of the leadership of the Social-

Democratic parties "to their own" countries occurs at a time when, under the impression of the temporary defeat in Spain, the urge for unity and for a stronger manifestation of the international solidarity of the proletariat is distinctly noticeable in the ranks of the working class. The president of the Labor and Socialist International replies to the numerous demands and questions of the working masses which point in this direction with the evasion that, in times like these, the Labor and Socialist International cannot fulfill its function to as great an extent as one could wish.

*"It is suffering the same fate as the League of Nations. Both have lost in respect and influence precisely in this period of imminent war danger just when their work for peace was more than ever necessary."\**

In this speech before the forum of the Labor Party, which is one of the most determined opponents within the Second International of a unified international labor policy against fascism, imperialist war and capitalism, the Labor and Socialist International was described by its president as an institution representing a past (!) and embodying a future without even its responsible leaders allowing it any place in the present.

This vague "embodiment of the future" should certainly not be given more definite form by any kind of concrete work in the present! This "future" is expressly relegated by the leaders of the Labor

---

\* From the speech at the British Labor Party conference.

and Socialist International to a time lying far beyond the great imminent conflict with fascism. Thereby the leading organs of "International" Social-Democracy, in face of the imperialist war now going on for the redistribution of the earth and the danger of its extending into the second world war, completed their abdication in order to make room for the ruling bourgeoisie and their general staffs. It is natural to compare this to the attitude of most of the leading Social-Democrats in 1914. Even in the ranks of Social-Democracy, voices have already been heard which draw the conclusion from such comparisons that the present attitude of the Second International must lead to "an incomparably more serious catastrophe" than that which "the Socialist experienced in August, 1914." (Pietro Nenni in *Travail*.)

A document of the Austrian Socialists ("The Austrian Socialists and the Labor and Socialist International") states:

"The L.S.I. does not have that which the international labor movement most urgently needs in this historical situation: a unified international strategy, a unified international will to struggle against fascism."

It is evident from these extraordinarily serious statements coming from the ranks of Social-Democracy itself that the events taking place within the Second International are of importance for the entire labor movement and that it is in the interest of the international working class to establish complete clarity concerning them and their consequences.

#### THE CONTRADICTIONS AND CONFLICTS IN THE L.S.I.

The meager commentaries of the official organs of the L.S.I. attempted to present the organizational changes as measures which were necessary in order to bring the relative position of the individual Social-Democratic parties in the

leading organs of the L.S.I. into accord with the role which they are playing in their own countries at the present time. In reality, it was a matter of handing over the monopoly of the leadership to one group of parties. The noteworthy and particular feature in this procedure is the fact that it gave control of the helm to that tendency in Social-Democracy which—regardless of all the contradictions that also exist between them and in each separate party—is determined to prevent the realization of an international class policy of the proletariat, whose "leadership" therefore is expressed in the fact that it completely paralyzes the forces of the Socialist parties in the international field.

The gap between decisions and deeds which has always existed in the Second International is thereby deepened and extended. In the future—as the Austrian Socialists state in their memorandum—no political resolutions generally shall be adopted, "for even the decisions of recent years which were never considered binding, and in any case were disregarded by most parties, are regarded by those parties which have acted most against them as an unbearable burden, as a restriction on them and an undesirable disruption of their domestic policy."

In the following examples in *Travail* Pietro Nenni has elucidated the gap between decisions and deeds in Social-Democracy:

"Our International has adopted splendid resolutions on every occasion. The sections of the International have not carried them out or have carried them out with so many reservations that the meaning of the action which they undertook was distorted. We were unanimously against non-intervention; but the action instituted against the governments which followed the principle of non-intervention never assumed the character of a life and death struggle.

"We were against direct or indirect recognition of Franco and yet we had to observe with pain how Socialist-led governments took this direction. All this happened on the excellent ground that they did not want to carry the Spanish

conflict into general European and world politics."

This contradiction between word and deed, however, is only the expression and the result of a whole series of contradictions and conflicts existing in the Second International and its affiliated parties. Let us try to characterize them in a few brief lines!

There is a contradiction between the legal parties in the Second International and those prohibited and suppressed by fascism. If this is mentioned first here, it is not because it is in any way to be regarded as the decisive contradiction but because it is in the forefront at the present time. Nothing characterizes more sharply the manner of thinking of the leading people of the L.S.I. than the definition by which they are wont to distinguish the two kinds of parties. They describe the legal parties alone as living parties.

The inner disputes of recent years have made it more and more clear that the Social-Democratic parties which are represented in the governments of capitalist countries or are to be found in "influential" positions in parliaments are striving to get rid of the illegal parties which they consider to be ballast. At best, they are magnanimously ready to support their emigrés. But they resist with growing vehemence giving these parties a political right of voice and vote. The reactionary leading circle around Henri de Man in the Belgian Labor Party has sneeringly described the outlook for the future of the parties driven into illegality by fascism as a "chimera" to which no "conscientious" politician would give any kind of consideration. To the extent that fascism has succeeded in gaining ground and suppressing formerly legal Social-Democratic parties, these reactionary leaders have strengthened and deepened in theory and practice the national isolation of the labor parties.

The so-called "living," that is, the legal parties, however, are just as little agreed among themselves as the illegal ones.

At the Zurich Congress of the International Trade Union Federation, at which the contradictions and conflicts prevailing in the Second International found expression, the delegates of various "living" parties opposed one another in voting on trade union unity and the peace resolution. Or, in the defense of the peculiar "non-aggression pact" concluded by the Social-Democratic-led Danish government with the Hitler government, Danish Social-Democracy felt itself compelled to polemize against the central organ of Dutch Social-Democracy which, in a very conciliatory way, had described the attitude of the Danish government as "faint-hearted." Between the Socialist Party of France and the reactionary leadership of the Belgian Labor Party, there are many contradictions which develop primarily through the pro-German "neutrality policy" conducted by Spaak and De Man.

Every political event of particular importance brings new and deeper contradictions to the surface. That happened in connection with the Munich Agreement. That is generally the case in regard to the imperialist demands of German fascism. The Second International is unable to bring about a single unified political position towards fascism. It is just as little able to formulate a unified position towards war and concretely on the right of self-determination of nations. It breaks up into countless tendencies and groupings, the most reactionary of which have hitherto maintained their preponderance over the progressive ones in all decisive cases. A party as uninfluential in its own country as the Socialist Party of the U.S.A. led by Thomas, for example, is able, through transmission by the reactionary trade union leaders around Green, to make its influence felt on the European parties of the Second International. In the struggle against Japanese imperialism which is allied with German fascism, the deciding attitude toward the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples is the attitude of representatives of "great power" interests.

Is there a common denominator to

which all these contradictions and conflicts can be reduced? Yes, there is: *the dependence of the leading circles of Social-Democracy on the bourgeoisie.*

The L.S.I. is unable to bring about a unified position towards fascism because the separate parties permit themselves to be decisively influenced by the interests of their particular bourgeoisie and because, within each party, the partially conflicting interests of the various groupings of the bourgeoisie prevent the adoption of a unified position in accord with the class standpoint of the proletariat.

The L.S.I. is unable to adopt a unified position on war because the influence of the various interest groups of the bourgeoisie oppose and run counter to one another in it and because they prevent the L.S.I. from attaining a position on war which is dictated by the interests of the international working class as a whole.

The L.S.I., under the influence of the bourgeoisie, has passed over in practice to breaking up the interests of the international working class as a whole into "nationally" separated interests of the workers of separate countries. Thereby, it deprives the workers under its leadership of their strongest weapon, international solidarity, which alone at present is suited to giving the working class superiority over all other forces. But that means that in every single country also, the working class—robbed of its international support—is delivered up to the tyranny of its own bourgeoisie.

#### THE PARTIES OF THE L.S.I. IN THE FASCIST COUNTRIES

In some countries the Social-Democratic parties have been prohibited, suppressed and driven into illegality by fascism. Parties which previously were among the pillars of the Second International were swept aside by fascism. Their supporters and activists in these countries are exposed to the fascist terror. Their leaders are in exile.

Has the development imposed upon these parties pressed the L.S.I. to draw any lessons and conclusions?

The L.S.I. has not called an international congress for eight years. An international conference was last held six years ago. The forum, according to the statutes of the L.S.I. before which the changes brought about by fascism could be discussed, has therefore evidently been eliminated. The last Congress of the L.S.I. confirmed the "toleration policy" of German Social-Democracy which finally paved the road for fascism. The last conference of the L.S.I. became a "justification" of the policy of German Social-Democracy which was condemned by events.

The leading circles of the L.S.I. had no understanding for the searching and groping of its own supporters for paths which would not end up in the abyss to which the path of German Social-Democracy had led. Just as today in the Second International there is no uniform evaluation of fascism, so there is no uniform opinion concerning the fatal policy of German Social-Democracy. While, among the masses of workers, the understanding has developed that the road of German Social-Democracy led to an historical condemnation of the policy of class harmony and that the forces of the working class must be rallied by establishing unity, and hurled against the offensive of fascism, the leading circles of the L.S.I. have held on to the policy of class harmony.

The attitude of the leadership of the L.S.I. has led to the fact that neither the Social-Democratic parties which hitherto have not been destroyed by fascism and reaction, nor even the Social-Democratic parties suppressed by fascism, have drawn fundamental lessons from the collapse of German Social-Democracy. Actually, the leadership of some parties driven into illegality by fascism have till now left their supporters and activists fighting in the country without new weapons under the new conditions of struggle.

When fascism came to power the



leadership of Social-Democracy tried to do everything to be tolerated as a legal and loyal "opposition" party. It went so far as to come out openly in parliament for the foreign policy of the fascist dictatorship! It severed connections with the L.S.I. in order to be allowed possibly to continue its existence as a "national labor party." After all these attempts failed, it established a phantom imitation of the former party leadership outside of Germany, acted for a while as if it intended to carry through a profound theoretical and practical change of position, soon appeared again in the L.S.I. as if nothing special had happened and finally continued with the policy it had at the time it was interrupted when fascism came to power.

On what does this Social-Democratic leadership abroad base itself? It has been rejected by the ruling strata of the bourgeoisie. It was given no possibility of legal opposition in the country itself. But it did not want to pass over to organizing a revolutionary struggle with the aim of overthrowing fascism, although in the meantime the most active Social-Democrats in the country had recognized this road as the only correct one and although the exponents of the revolutionary currents grew in numbers and importance among the Social-Democratic emigrés as well.

This phantom of a Social-Democratic leadership oriented itself on forces within the German bourgeoisie, assuming that they might become factors which would supplant the present regime. At the same time this leadership tied up with those forces abroad whose support it believed it might expect in its efforts to change the present fascist regime without revolution.

It is not surprising that these are forces which, within the L.S.I., belong to the reactionary circles obstructing the international anti-fascist struggle. As a result, this leadership of German Social-Democracy has neither sought nor found a close connection with the Spanish Socialist Party nor with the progressive forces of the Socialist Party of France.

But in both of these parties it has kept contact with the anti-unity, pro-class-harmony and anti-Communist groupings. The "theoretical" contributions of this leadership of German Social-Democracy living abroad include the discovery of "progressive" tendencies in fascism and the pseudo-Marxist justification of the annexation of Austria.

The Social-Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia has also temporarily severed its connection with the L.S.I. in order to adjust itself to the "actual facts" created by fascism. Without entering in detail into the particular situation of this country and this Social-Democracy, we cannot avoid stating that this party, after the capitulation of the reactionary bourgeoisie of this country to German fascism, joined the retinue of its own bourgeoisie and surrendered any independent role in the struggle for the conquest of the independence of suppressed Czechoslovakia.

The Austrian revolutionary Socialists who at present come out as sharp critics of the failure of the L.S.I. and its actual liquidation, however, have done a poor service to their own working class by estimating the rape of their own country by German fascism as an "historically progressive" act and thereby broke down on the decisive question confronting the Austrian working class in the struggle against fascism—to rally the Austrian people in the struggle to win its independence.

These sketchy allusions to the status of some of the Social-Democratic parties suppressed by fascism do not claim to be complete. However, they do draw attention to the weakest point displayed by these parties at the time. It is characteristic that these weakest points always coincided with the central tasks of the working class in the given countries.

Summarizing, it may be said concerning the status and role of the Social-Democratic parties of the countries dominated above all by fascism: The great lesson which is signaled by the victory of fascism has passed by their leaderships without their overcoming the

basic error of the policy which made this victory possible, or even making it the subject of self-criticism. In contrast to the most active anti-fascist fighters who have grown up among the cadres of these parties in the home countries, the leaderships which are to be found abroad and the functionaries dependent upon them move entirely in the old rut. Thereby, they themselves contribute to the fact that their former followers have no real revolutionary orientation and consequently do not become organizers of the anti-fascist people's movements in the different countries to a sufficient extent.

The leadership of the L.S.I. has not drawn the conclusion from the victory of fascism in some countries that everything must be done to liquidate the policy which made the victory of fascism possible and to carry through a policy which, internationally, will prevent a further advance of fascism. On the contrary, it has even elaborated the policy of class harmony and subordination to the interests of their own bourgeoisie and extended it so consistently that it had to lead to the actual ruin of its own International.

#### THE POSITION OF THE L.S.I. ON SOCIALISM

The attitude of the L.S.I. to fascism and the lessons which should have been drawn from the collapse of some of its most important parties are closely connected with its relation to socialism.

Since the first imperialist world war, socialism has been successfully built on one-sixth of the earth. The country in which socialism, the teachings of Marx and Engels, has been realized, is in the process of developing into communism. Whoever wants to be a Socialist today has *more* to base himself on now than theory. The theory has successfully passed the test. It has been transformed into reality. Nourished by the experiences of the struggle of the Bolsheviks against imperialism and by the experiences in the construction of socialism itself, it was extended and further developed by Lenin and Stalin.

When we say that whoever wants to be a Socialist today can base himself on the realized theory, this also means that one *cannot be a real Socialist* in our time *without* basing himself on the concrete, the realized socialism which has taken on shape and form. But this is precisely the relation of a part of the leaders of international Social-Democracy to the Soviet Union. They are Socialists in words, but in practice they are enemies of realized socialism. They speak vaguely of a socialist future which is so nebulous that it has no connection with present realities, but they conceal and distort the truth concerning the realization of socialism in the Soviet Union. They assert that the L.S.I. unfortunately cannot fulfill its own tasks at the present time, but they artificially isolate the European labor movement, which is under its influence, from the Soviet Union and split the international working class by the fact that through their hostility to the country in which socialism has become a reality, they attempt to erect a wall between the workers of the capitalist countries and the workers and toilers of the Socialist Soviet Union.

Because of the fact that the leading men of the L.S.I. neglect everything that would be suited to present the socialist reality in the U.S.S.R. to the workers in the capitalist countries but indeed do a great deal to slander the Soviet Union and degrade it in the eyes of the workers, the Social-Democratic leaders have contributed towards shaking the faith and confidence of the working class in its inevitable victory.

In 1914, Lenin showed that the collapse of the Second International at the beginning of the first imperialist world war was the result of the pernicious influence of opportunism. The disintegration of the L.S.I. which was rebuilt after the World War is explained by the same causes *and* by the negative hostile attitude of the majority of the Social-Democratic leaders towards realized socialism.

The L.S.I. is infected with anti-

Communist poison. Even the Austrian Socialists, in their memorandum, cannot avoid admitting that the reformist parties have "often not risen above a vulgar bourgeois anti-Bolshevism." The leading circles of the L.S.I. do not feel tied up with the promising and strong forces which have realized on one-sixth of the earth what Marx and Engels scientifically established and prophetically proclaimed in the *Communist Manifesto*. On the contrary, the leading circles of the L.S.I. have repeatedly solidarized with men of the past, with the Mensheviks who have been washed aside, and with the Trotskyite scum who appeared just right for disrupting the forces of the proletariat.

If now, the liquidation of the international activity of the L.S.I. is being criticized in the ranks of the Austrian Socialists and in the midst of other parties in the Second International *without* grasping this decisive cause, without grasping the root itself, this means that these critics also remain on the surface.

But when, like the authors of the memorandum of the Austrian Socialists, they even try to make their criticism of those responsible for the disintegration of the Second International palatable by simultaneously slandering and "negating" the Communist International with untrue "arguments" dragged in by the hair, then it is necessary to ask whom this really serves and from whom it really stems. The criticism of those responsible for the disintegration of the L.S.I. may contain ever so many correct details, but when it denies or covers up the basic reason, it does more harm than good.

He who is compelled to admit that the leadership of the L.S.I. is no longer pursuing an international proletarian policy and he who conceals or disputes the fact that precisely the position of the leading politicians of the L.S.I. on the Socialist Soviet Union is an expression of this turning away from the international working class and its struggle for victory over the bourgeoisie, in the last analysis only contributes still more profoundly to discourage the workers,

disappointed by the attitude of the L.S.I., and to drive them into the arms of bourgeois or fascist demagogues. Because this danger, in view of the imperialist war, is so serious, the rejection of such a false and distorted criticism of the Communist International is urgent.

In the years which have passed since the end of the first imperialist World War most of the Social-Democratic parties have for a longer or shorter time conducted or strongly influenced the governments of their countries. If we should want to investigate in detail how these parties vindicated the confidence placed in them by the working class and how they utilized the opportunities for extending the strength and the power of the working class, then many examples would be found to show that where the Social-Democratic parties attained power, the positions of the working class even within bourgeois democracy were weakened in a relatively short time. These same Social-Democratic leaders, who, either with openly reactionary or with refined "radical" arguments refused to take the road of the Bolsheviks by conducting their policy of coalition with the bourgeois parties on the basis of class harmony in every country, have weakened the working class and helped the bourgeoisie to push forward again.

We need only to recall that Social-Democracy was *simultaneously* the leading party in the following countries: France, Spain, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, while in Czechoslovakia it had important government positions. A tremendous part of Europe was under Social-Democratic government, but Europe, the European working class, hardly knew it. There was no uniform anti-fascist peace policy of these governments, but on the contrary: it was precisely some of the Social-Democratic-led governments which attacked the Spanish republic from the rear and opened up the road to the fascist aggressor.

Leading people of the L.S.I. did not

even free themselves of their ties with the bourgeoisie when the movement of the working masses was as stormy and powerful as in France in 1936-37 or in Spain during the same year. That, in the last analysis, the same result occurs irrespective of whether Social-Democracy behaves openly as pro-bourgeois or "radical," is shown by the quite similar damage which the Right Prieto and the "Left" Caballero did to the struggle of the Spanish people; this is also shown by the last act of the war in Spain which was staged hand in hand by the Trotskyist, Anarcho-Syndicalists and extreme Right Social-Democratic elements.

With their attempts to carry on "labor politics" against socialism in the Soviet Union on the basis of class harmony, all Social-Democratic parties have hitherto been shipwrecked without in the least helping the international labor movement. Only where Social-Democrats freed themselves from their ties with the bourgeoisie, where they let themselves be guided exclusively by the interests of the working class and the toiling masses were they able really to serve the people. But the great example in this respect: the attitude of Negrin and of that part of Social-Democracy led by him also offers an example of what character the struggle of the reactionary elements against the progressive forces assumes in such a case.

#### WHAT DOES THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE L.S.I. OBLIGATE THE INTERNATIONAL- ISTS IN THE L.S.I. TO DO?

The degree of disintegration which the L.S.I. has reached through the policy of capitulation, of retreat to one's own country and of the betrayal of the principles of Marxism, makes it appear rather hopeless to figure on a decisive turn on an international scale in the near future. The reactionary factors in the L.S.I. and the I.F.T.U. will do everything further to paralyze and split the forces of the international working class

in order to prevent these forces from nullifying their reactionary plans.

So much the greater will be the responsibility and the task of the real internationalists and Socialists in the ranks of the L.S.I. They would not do justice to this task if, in the spirit of some "revolutionary Socialists," they wanted to wait for better times to come with the expected final defeat of fascism. This thesis resembles very much at bottom the conception represented by the President of the L.S.I. concerning the "embodiment of the future" which is likewise supposed to have nothing to do with the present.

When even the Austrian Socialists declare in their memorandum that "one may speak of a surrender of the foundation, of an open political liquidation of the Labor and Socialist International," and when Pietro Nenni speaks of a threatening catastrophe which will be incomparably more serious than that of 1914, then these statements should obligate the real internationalists and Socialists in the L.S.I. to undertake the most serious work *in the present*.

For years, the reactionary leaders of the L.S.I. have prevented the achievement of unity of action of the working class, at one time declaring that the individual parties and not the L.S.I. could decide this, and at another time asserting that this question could only be solved internationally. The seriousness of the situation and the condition of the L.S.I. make it necessary not to allow unity of action to be prevented and dragged out any longer by authorities which deny the independent role of the working class in the present.

The real internationalists and Socialists in the L.S.I. will best demonstrate their loyalty to the principles of Marxism if everywhere, together with the Communists, they undertake the realization of unity of action. That is at the same time the best and most decisive means against discrediting international solidarity by the liquidating leaders of the L.S.I. Finally, that is a means against spreading national prejudice in the working class and especially among

the recruits of the working class, the working youth.

If the disintegration of the L.S.I., due to the liquidators who are tied up with the bourgeoisie, is not to benefit the bourgeoisie and fascism exclusively, then the collaboration of the real internationalists and Socialists in the L.S.I. with the Communists is required; then we really

need the realization of the international labor conference stimulated by many labor organizations and proposed by the Communist International to the L.S.I.; then we need the common effort of the forces of all revolutionary workers to establish the united front of the working class against fascism, imperialist war and capitalism.

---

### THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

“The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit:

“1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

“2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet state.

“3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

“4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.”—Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 16-17.

---

---

---

## A Reply to Thomas Mann

**T**HE great German writer, Thomas Mann, in whose person bourgeois humanism is confronting fascist barbarism, has been for many years in the ranks of the fighters defending truth, freedom and human dignity against "totalitarian" destruction. In the personal development of this important man who emerged from the retirement of a "non-political" life and arrived at the understanding that politics poses "the question of man himself with a final and mortal seriousness," we believe that we observe the general development of the best part of the bourgeois intellectuals.

Thomas Mann, an emigré today, is now, as before, bound by fine, firm threads to those German intellectuals who are exposed to the brutal hate, the outrageous infamy and the inhuman baseness of German fascism; and many signs point to the fact that these intellectuals are not only meeting the fascist destroyers of Germany with increasing abhorrence but are also beginning to show a readiness to fight against fascism.

We Communists consider it an important task of the working class to give all possible aid to these intellectuals who are rejecting fascism, and, in part, are already anti-fascists. In doing this, we understand quite clearly that it is a *bourgeois* humanism that is becoming militant, that is, a humanism which, together with bourgeois traditions, combines bourgeois prejudices. That which unites us not only *tactically* but also *in principle* is fundamental: The acknowledgment of freedom and reason, the steadfast conception that man is not only a zoological creature which is determined by "blood, race and instinct,"

but that he is distinguished from the animal world by human consciousness, the original source of human dignity, and by the aspiring endeavor to shape all human relations on the basis of reason and freedom, peace and culture, respect for other people and other nations. Both see in fascism the mortal enemy of all these conceptions and efforts, the mortal enemy of humanity. What separates us is primarily the reply to the question: How can we produce a social condition and how must this social condition be constituted, which actually guarantees freedom, culture and human dignity, which preserves humanity from sinking into barbarism?

In order to achieve genuine unity of struggle against fascism, we must be sincere in the discussion of that which separates us, sincere and friendly. The anti-fascist unity of struggle of the Communists, the revolutionary workers, with all those forces which are honestly desirous of defending freedom and peace, culture and civilization against fascist barbarism, need not sink to a tactical maneuver, to the attempt at cunningly "using" one another. Every such attempt must lead to serious differences of opinion being passed over in misplaced silence, for a time, only to have us strike out in anger at one another at some later day. In such cases it is said at first: "*Nous sommes d'accord!*" (We are agreed), when we aren't actually agreed; and suddenly when we are no longer able to keep silent about the differences of opinion, no less inappropriate outbreaks of anger will occur.

In view of an incident in the center of which Thomas Mann was involuntarily involved, we consider it necessary to

speak openly about this question. In a lecture in America published some time ago, Thomas Mann had already characterized Bolshevism quite falsely and in profoundest contradiction to reality. Various evil elements, who consider it their task to sow confusion and disruption in the ranks of the German emigrés and in the entire anti-fascist front, immediately retailed them for incitement against the Communists and the Soviet Union. But instead of contemptuously waving these elements aside, while taking factual issue with the incorrect and therefore harmful views of Thomas Mann, the Runa agency allowed one of its collaborators to revile and cast suspicion on Thomas Mann.

By his remarks Thomas Mann *objectively* helped the enemies of the Soviet Union; that is undisputable; but that is no reason to describe him as a "reactionary ignoramus" "bought" by American capital. On the contrary, it is necessary to establish fundamentally that our respect for the writer and humanist, Thomas Mann, does not depend on whether he evaluates Communism correctly or incorrectly, but that we expect of him and every honest anti-fascist a more thorough study of Bolshevism and of the Soviet Union, and a conscientious *opinion* and not a hastily formulated *prejudice*.

One's attitude towards the Soviet Union, its nature, its achievements and problems is today not a private matter but an extraordinarily serious and decisive question in the struggle against fascism. In a polemic filled with moral passion and political clarity, Thomas Mann has indicted the men and powers of the reactionary bourgeoisie who betrayed the freedom and the peace of nations at Munich because they intended to incite and equip German fascism for a crusade against the Soviet Union. In words of enduring validity, he asserted:

"The history of the betrayal of the Czechoslovak republic by European democracy, the sacrifice to fascism of this state allied to democracy and trusting it, in order to save fascism, to strengthen it permanently and to utilize it as a military force against Russia and socialism

—this history is one of the foulest acts ever perpetrated." (Thomas Mann, *Attention Europe!*)

But how will Thomas Mann reconcile this statement, which is so strong because of its truth, with the fact that in another place (in the above-mentioned lecture in America) he describes German fascism as "Bolshevism" of a special kind and adds:

"They are hostile brothers of whom the younger learned practically everything—except the moral thing—from the older one, the Russian; for his socialism is morally spurious, mendacious and contemptuous of man. . . ."

There is a gaping contradiction here which is all the more strange since it is Thomas Mann himself who sees the decisive criterion of all politics in its *moral* content, since he himself deplures, as a profoundest decline leading to fascism, that "people no longer know the difference between truth and lies," since he himself brands German fascism as the "utter confounding of politics and knavery."

If, therefore, Bolshevism, as Thomas Mann admits, differs fundamentally from fascism in its moral respect, if he concedes in the same lecture that "the moral nature of all true socialism holds true also in the case of Russia, it must be acknowledged as a *peace force*"—then how can he describe fascism at the same time as "Bolshevism" of a special kind, as a "narrow-minded Bolshevism," as "a morally inferior form of Bolshevism free from all humanitarianism"?

Although Thomas Mann rejects historical materialism, he will certainly not deny that the moral qualities of a society are in some way connected with the social system itself, that it is no *accident* that "the moral nature of all true socialism" holds true in the Soviet Union also, that it is no *accident* that it is a peace force fighting for peace throughout its existence. Just as little can it be called an accident that the Bolsheviks have always told the masses the truth no matter how bitter it was, that nothing is more alien to them than the gap between words and deeds, between theory

and practice, that, for them propaganda means nothing but *education*.

Thomas Mann has repeatedly branded the principle of fascist propaganda as in harshest contradiction to the principle of education; considering that, let him examine Stalin's speech, the decisions of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, issued by the Central Committee, the entire propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, and he will find that *education*, tireless, patient education of the masses of people, constitutes their innermost nature. Thomas Mann has repeatedly pointed out that the fascists evaluate culture, intellect, art, ideas as "idealist rubbish from the nineteenth century." Let him visualize the devotion with which the Bolsheviks defend the cultural heritage, with what care they take over and develop all traditions of humanism, what respect and promotion art and culture enjoy in the Soviet Union. It is not a pale and sickly, but rather a fighting "militant," humanism that is flourishing in the Soviet Union, a humanism to which Thomas Mann's words fit:

"What is needed is a humanism of the will, and fighting determination for self-preservation. Freedom must discover its manhood; it must learn to put on armor and to defend itself against its mortal enemies; it must finally understand after the most bitter experiences, that a pacifism which claims not to want *war at any price* produces, rather than banishes, war." (Thomas Mann, *Attention Europe!*)

And when Thomas Mann emphasizes the necessity of "taking the side of those who want to give a meaning to the earth, a human meaning to the earth," then he cannot avoid conceding that the Bolsheviks are exerting all their energies to give the earth, to life, this meaning, that the Five-Year Plans, the systematic raising of the living standards and the cultural level, the transformation of labor into "a matter of honor, fame and heroism," that the education of the whole of society to a brave, reasonable,

tempered optimism mean just this and nothing else.

Is all this only an accident? And, on the other hand, is it only an accident that the German fascists trample truth in the dust, deny the intellect, destroy culture, annihilate peace, despise, mistreat and break human beings? Neither the one nor the other is an accident, and every anti-fascist must make it his business to get to the bottom of things and search for the *roots* of the two systems. But these roots lie in the fact that the Bolsheviks have abolished the *exploitation of man by man*, while the fascists increased this exploitation to the utmost. Fascism, to be sure, has tried to imitate certain *externalities*: It speaks of four-year plans, it passes itself off as "socialism," it acts as if it were "revolutionary," etc.; but when a cannibal consumes his victims with a knife and fork, it certainly cannot be said that he has "learned practically everything except the moral thing" from his "brother," the civilized person.

For the sake of truth and for the sake of the anti-fascist struggle we consider it indispensable that in a question of decisive importance, in the question of their attitude towards the Soviet Union, bourgeois anti-fascists should not be misled by externalities and prejudices. We do not want to force our outlook on any bourgeois anti-fascist, but we should like and have the right to request that he becomes acquainted with this outlook, not second hand, that he become aware of the decisive importance of the Soviet Union in the struggle for freedom, peace, culture and human dignity, and, thereby, the implications of his attitude towards the Soviet Union.

Our Comrade Dimitroff, who is not only dear to the workers but also to the bourgeois anti-fascists of all countries, has stated in his important article on the twentieth anniversary of the great Socialist October Revolution:

"The *historical dividing line* between the forces of fascism, war and capitalism, on the one hand, and the forces of peace, democracy and socialism on the other hand is in fact becoming the *atti-*



*tude* toward the Soviet Union, and not the formal attitude toward Soviet power and socialism in general, but the *attitude* to the Soviet Union, which has been carrying on a real existence for twenty years already, with its untiring struggle against enemies, with its dictatorship of the working class and the Stalinist Constitution, with the leading role of the Party of Lenin and Stalin." \*

We believe that anti-fascists like Thomas Mann, after a serious examination, will be unable to avoid recognizing the historical truth of these words. And

---

\* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, p. 280, International Publishers, New York.

it seems to us we are not requesting too much when we expect of anti-fascists like Thomas Mann and all of his intellectual fellow-travelers that they become acquainted with the fundamental questions of Leninism, with the speeches and writings of Stalin, with the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* and that they then very seriously ask themselves the question whether they have not succumbed to prejudices when they thought they were passing judgment? We allude to this not for the purpose of "converting" bourgeois anti-fascists, but because it will strengthen them, and thereby our common cause, when they correctly understand the nature and significance of the Soviet Union.

---

---

## The "De-Judaization" of the Czech People

**A**NTI-SEMITISM as a weapon of the ruling classes for plundering their own people and for diverting the masses from struggle against the dominant regime was known even before fascism. Anti-Semitism as a weapon for extensive plundering and expropriation of foreign peoples is a "discovery" of German fascism. The decree of Reich Protector Neurath on the so-called "De-Judaization of Czech economy," of June 22, 1939, will certainly take its place in history as a classic example of fascist plundering and expropriation of foreign peoples with the aid of anti-Semitism.

The decree comprises twelve paragraphs. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 state that Jewish concerns and combinations are allowed only by special written permission of the Reich Protector who can transfer in whole or in part his authority to issue decrees and his other rights connected with factories, real estate, leases and financial bills and with holdings and enterprises. Up to July 31, 1939, all Jewish landownership must be reported to the competent authority.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the decree forbid Jews to do business in land, to participate in economic enterprises or to lease them, to take over or to transfer financial bills, to sell gold, silver, platinum, precious stones, pearls and other jewels and art objects if the individual object or collection amounts to more than 10,000 kroner.

Paragraph 6 defines who is to be considered a "Jew" in accord with the Nuremberg racial laws.

Paragraphs 8 to 12 contain the right of the Protector to put in or recall trustees, deputies and enforcement officers; a means of denationalization, because these authorized agents of the Protector

are, of course, Germans. Furthermore, these paragraphs contain the penalty and enforcement provisions.

The decisive paragraph which can actually be called the expropriation paragraph of Czech economy is Paragraph 7 which stipulates when a concern is to be considered Jewish. According to Paragraph 7 not only those concerns are Jewish whose owner is a Jew but also concerns with *one* or more personally remaining Jewish members, as well as with *one* or more Jewish members of the administrative body or board of directors. The branch of a concern so designated as Jewish is to be considered Jewish. The branch of a non-Jewish concern is to be considered Jewish if the manager or one of several managers of the branch is a Jew.

This paragraph shows clearly that the decree on Jews is nothing but a predatory raid on Czech national wealth and property. With the inclusion of Jewish wealth and property, Czech economy is at the same time to be subjected to an extensive expropriation in favor of German finance capital, for, according to this paragraph, Czech economy is extensively "'Judaized."

Thanks to the struggle of the working class and Masaryk against anti-Semitism, there were only slight anti-Semitic sentiments among the Czech people in the pre-War period. The Czech Jews engaged extensively in the economic, cultural and national life and activity of the Czech people. The national Czech democratic movement in the Danube monarchy during the World War, the democratic development in the post-War period, the recent anti-fascist movement promoted this process of assimilation. To the extent that the Jews were not in the

militant proletarian movement, they were a prop of the bourgeois-democratic regime. There were and are many Czech Jews who no longer know that their grandfather or grandmother were Jews, who thought and acted only as Czechs. No one tried to pry into a person's origin; the Jews had absolutely equal rights with other Czechs in the state and economy, throughout public and national life, and nowhere met up with any prejudices. As a result of this complete assimilation of the Czech Jews in Czech national life, there could be but very few important Czech enterprises which were, so to speak, purely "Aryan."

The decree on Jews also evoked the greatest consternation in the camp of the Czech bourgeoisie. To be sure, parts of this bourgeoisie still have illusions and do not quite believe that the Nazis will dare to expropriate them gangster-fashion. The Czech party of "National Community" speaks of the national right to Jewish property, and Czech papers think that one should not speak of "Aryanizing," but of transferring Jewish property to Czech ownership, since, after all, this Jewish property stems from Czech national property. They still do not want to believe that their own skins are also at stake.

But the Czech coordinated press, which reflects such illusions, also characterizes the robber morality of the Nazis by calling upon the Czech population in no case to be frightened into handing over money, jewels, precious stones, etc., to people in Gestapo uniform, but to denounce such people without fear. The Gestapo uniform, a high-ranking symbol of the Nazi Reich, is thus publicly exposed, to a certain extent, by the press itself as a token of the robber's profession and robber's morality.

Reproaches were hurled on all sides. The fascist and reactionary Czech capitulationist circles, who facilitated the work of the Nazis by their anti-Semitic campaigns, reproached other Czech circles on the ground that their hesitations and rejection of anti-Semitism were responsible for this decree. The circles of the vassal government and the leadership of

the party of "National Community" reproached the Nazi officials for not replying to their inquiries and their proposals; and the Nazi officials replied maliciously and brutally that the autonomous protectorate authorities are unable to act, indeed are helping the Jews.

With the rejection of the Nazi anti-Semitic incitement and the anti-Semitic campaign of the Czech reactionary circles, which the Czech people felt was a means for its own enslavement, the concept of "honor Aryan" was born under the pressure of this resistance of the people and by means of which they wanted to save popular Czechs of Jewish origin from persecution as, for example, the popular sports editor, Laufer.

German fascism took this rejection of the anti-Semitic incitement as a pretext for decreeing the law on Jews over the heads of the autonomous Czech authorities. The violent discussion following the decree was not only supposed to move the occupationists to spare the Czech bourgeoisie, but, simultaneously, to divert the Czech people from the enormous implications of this decree.

A small part of the Czech bourgeoisie still hopes to avert the worst by slavish submissiveness to the occupationists. But on the other hand, this new heavy blow against the Czech people increases the movement of national resistance against the occupationists.

The masses understand that the blow is directed against all, that the so-called Aryanization means nothing but the complete and unrestricted domination of German finance capital over Czech economy, over Czech factories and workers. The Czechs are being thrown out of the "living room" which German imperialism conquered and are being penned up in the servant's quarters. This, and nothing else, is what German imperialism means by German "living room"—the merciless expropriation and enslavement of foreign peoples, the "totality" of force, with which it transforms foreign nations into "have-nots."

In every country, the anti-Semites are

the ones who prepare the way for German imperialism. "Rather a small pogrom than pay a large tax on fortunes," a reactionary Jewish capitalist once said. Today the world begins to understand

that the pogrom incitements of German fascism are not only intended to prepare a "large tax on fortunes" but the thorough pillage and expropriation of the nation, in favor of the fascist gangsters,

---

### AN INTERNATIONAL FRONT AGAINST FASCISM

"The fascist adventurers are in a hurry to take the offensive because they fear the growing movement of the people's front, the growing resistance of the nations to fascist aggression, the union and welding of the peoples into an international front of struggle against the fascist war-makers. The fascist rulers want to forestall the welding of the masses and to strike at them before they unite to repulse fascism. They are trying to divide the peoples, to sow discord among them, in order the more easily to defeat them one by one. They are making skilful use of the complaisance of the ruling classes of Great Britain and France, and are turning them into accomplices of their nefarious deeds, thus compromising and discrediting them still further, and endeavoring by this rascally maneuver to divert the indignation of the masses from themselves."—D. Z. Manuilsky, *The World Communist Movement*, p. 9.

---

---

---

# The Zurich Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions

BY W. FLORIN

**T**HIS is the second time that a congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions has been held since the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, this time at Zurich. The previous congress held in London in 1936 faced the accomplished fact that the great German and Austrian trade union movement had been destroyed by fascism; that, after attacking Ethiopia, the fascist states were preparing new acts of aggression. At the same time, the Congress took place under the impress of the growing movement of resistance in a number of countries, primarily the victories of the People's Front in France and Spain. It took place under the great effect produced by the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International on the toiling masses of the whole world, rallying them for unity, for resistance against fascism and for the defense of their popular democratic rights and peace. It took place under the impress of the firm and consistent stand of the Socialist Soviet Union against the fascist aggressors during the attack on Ethiopia.

Exposing the growing fascist menace in a number of countries and the further aggressive designs of the fascist states, the progressive forces at the London Congress of the I.F.T.U. demanded a resolute struggle against fascism and that the congress take the initiative in establishing international trade union unity.

If the compromise decisions which were arrived at in the commissions after

violent battles had been consistently executed, they would still have made it possible to put serious obstacles in the path of the aggressors. But these decisions were sabotaged by a number of trade union centers and even by the leadership of the I.F.T.U. once the Congress was over.

Despite all the lobbying of anti-unity elements, a decision was adopted at the London Congress which instructed the leadership of the I.F.T.U. to negotiate with the Soviet trade unions regarding affiliation of the I.F.T.U. This decision also was sabotaged by the leadership. Only under pressure of the masses and a few progressive national organizations did the I.F.T.U. send a negotiations delegation to Moscow in the autumn of 1937. As we know, the negotiations resulted in an agreement. The delegation of the I.F.T.U., consisting of Jouhaux, Schevenels and Stolz, made the statement in Moscow that they would support the demand of the Soviet trade unions before the leadership of the I.F.T.U.; in fact, they declared that this demand was substantially identical with the views of the I.F.T.U.

As a result, millions of workers confidently looked forward to the realization of trade union unity. Immediately, the reactionary press, government organs in a number of bourgeois democratic states and the entire fascist press launched a vicious campaign against the emerging international trade union unity. The reactionary press appealed to the "reason" of the reformist trade union leaders,

flattering and threatening them all in one breath. Thereupon Schevenels promptly repudiated the statement which he made in writing in Moscow. Reactionary trade union leaders displayed the utmost hostility against any collaboration with the Soviet trade unions, in which they were in rather striking agreement with the panic-mongering and fascist press. Some of them threatened to split the I.F.T.U.

In May, 1938, the I.F.T.U. held a conference in Oslo. A number of trade union leaders headed by Citrine and Mertens fought for a policy which signified the ideological preparation of Munich within the organized labor movement. The differences around this line which were still further sharpened at Oslo by the question of the admission or non-admission of the Soviet trade unions could no longer be concealed by compromise resolutions. The conflict between the pro-unity forces and the anti-unity forces was simultaneously a conflict between firm anti-fascist fighters on the one hand, and capitulators on the other hand. The forces of progress were defeated in Oslo, but their position has proved to be correct and many of their opponents in Oslo have meanwhile gladly changed their attitude.

The events in Oslo, the forcible subjugation of Czechoslovakia and Albania by the fascist robber states, the defeat of the heroic Spanish people caused by the policy of "Non-Intervention" and betrayal and the cynical admission by Hitler and Mussolini that they intervened right from the start, the continuation of the Japanese war against China and the threats of aggression by the fascist axis powers in the West and the East, have led the toiling masses of the whole world to demand even more energetically international trade union unity and international action against fascism.

That is why the question of collaboration with the Soviet trade unions and their admission to the I.F.T.U. came up again at the Zurich Congress. Although the British trade union center had not change in any way its negative attitude

towards the Soviet trade unions, it was compelled to take account of the sentiments of its members, the international situation and the oscillations of British policy, and introduce a motion to renew the invitation to the Soviet trade unions, without seriously trying to secure a majority for this motion.

If the admission of the Soviet trade unions was defeated at the Oslo Conference by a vote of sixteen to four, with one absention, it was defeated at Zurich only by 46 to 37, with the four Spanish delegates excluded from balloting. Formally, the vote actually meant that the representatives of 9,300,000 were for inviting the Soviet trade unions and the official representatives of only 6,200,000 were against the invitation. Despite this, according to the peculiar method of representation, the motion was considered lost.

In reality, the vote should be evaluated differently, for the opponents of unity can by no means claim that their own trade union membership, whom they formally represented, is behind them in this attitude. Even one of the most reactionary anti-unity elements, Lindberg of Sweden, let slip this admission.

"It is true that the workers of all countries are for collaboration with the Soviet Union for purely emotional reasons. That is the case, not only in England, but also in the Scandinavian states, and certainly even in the fascist states."

This admission contains only a part of the truth. Millions of class conscious workers organized in trade unions in the capitalist countries feel much more than "sympathy" for the Soviet Union. They demand close collaboration with the Soviet trade unions and are ready to defend the Soviet Union with all their might against any attack by the capitalist states. Thus, although these opportunist trade union leaders know the will of their trade union masses for unity, these enemies of unity and capitulators before fascism voted down international trade union unity in Zurich.

The question arises: Whom, whose will

and whose interests did those trade union leaders represent by opposing unity? This was shown clearly by their position on the questions which were most closely connected with this, primarily the question of the struggle against fascism and fascist aggression. The question was: international action of the world proletariat or continuation of the fatal policy of confining oneself to protests and passivity. The question was: support unity of the peace-loving states to halt further aggressions or condone the continuation of a Munich policy.

It was no accident that almost all the spokesmen of the anti-unity forces came from those countries which have been carrying out the suicidal policy of weakening the League of Nations, sabotaging Article 16; a policy of so-called "neutrality" towards fascist aggression and toleration of fascist plots in their own countries and intervention by the fascist states in the internal affairs of their countries.

In accord with the directives of their governments which were dictated by considerations for the fascist states, they opposed any international proletarian action as well as the establishment of an effective peace pact between the states against fascist aggression. There is no clearer indication of this than Lindberg's slanderous words:

"We who represent the neutral states do not want to be pawns in the game of the big powers by the round-about route of the trade union International."

In reality, with this position they have actually become pawns in Hitler's hand on the world chessboard. They weaken the fighting front; they slander the I.F.T.U.; they play into the hands of fascist propaganda. By speaking generally of great power blocs, they deny that only fascism wants war; they prevent an effective struggle against fascism. They make of their nation a football for the fascist states, as the Danish example shows; they turn their nation over to fascism; they want their nation to supply its labor power and its natural re-

sources to the aggressors even during war. That is their "neutrality." We do not doubt that the workers in these countries will soon see through this policy, will recognize the dangers connected with it and will resist it.

The Congress of the I.F.T.U. reflected the political crisis of the Second International and the danger of a split in the trade union International, for the behavior of a number of speakers showed that they are not inclined to break the coalition with their bourgeoisie even when this bourgeoisie facilitates fascist aggression still more, and that they value the coalition with their bourgeoisie more than their membership in the I.F.T.U. Just as the "neutral" governments have worked to render the League of Nations impotent, so, to take an example, do the heads of the Scandinavian trade unions strive to reduce the I.F.T.U. to a study and information bureau, not only that they may escape international criticism and international guidance, but also to deprive the I.F.T.U. of the possibility of organizing international actions.

The important speech by Comrade Jouhaux at the Zurich Congress, in which he expressed the views of broad trade union masses, contained substantially the following contents:

1. By its passivity, the I.F.T.U. has contributed towards bringing about the Munich situation. The question is now whether the I.F.T.U. should continue to be satisfied with moral protests or pass to organized actions.

2. The struggle must be waged for the purpose of placing insurmountable barriers before fascism by means of uniting all peace-loving states, small and big. Collective defense against every act of aggression; no nation is to stand aside. The trade unions should be in the front ranks working for this; they should be in the front ranks of the struggle against fascism.

3. The trade unions should strive with all their power to see that their nations do not feed the fascist aggressor, do not produce for him, do not work for him.

That is a fighting program. We regret

to record that no fighting decisions were adopted to correspond to this programmatic speech. The attitude of Mertens (Belgium), de la Bella (Holland), Lindberg (Sweden), Weber (Switzerland), Watt (America), Schevenels and their supporters leaves the I.F.T.U. constantly hanging in the air and renders it incapable of action on any serious international question.

What were the chief arguments of the opponents of unity in Zurich?

First arguments: There has been no change in the situation since Oslo which would require any revision of the Oslo decision. (Mertens, Belgium.) What does Mertens care that following Oslo the Czech people, the Spanish people, the Albanian people were subjugated by fascism, that the bloody war is still going on in China? Mertens does not want to see that Hitler has had military offensive positions constructed at the Belgian border and that the bloody rape of the Belgian people in 1914 can be repeated. Mertens is not moved by the fact that a new powder keg has arisen at the Polish border. Following Oslo, the danger of a universal war conflagration in Europe, provoked by the fascist states, has become even more acute. That hardly needs to be explained to anyone in the world. Whom does Mertens wish to serve by trying to ignore this?

Second argument: The admission of the Soviet trade unions would weaken the I.F.T.U., and under the circumstances would destroy some movements. (Mertens.) What is the truth? The admission of the Soviet trade unions to the I.F.T.U. would more than double the strength of the I.F.T.U. It would be easier to defeat every new attack on the trade union movement by fascism. Only he could speak like Mertens who has the idea of participating in splitting and destroying the trade unions in case the trade unions should become a menace to capitalism.

Third argument: "The Russian peace pact is necessary, but trade union unity with the Russians would weaken the I.F.T.U. . . . There is no unity between two principles which are to one another

like fire and water." (Dr. Max Weber, Switzerland.) What kind of principles are these? The Soviet trade unions are for socialism all over the world. Dr. Max Weber is for the retention of capitalism. These are the principles which are like fire and water to one another. And where Max Weber sees a weakening of the I.F.T.U. we see that it would get stronger. The capitalist supporters in the I.F.T.U. would be weakened, and the socialist forces in the I.F.T.U. would be strengthened. But the Soviet trade unions have not made the recognition of their principles by the I.F.T.U. a condition.

Fourth argument: The Soviet trade unions are not free trade unions; they are state organizations and are tied up with the government. (Robert Watt, America.) This argument was also advanced by such anti-Communists as Lindberg, so that Jouhaux was compelled to expose their trick:

"To be impartial, I should be compelled to investigate the relation of certain trade union centers to their governments, the dependence of certain trade union centers upon the decisions and orders of the governments."

The representative of the Swedish foreign minister must have understood what Jouhaux meant.

Let us examine this argument. The trade unions in Russia arose after the political labor party was established and through the initiative of the Bolsheviks. The trade unions were always closely connected with the Party of the working class and were led by them politically and ideologically. Hence, the trade unions did not arise only after the Soviet state was established; on the contrary, they helped to win this state. Therefore they were and are revolutionary trade unions. The trade unions were independent of the capitalist state and the capitalist government.

Under the leadership of the political party, the working class achieved its workers' and peasants' state, *its* state and *its* government, and hence also the government which the trade unions desired, for which they fought and which



they unreservedly support. Perhaps the Soviet trade unions should not help to organize and strengthen the state of the workers and toilers? Perhaps they should watch the construction of socialism without interest? Or perhaps they should oppose their own government as the working class opposes the government of a capitalist country? We see that this argument is rotten and demagogic.

Now allow us to say a few words concerning the condition of some trade union centers in capitalist countries. In its appeal on May First this year, the Second International pointed to the Scandinavian countries and even spoke of the "socialism" that was being built there.

In all these countries Social-Democratic governments are at the helm. But in two of these countries there are anti-union gag laws. In Sweden, under pressure of the government, the trade union center signed an agreement with the employers limiting the freedom of the trade unions. The agreement became public. The trade unions and mass organizations protested against it. But the central leadership is trying to compel the individual unions to carry out the agreement. In Norway, judgments are handed down by the courts against trade unions and their members on the basis of anti-union laws. In Denmark, the Social-Democratic government has created a law which greatly curtails the freedom of action of the unions against the capitalists and thus helps to keep wages low among the bulk of the working masses. Finland is governed by a Social-Democratic coalition government. But the trade unions are constantly under the surveillance and control of the Okhrana. And yet, the trade union heads defend the government policy against the criticism of the masses and constantly act in the closest contact with their governments.

The Dutch Social-Democracy is not in the government. But, despite this, it practices a policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie. That also binds the trade unions in which the Social-Democrats

have decisive influence. In Belgium, Mertens has been carrying out the orders of the Spaak government for years; and in Switzerland, Grimm knows very well how often governments have influenced trade union measures. The British formerly used the argument also, but did not advance it this time because the collaboration of the trade union leaders with Chamberlain has become too obvious.

These are the facts: The opportunist trade union leaders who are not only in a position of dependence on their governments but also have binding agreements with employers' organizations, who have themselves helped to bind the unions a hundredfold by laws and decrees, who have created a "theory" glorifying this situation, these are the people who have "discovered" the lack of freedom of the Soviet trade unions.

When Julien Racamond, in his clear and impressive speech, criticized the I.F.T.U. for not organizing any international action against fascism, for not helping the heroic Spanish people, which would have been possible; when a Chinese delegate criticized the I.F.T.U. for not having allowed any aid to the Chinese struggle for liberation since 1938; when the Indian representative points out the inadequate activity of the I.F.T.U. on behalf of the toiling masses of the Orient; when the Palestinian representative criticizes the I.F.T.U. for its inadequate struggle against racial persecution; when Spieckmann of the professional employees secretariat complains about the indifference of the I.F.T.U. and the national organizations towards the support of the illegal trade unions in the fascist countries—all this presents a shameful picture of inactivity on such important international questions.

At the Zurich Congress, Mertens delivered a report on the struggle to prevent and mitigate economic crises, on the problem of unemployment and the reduction of the hours of work. Indicatively enough, there was no discussion on this point. Mertens, who developed an oppor-

tunist "theory" on the prevention of crises under capitalism, presented directives for the prevention of and struggle against crises which were nothing but the rotten theory of "organized" capitalism. Koppers of Holland supplemented this in his report on the "Trade Unions and the State" in which among other things, he presented the reactionary demand that the capitalist state should intervene in the regulation of social conflicts and that the trade unions should strive for a so-called democratic planned economy in the capitalist state.

Mertens and Koppers had to admit that no encouraging results could be recorded with respect to assuring the unemployed a living. Furthermore, they had to admit that no progress had been made since the London Congress on the question of reducing the hours of work; in fact, some countries had even gone backwards. They would have done well to criticize the I.F.T.U. because, after the conquest of the forty-hour week in France, it did not call upon the trade unions of all countries, likewise, to take up the struggle for the forty-hour week.

In doing this, Mertens and Koppers would have been compelled to exercise self-criticism. They would have had to criticize the fact that the I.F.T.U. left the French workers in the lurch when their achievements were cut down by the attacks of the bourgeoisie. Instead of this, Mertens admits that they had placed their hopes only in the International Labor Office where the handling of the question of shortening the hours of work has been indefinitely postponed. Mertens could not offer anything beyond the recommendation that the trade unions should undertake "actions" so that the workers themselves would understand the importance of the problem and then, at the proper moment, take up the struggle again. For the workers to understand the problem no "actions" are really necessary. Just let the trade union leaders seriously put the question of the struggle for shortening the hours of work as a question of immediate action,

the proper moment will come quicker than one thinks.

The Congress of the I.F.T.U. did not allow any representatives of the illegal trade union movements from the fascist countries to take part as regular delegates with the right to vote. This is a question of principle and actually represents a concession to the fascist dictators. To what extent the workers in the fascist countries feel bound up with the international labor movement was evident from a letter from Austria in which 250 factory delegates in the name of 97,000 workers, demanded trade union unity and the admission of the Soviet trade unions into the I.F.T.U.

The Congress of the I.F.T.U. in Zurich recorded no visible progress with respect to the policy and tactics of the I.F.T.U. But the progressive trade union centers have won many new supporters for their proposals and policies among the broad masses of the world trade union movement, although they could not yet assert themselves at the Zurich Congress. In the other countries, too, the majority of the trade union masses is for a progressive policy, but this majority has not yet gotten into motion sufficiently to force the leading organs in their trade unions to respect their will.

The Congress at Zurich has shown that there is a big contradiction between the opportunist opponents of unity and the progressive leaders. It has shown that an ever-widening breach is arising between the reactionary opponents of unity and the broad trade union masses. The composition of the newly elected leadership of the I.F.T.U. does not express the will of the broad trade union masses. Today it is perfectly clear that the progressive minority in the leadership represents the overwhelming majority of the membership.

Hardly did the vote against unity at the Zurich Congress become known than broad masses protested at many trade union meetings in most European countries against the anti-unity decision of the I.F.T.U. As their resolutions state, they pledged to continue the struggle un-

til they defeated the enemies of unity. Representatives of those delegations who fought for unity also declared that they would continue the struggle.

In view of the sharpening of the international situation and the deep crisis in the Second International, larger and larger masses see in trade union unity the strongest possibility of common international proletarian actions against the fascist aggressors, for the freedom and peace of the nations. A thinking worker can hardly understand how on the one hand one can endorse the agreement of England and France with the Soviet Union against the fascist aggressors, while on the other hand trying by all means to prevent the agreement between the workers in the capitalist countries and the workers of the Soviet Union. This obstruction of the unity of the trade union workers of all countries for common defense of their most ele-

mentary interests as workers, their bread, freedom and peace, contradicts the natural feeling of every worker.

There are not many questions in which the overwhelming majority of the international working class is so unanimously agreed as the question of the admission of the Soviet trade unions into the I.F.T.U., the question of international trade union unity. To stick stubbornly to this question and thereby embody the will of the overwhelming majority of the international working class, is therefore one of the most important tasks of the Communists and all supporters of labor unity. Everything must be done on this question to overcome the resistance of the splitters. This is the question in which there is the most likely possibility of gaining a victory for unity in every country and internationally and thereby a mighty upsurge of the labor movement.

---

---

# The Importance of the "History of the C. P. S. U. (B.)" to the International Working Class

BY P. DENGEL

**I**N HIS report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin said:

"The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery. For the bourgeoisie knows that if capitalism has not yet been overthrown and still continues to exist, it has not itself to thank, but the fact that the proletariat has still not faith enough in the possibility of its victory. It cannot be said that the efforts of the bourgeoisie in this respect have been altogether unsuccessful. It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and scepticism."\*

It is obvious that in these years of the new imperialist war into which the fascist aggressors have dragged hundreds of millions of people, the international labor movement has not played the role that it could have played in accord with its strength and importance. The international labor movement has not adequately met its obligations to the Spanish people which defended itself for more

than two and a half years against the superior forces of the fascist interventionists and against the intrigues and disruption of the reactionary bourgeoisie of the other capitalist countries and its agents.

It has not met adequately and still is not meeting adequately its obligations to the Chinese people who have been fighting the Japanese bandits for two years now. There was no lack of sympathy by the great majority of the working class in the capitalist countries for the Spanish and Chinese peoples; there was no lack of readiness for international proletarian aid, but there is a lack of understanding that this aid was and is possible only if the working class in every country defeats its own reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie. What is lacking is the confidence of the workers in their own power and ability to defeat their own reactionary bourgeoisie and to place themselves at the head of the people in order to beat back fascism and prevent a new world war.

The bourgeoisie leaves nothing undone in order to confuse the workers as to their task, their role in the present period in which the international situation has been sharpened to the extreme. For example, there can be no mistake that the propaganda of the fascist robbers on the national question has exercised and still exercises some influence on the labor movement. The brazen chatter of these criminals about the claims of the "proletarian nations" as against

---

\* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 62. International Publishers, New York.

the "rich nations," about a "nation without room," about their claims to a "share of the raw materials of the world," that is, of colonies and the oppression of peoples; their attempt to "justify" their predatory adventures with the claim of the "right of self-determination" of nations, as in the case of Memel and Danzig—all this sows confusion in the ranks of the working class and is not sufficiently combatted.

The reactionary warmongers in the other capitalist countries, in turn, attempt to justify their actual support of the fascist criminals on the alleged ground of "saving peace." They even had the audacity to accuse those who want to set up a barrier against any further crimes by the fascist aggressors of "warmongering." They talked of the alleged "weakness" of the Soviet Union. On the one hand, they exaggerated the tardiness in the preparedness of their own countries and, on the other hand, the military strength of the fascist states.

This brazen and lying propaganda of the fascists and the reactionary bourgeoisie would not have been able to cause so much confusion in the ranks of the working class, as was the case and still is, if the "reformist camp followers of the bourgeoisie," the reactionary Social-Democrats, had not supported this pro-fascist propaganda. They added their bit towards poisoning the workers with the venom of doubt in their own power and in the possibility and inevitability of their victory, in order to compel them to capitulate before fascism step by step.

It must be stated that the Communists have far from succeeded in canceling this propaganda of the fascists, the reactionary bourgeoisie and their reformist camp followers. It still happens that Communists do not entirely see through the tricks of the fascist and pro-fascist propaganda and permit themselves to be sidetracked. One example will show this:

German fascism which has subjugated and oppressed the Austrians and Czechs, which is threatening the independence of Poland, the Baltic states, Denmark and Holland and, together with Italy, also the independence of France, Swit-

zerland and the Balkan countries, shouts about the "encirclement" and the rape of Germany by the "rich countries."

At this moment reactionary German Social-Democrats are beginning to tell fables about the dismemberment of Germany in case of a war instigated by the German fascists, and they "protest" against it. Quite obviously these reactionary Social-Democrats are using these "protests" to prepare their future desertion to the side of the German imperialist bourgeoisie.

It was the task of the German Communists to see through the reactionary, pro-fascist character of this propaganda and expose it. Instead of this, they allowed themselves for a time to be enticed partly along the same slippery road, instead of clearly stating that those who resist German fascist aggression are waging a just war, that no one is threatening the German people, that, on the contrary, present-day Germany is a national prison and endangers the independence of other peoples, and that if a just war, a war of defense against the aggressor, will be necessary, it is not because there is any danger of the dismemberment of Germany by the reactionary bourgeoisie of England and France, but the danger of a treacherous agreement between this reactionary bourgeoisie and German fascism against the Soviet Union.

In his report of the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Comrade Manuilsky said the following concerning these weaknesses of the Communists in the capitalist countries:

"The Communist Parties have not yet learned to combat fascist demagogy effectively; they were unable to foil the speculation of German fascism on the national question in the Saar, in Danzig and in the Sudeten region.

"They have still a poor grasp of Stalin's great art of foreseeing events, of estimating the part played by the various states, classes and parties in these events, and of anticipating the maneuvers of the enemy and thwarting his plans in time.

"The Communists of the capitalist countries are not sufficiently prepared for abrupt turns of events and have not yet mastered the forms of struggle dictated by the tense international situation."\*

The Communists are the most progressive section of the labor movement in all countries. It depends upon their activity, their policies, their circumspection and ability correctly to estimate the entire situation and to be prepared for every abrupt turn of events, to what extent the labor movement in every country and internationally is able to take over leadership of the struggle against fascism and against the pro-fascist, reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie.

Events are helping the Communists. The bourgeoisie is getting more and more entangled in its own contradictions. The reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy are more and more openly proving to be accomplices of their bourgeoisie, so that the masses of their supporters are getting profoundly disturbed. But, above all, it is the reality of socialism on one-sixth of the earth, the steadily growing importance of the Soviet Union in the world, the activity of the government of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, which are helping the Communists master their tasks.

"If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our Party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case."\*\*

It is necessary to show the masses of workers the full greatness, the full importance of the example of the working class of the Soviet Union in the past and in the present. The *knowledge* of this example is the best weapon in the strug-

gle against the propaganda of the bourgeoisie and its reformist camp followers; it is the best weapon for uniting the working class on the basis of faith in its own power, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory over fascism and over capitalism.

The tremendous importance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* consists in the fact that it gives the Communists and other workers the opportunity to acquire this *knowledge*, the knowledge of the conditions of the class struggle, the knowledge of how to master the difficulties of this struggle under the most complicated circumstances, the knowledge of what the prerequisites are for making possible and assuring the advance and victory of the working class, the knowledge of the creative power of the proletariat to mold a new and better world, the world of socialism, the knowledge of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

This knowledge, however, is transmitted in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* on the basis of living experience; it is knowledge that is substantiated by facts and tempered by concrete examples.

We only select a few problems out of the large number dealt with in this book, in order to show its importance for the present.

The teaching on the *importance of theory* for the revolutionary struggle of the working class runs through the entire book. In the period of the establishment of the political party of the Russian working class, Lenin waged a struggle against the "Economists," opportunists who declared that the ideological confusion reigning in the Russian labor movement of the time was "normal" and who called the economic struggle of the workers for higher wages, etc., the chief concern of the workers. Lenin delivered a devastating blow particularly in his famous book *What Is to Be Done?* to this opportunist philosophy. Analyzing this book, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* says, among other things:

\* D. Z. Manuilsky, *The World Communist Movement*, p. 49. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

\*\* Joseph Stalin, *Cited Work*, pp. 62-63.

"Lenin showed that to bow in worship of the spontaneous working class movement and to belittle the importance of consciousness, of socialist consciousness and socialist theory, meant, in the first place, to insult the workers, who were drawn to consciousness as to light; in the second place, to lower the value of theory in the eyes of the Party, that is, to depreciate the instrument which helped the Party to understand the present and foresee the future; and, in the third place, it meant to sink completely and irrevocably into the bog of opportunism.

"Without a revolutionary theory," Lenin said, 'there can be no revolutionary movement. . . . The role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.' (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 47, 48.)

"Lenin showed that the 'Economists' were deceiving the working class when they asserted that a socialist ideology could arise from the spontaneous movement of the working class, for in reality the socialist ideology arises not from the spontaneous movement, but from science. By denying the necessity of imparting a socialist consciousness to the working class, the 'Economists' were clearing the way for bourgeois ideology, facilitating its introduction and dissemination among the working class, and, consequently, they were burying the idea of union between the working class movement and socialism, thus helping the bourgeoisie.

"'All worship of the spontaneity of the labor movement,' Lenin said, 'all belittling of the role of the 'conscious element,' of the role of the party of Social-Democracy, means, altogether irrespective of whether the belittler likes it or not, strengthening the influence of the bourgeois ideology among the workers.' (*Ibid.*, p. 61)."

When, in the period following the defeat of the Russian Revolution of 1905, decadent tendencies also manifested themselves in Russian Social-Democracy and a number of writers undertook to attack the philosophical, theoretical foundations of Marxism, Lenin wrote his

book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* says the following on the importance of this book:

"In order to appreciate the tremendous part played by Lenin's book in the history of our Party and to realize what theoretical treasure Lenin safeguarded from the motley crowd of revisionists and renegades of the period of the Stolypin reaction, we must acquaint ourselves, if only briefly, with the fundamentals of dialectical and historical materialism.

"This is all the more necessary because dialectical and historical materialism constitute the theoretical basis of Communism, the theoretical foundations of the Marxist party, and it is the duty of every active member of our Party to know these principles and hence to study them."\*

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* itself devotes a separate section to a remarkably clear and understandable account of dialectical and historical materialism, that "theoretical foundation of Communism."

Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized that consistent revolutionary practice is impossible without mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is one of the basic tenets of Lenin's teaching that it is the task of the revolutionary party of the working class to bring socialist consciousness to the working class as a prerequisite for uniting the workers for the struggle for socialism.

There are still Communists who take too little note of these teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, who do not work sufficiently themselves to eliminate the gaps in their theoretical knowledge, who excuse this unforgivable shortcoming by repeatedly pointing to their practical activity until one gets tired hearing it. Actually, this insufficient theoretical knowledge is the reason why many Communists often feel lost in complicated situations, are not able to foresee the change in the situation, or recognize it

\* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, International Publishers, New York, pp. 36-37.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 105.

in sufficient time, are incapable of nullifying the propaganda of the enemies.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* shows that the Bolsheviks, Lenin and Stalin, were able to deal with the most difficult and complicated tasks only because they were masters of theory, because they mastered the science of socialism, which was established by Marx and Engels, and enriched it and developed it further in accord with the changed situation, the new experiences and tasks.

Mastery of the theory of Scientific Socialism, concern with questions of theory, work on the scientific solution of the decisive problems of every country, thorough scientific refutation of the hostile propaganda of the bourgeoisie and its reformist supporters—all this the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* shows as the imperative tasks of the Communists.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* further teaches us that the developed, class conscious section of the working class, the Communists, will absolutely succeed in uniting the working class and in repelling and destroying the influence of the bourgeoisie if they know how to carry out a correct policy.

The year 1917 offers a clear example of this. Immediately after the February Revolution, the majority of the workers in Petrograd and Moscow followed the parties that stood for compromise with the bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, although the Bolsheviks were the leaders of the direct struggle of the masses on the streets.

In the brief span of eight months, the Bolsheviks, under Lenin's leadership, armed with Scientific Socialism, prepared by their entire previous history, tempered by revolutionary struggles and illegality, succeeded in winning the majority of the working class.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* says concerning this:

"On the basis of the decisions of the April Conference, the Party developed extensive activities in order to win over

the masses, and to train and organize them for battle. The Party line in that period was, by patiently explaining the Bolshevik policy and exposing the compromising policy of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, to isolate these parties from the masses and to win a majority in the Soviets."

"In addition to the work in the Soviets, the Bolsheviks carried on extensive activities in the trade unions and in the factory committees.

"Particularly extensive was the work of the Bolsheviks in the army. . . .

"Thanks to Bolshevik propaganda and agitation, already in the early months of the revolution the workers in many cities held new elections to the Soviets, especially to the district Soviets, drove out the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries and elected followers of the Bolshevik Party in their stead."\*

The central slogan of the Bolsheviks in this period was "All Power to the Soviets!" After the peaceful demonstration of the Petrograd workers and soldiers was smashed in July, counter-revolution took the offensive against the working class.

"In view of the changed situation," the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* writes, "the Bolshevik Party decided to change its tactics. It went underground, arranged for a safe hiding place for its leader, Lenin, and began to prepare for an uprising with the object of overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie by force of arms and setting up the power of the Soviets.

"The peaceful period of the revolution has ended," said Comrade Stalin, "a non-peaceful period has begun, a period of clashes and explosions." (Lenin and Stalin, *Russian Revolution*, pp. 139-140.)\*\*\*

In August an entirely new situation arose again. General Kornilov openly organized a plot against the revolution, so that, together with all counter-revolutionary forces, he could abolish the Soviets and disarm the workers.

Under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, there arose the united front of the work-

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 191-92.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 197.



ers against counter-revolution; under their leadership the workers and soldiers smashed the Kornilov putsch.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* says concerning this:

"In those days the mortally terrified Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders, Kerensky among them, turned for protection to the Bolsheviks, for they were convinced that the Bolsheviks were the only effective force in the capital that was capable of routing Kornilov.

"But while mobilizing the masses to crush the Kornilov revolt, the Bolsheviks did not discontinue their struggle against the Kerensky government. They exposed the government of Kerensky, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries to the masses, pointing out that their whole policy was in effect assisting Kornilov's counter-revolutionary plot."\*

In these struggles, the Bolshevik Party had grown to be the decisive force in the Revolution. At the same time, the crushing of Kornilov's putsch had shown the tremendous power of the Soviets. The Bolsheviks won consecutively the majority in the Soviets in all the decisive centers of the country.

By the end of October, 1917, the Bolsheviks were already in a position to lead the working class to a victorious uprising, to the conquest of power.

By their bold and incisive struggle, the Bolsheviks won the leadership of the working class and by means of this the working class of Russia won the leadership of the Russian people, realized the alliance of the workers and the peasants.

This experience of the Russian proletariat gives the working class of all countries the certainty that it can win the leadership of the people, that it can realize the alliance with the peasantry, when it frees itself of all ties with the bourgeoisie and resolutely defends its own cause as the cause of the entire people. How to conduct independent politics of the working class under all conditions, how rapidly to reorientate in every new situation, how to combine unswerving firmness with the greatest

tactical flexibility—this can and must be learned by all Communists from the history of the Bolsheviks.

The experiences of the Russian labor movement, of the revolutions and especially of the year 1917, show that the working class can emancipate itself from bourgeois influence and conquer power only when it is led by a party "free from opportunism, irreconcilable towards compromisers and capitulators, and revolutionary in its attitude towards the bourgeoisie and its state power."\*

Such a party was created by Lenin who, from the changed conditions—imperialism, the period of the proletarian revolution—drew the conclusions for the organization, the structure and the contents of the politics of the organized vanguard of the working class, the revolutionary party of the proletariat.

Only the *revolutionary working class party of a new type*, molded and educated by Lenin in a persistent, stubborn and consistent struggle against opportunism and against all conciliators, was capable of winning the confidence of the working class, of uniting them, of infusing them with the consciousness of their power and historical tasks, of leading them to the victory of the proletarian revolution.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* gives a graphic picture of the *creative power of the working class*, of being able to overcome all difficulties *after the conquest of power*, provided that it is headed by a party fully devoted to the working class, most intimately bound up with it, and armed with the weapon of Marxism-Leninism. It was relatively easy for the Russian working class to conquer power, as Comrade Stalin said; but it was hard for it to ensure its power and to build up socialism. The Soviet Union was the first country to take the unknown road of the realization of socialism. Up to this day it has remained the only country in which socialism has been realized; it was compelled, therefore, to build up socialism without any model to follow and in the midst of a hostile capitalist world. When

\* *Ibid.*, p. 201.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 353.

the Russian working class conquered power, the backward country was exhausted and disorganized by the war. Counter-revolution and the capitalist interventionists tried to utilize these circumstances to stifle the young Soviet republic. But, led by the Bolshevik Party, the working class, in alliance with the masses of toiling peasants and the peoples formerly oppressed by tsarism, defeated the armies of counter-revolution and the interventionists, drove them out of the country or destroyed them, despite a lack of arms, despite a lack of clothes and shoes, despite hunger and disease.

Under the farseeing and bold leadership of the Bolsheviks headed by Lenin and Stalin, the working class overcame all difficulties in the reconstruction of the country and the construction of socialism. Under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Stalin, the working class of the Soviet Union registered the world historic accomplishment of completely abolishing the exploitation of man by man, of realizing socialist society.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that the people cannot get along without capitalists and landlords, without merchants and kulaks. The working class of our country has proved in practice that the people can get along without exploiters perfectly well.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that, having destroyed the old bourgeois system, the working class is incapable of building anything new to replace the old. The working class of our country has proved in practice that it is quite capable not only of destroying the old system but of building a new and better system, a socialist system, a system, moreover, to which crises and unemployment are unknown.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that the peasantry is incapable of taking the path of socialism. The collective farm peasants of our country have proved in practice that they can do so quite successfully." \*

Socialism, which has been realized in the Soviet Union, has already shown its

superiority over capitalism. The superiority of socialism over capitalism is shown especially in the speed of the rate of growth never seen in any period of capitalism. Industrial production in the Soviet Union has increased ninefold over 1913; during this same period, the industry of the most important capitalist countries stagnated, topping the pre-war level only by a few per cent. The stormy advance of the Soviet Union took place at the very time that the capitalist world was profoundly shaken by crises which brought down frightful suffering and misfortune on the workers and peasants.

The superiority of socialism over capitalism is further shown in the fact that it sets into motion the creative activity of the entire population, the workers, peasants and working intellectuals, and involves the millions of the population in direct participation in all the problems and tasks of the state and economy. A democratic life, of which the workers and peasants cannot even dream in the capitalist countries, has developed in the land of socialism. Hand in hand with this living participation of the masses of toilers, with the growth of Soviet patriotism, goes the growth of internationalism, of fraternal solidarity with the working class of the entire world, with all oppressed and exploited, with all victims of imperialism and fascism, with all progressive and revolutionary forces and movements.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* teaches us that only the rule of the working class makes it possible for free nations to live together in peace without any kind of national oppression.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* teaches us, on the basis of dozens of concrete examples, that the rule of the working class signifies a fundamental change in foreign policy in contrast to the foreign policy of capitalist countries. This foreign policy is free from the slightest trace of imperialism. As a result, this foreign policy is completely subordinated to the desire to work for the preservation and assurance of peace among nations.

\* Joseph Stalin, *Cited Work*, p. 62.

What the best and greatest people of all times have demanded and longed for as an ideal of international relations and the realization of which they despaired, in view of the real situation, the Soviet Union has turned into reality.

Thus the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* shows all progressive people in the world that humanity can continue its progress only under the leadership of the working class. The victory of the working class signifies humanity's leap forward to a higher stage of human development.

The reactionary bourgeoisie does not hesitate to hurl humanity back into barbarism, in order to save its rule. But it is calculating without the working class which it cannot destroy without destroying itself. In the end, despite all temporary and partial defeats, progress and not rotten reaction has been victorious throughout history. At the present time, the working class represents the progress of humanity, and for that reason it will be victorious.

At the moment, however, the task is to guarantee this advance and victory of the working class without making additional dozens of millions of people go through the hell of fascism. The task is to thwart the advance of fascism and thereby to prepare its end.

That will succeed if the working class of every country and internationally places itself at the head of this struggle, if it unites for this struggle.

There is no lack of will on the part of the workers; but there is a manifold lack of faith in its own power, confidence in its ability.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* gives the Communists a new and important possibility of inspiring millions with this faith and confidence.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* is primarily a textbook for Communists. It is the duty of the Communists not only to read this book, but to penetrate into its innermost contents in order to master the Marxist-Leninist theory in the spirit formulated in the concluding chapter of the book:

"Mastering the Marxist-Leninist the-

ory does not at all mean learning all its formulas and conclusions by heart and clinging to their every letter. To master the Marxist-Leninist theory we must first of all learn to distinguish between its letter and substance.

"Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory means assimilating *the substance* of this theory and learning to use it in the solution of the practical problems of the revolutionary movement under the varying conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat.

"Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory means being able to enrich this theory with the new experience of the revolutionary movement, with new propositions and conclusions, it means being able to *develop it and advance it* without hesitating to replace—in accordance with the substance of the theory—such of its propositions and conclusions as have become antiquated by new ones corresponding to the new historical situation."\*

Beyond this, this book must be brought to millions of struggling, groping workers, and the Communists must help them to understand the substance of it. It is a marvelous weapon in the struggle for the unity of the workers, for their liberation from bourgeois influences, from the poison of opportunism, of doubt and disbelief.

The Communists will not delay in bringing the contents of this book to progressive, revolutionary peasants. In many respects it is a weapon in the struggle for the realization of the alliance of the workers and peasants.

Large sections of the progressive intellectuals have been aroused by the outrages of fascist barbarism. They are ready to take their place in the struggle against fascism and are looking for their place in this struggle. The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* will help them to free themselves from their vacillations, to find the road to the working class.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)* supplies the proof of the correctness and victoriousness of Marxism-Leninism.

---

\* *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, pp. 355-56.

This book describes the noblest and most consequential chapter in the history of humanity to date. To understand this book means to gain the conviction that the victory of the working class is irresistible. This book strengthens the faith of the workers in their own power, in their ability to be victorious and to build up a new and better world.

It is a decisive task of all Communist Parties at the present time to see to it that their fighting cadres acquire this book, not to rest until this book is understood by its cadres.

The appearance of this book obligates

them to examine and reshape their propaganda work from top to bottom.

The Communists who are fighting for the united front and the people's front against fascism and against the reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie must not only transmit this book to millions of workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals; they must spare no effort to help them understand it.

The fulfillment of these tasks will help substantially to unite the workers, to strengthen their alliance with the broadest masses of people and to prepare the victory over fascism and capitalism.

### SELF CONFIDENCE

"The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery. For the bourgeoisie knows that if capitalism has not yet been overthrown and still continues to exist, it has not itself to thank, but the fact that the proletariat has still not faith enough in the possibility of its victory. It cannot be said that the efforts of the bourgeoisie in this respect have been altogether unsuccessful. It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and scepticism. If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strength its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our Party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case."—Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 62-63.

---

---

# The Nature of German Fascism

BY F. LANG

**P**SEUDO-SOCIALISTS, conscious and unconscious agents of fascism, have been assembling more and more "arguments" for some time in order to prove that, after all, fascism contains something "progressive," that after all it might become a "starting point for socialism." To meet these "arguments" it is necessary to say something about the origin of fascism and to examine its development even if only in broad outline.

## GERMAN IMPERIALISM AFTER ITS DEFEAT IN THE WAR

German imperialism, which entered the world stage later than other countries, had been set back for decades by its defeat in the war of 1914-18. It lost its colonial possessions; the road to Bagdad was blocked to it; its influence which had been dominant in several countries was pushed back; German industry lost its ore basis in Lorraine and a number of other important sources of raw material; it lost its potash monopoly, and important markets. German capital export dried up; finance capital had to give up important foreign investments and holdings, first of all its holdings in the Rumanian and Galician petroleum industry. From a creditor country, Germany became a debtor country.

According to the assertion of the Italian reparations expert, Mario Alberti, which is quoted by Richard Lewinsohn in his book *The Redistribution of European Wealth*, page 350, the national wealth of Germany declined from \$83,000,000,000 in 1912-13 to \$58,000,000,000 in 1921, hence more than a fourth. According to other estimates, German na-

tional wealth amounted to \$95,000,000,000 before the imperialist World War but only \$60,000,000,000 after the war; the decline thus amounts to more than one-third. But these figures give only a faint idea of the gigantic material losses which Germany suffered as a result of its defeat in the war.

The apparatus of power of German imperialism was seriously weakened. On the basis of the peace treaty, Germany was not permitted to maintain an army based on conscription; it was prohibited from producing certain armament materials; it had to destroy its war material, demolish its fortresses and surrender its navy. This crash of German imperialism was all the more devastating to its bearers and stunned them all the more since the German armies were deep in enemy territory up to the end of the war (France, Belgium, Italy, Russo-Poland, Ukraine) and the imperialist squires had hatched the wildest "war aims" and lulled themselves with the most fantastic illusions. As late as June, 1918—five months before the collapse—Arz, the chief of the Austrian general staff, transmitted to the Austrian Foreign Minister Burian a report of the commander of the eastern army, Infantry General Alfred Krauss, on the far-reaching plans of German imperialism. It states among other things:

"The Germans are pursuing a definite economic-political objective in the Ukraine [which they occupied at the time—*F.L.*]. They want . . . permanent possession of the surest road to Mesopotamia and Arabia, to Baku and Persia which their occupation of the Ukraine

has put into their hands. . . . For this purpose, the Germans . . . intend to keep the Crimea in one way or another. . . . They will never entirely relinquish the valuable Crimean peninsula. . . .”\*

All these robber dreams were upset by the debacle of the war. The German big bourgeoisie had made 10,000,000,000 gold marks from war supplies—according to Lewinsohn, in the work quoted above; with the end of the war, this source of tremendous profits was cut off. Formerly, however, the ruling class could not think of squeezing more profits out of the proletariat than the “normal” degree of exploitation; on the contrary, it had to make considerable concessions to the advancing proletariat. The devastating consequences of the war unleashed by the big bourgeoisie, the tremendous sacrifices of human life, the results of the defeat for which the ruling class was responsible and which had a deep and incisive effect on the life of the entire German people, compromised the ruling class in the eyes of the broadest masses.

Despite serious temporary setbacks, the working class, which was under the inspiring influence of the great October Revolution, was on the march. Since the ruling class was not in a position to offer new opportunities for advancement to the urban middle classes and the peasantry who formerly had constituted their surest support, this following began to break away from it as indicated by the votes cast for the Socialist parties in the post-war period. The masses saw themselves hurled into the abyss by their one-time lords and masters and lost their confidence in the omnipotence and invincibility of the capitalist regime.

But German imperialism which had been undermined and had become somewhat anemic, did not become any milder, or more peaceful and conciliatory as the result of the weaknesses briefly sketched above. On the contrary, this inner corrosion *only increased its aggressiveness*; its urge for expansion only assumed

more excessive forms. The very defeat gave German imperialism new sustenance and new resources. The loss of important sources of raw material and markets drove German heavy industry to “come closer together.” The post-war period in Germany is characterized by a tremendous concentration and trustification of industry, by its even greater fusion with bank capital, by its even greater “reliance” on the state whose resources flowed into the bottomless pockets of the big industrialists, finance magnates and Junkers under every possible heading.

This development drove the inner contradictions of German imperialism more and more to a head. Cartelization and trustification completed the *monopoly character* of Germany economy to an ever greater extent. In other words, the very catastrophic outcome of the war for the German big bourgeoisie broadened the *foundation* of German imperialism—the monopolies; but its range of action was extremely narrowed down. German imperialism was like a locomotive under full steam, but unable to move from the spot because the tracks were obstructed. The world was divided up, but the German bourgeoisie had been passed up in the course of it.

The aggressiveness of German monopoly capital which had no outlet, no valve, drove inward. German imperialism picked Germany to the bone. During inflation, its maw swallowed up almost the entire savings of the people. The bondholders whose wealth at the time was estimated at about five billion gold marks, the homeowners, the smaller and middle capitalists were expropriated. The big sharks began to swallow one another in a bitter competitive struggle waged with the most unscrupulous means; big concerns, as, for example, the Stinnes concern, the Michail concern, collapsed. From time to time the inner tensions of German finance capital were released in tremendous explosions (inflation, deflation, economic crises), but this did not clear the atmosphere.

The German finance and industrial oligarchy were in possession of an enor-

---

\* *The German Occupation of the Ukraine, Secret Documents*, p. 79.

mous abundance of resources of economic power. It had accumulated tremendous riches and mammoth wealth in its hands and yet it marked time, since, as a result of Germany's changed position in the world, it found no opportunities for expansion.

If then, the ruling class of Germany was compelled temporarily to furl its tattered imperialist banner and to shelve its dreams of conquest because of the strong pressure of the victorious powers, it had to give up certain positions in Germany itself in order to save its main positions. It was compelled "to face the facts of reality." A leading organ of the ruling class, *Deutsche Führer Briefe*, told tales out of school in September, 1932, when it wrote:

"The problem of consolidating bourgeois post-war Germany is characterized by the fact that the leading bourgeoisie is too scattered to find the power within itself. Therefore . . . it must form alliances with social strata alien to it but which do it the enormous service of basing its regime on the masses. During the first period of consolidation at the end of the war, Social-Democracy was this pillar of the bourgeois regime." (Retranslated from the French, quoted by Dzelepy, *The True "Mein Kampf" of Hitler*, p. 177.)

However, the ruling class did not get this "pillar" "for nothing." For the "service" rendered, it had to make certain "sacrifices" and turn over many state posts which were formerly the domain of Prussian Junkers and loyal trusted lackies of the big capitalists. Social-Democrats, democrats, "liberals" became police chiefs and judges, and moved up to higher positions in the state. The bourgeoisie had to tack and maneuver. The trade unions became a big power and the large manufacturers were compelled to accept certain restrictions on their omnipotence; the bourgeoisie had to practise a certain amount of moderation. But in this, the monopolistic big bourgeoisie became involved in conflicts and contradictions inside of Germany; the inner conflicts and tensions increased. Although the momentary interests of the

capitalist class were restricted, although the immediate goal was achieved and they succeeded in "weathering the storm," nevertheless, it could not and would not permanently reconcile itself to such a situation. The anonymous handful of all-powerful finance magnates, heavy industrialists, nobles and large landowners were not satisfied to remain permanently in a position in which they were not "masters in their own house," to have to make concessions to the masses, not to have their own sufficient mass basis on which they could proceed to demolish the Versailles Treaty and fructify and reawaken German imperialism.

This twofold contradictory situation—no mass basis of their own at home and no possibility for expansion abroad—could not be solved by "normal" methods; it strove for a violent way out. Trust capital, bared to the bone, strove to create a broad mass basis for itself, to reestablish its unrestricted power, to equip an apparatus of force, to wrench the organizations of the masses out of their hands, to subject the people to its direct command, to force it to subordinate its own interests to the interests of the imperialists, in short, to demolish democracy so that—after resolving the inner contradiction—it could proceed to the solution of the external contradiction, to conquer "new room," new territories and spheres for an imperialism "without room."

Since, as a result of its split, as a result of the collaboration of Social-Democracy—which was followed by the majority of the proletariat—with the bourgeoisie, as a result of the absence of a Bolshevik mass party, the German working class did not succeed in establishing a consistent democratic republic and in shifting the burdens of Versailles to the shoulders of the capitalist class, the ruling class was able to rally its forces, to carry out its offensive against the masses of the people, to defeat the proletariat and to force the German people to make the most frightful sacrifices to the expansionist endeavors of German imperialism.

## HITLER FASCISM

The defeat in the war likewise supplied the bourgeoisie with the means of solving the crisis from the imperialist point of view.

After the war was lost, there was that social formation on the inner German "market" which was as if made for the job of becoming the mass bearer, the pioneer, of the German imperialist drive for conquest, the grave-digger of democracy, the inciter and instigator of imperialist robber wars. It was this social formation which, gathered in the National-Socialist movement, created the mass basis for the big bourgeoisie and produced the cadres which destroyed the organizations of the proletariat and wrenched away from it the means of defending itself against the blows of the ruling class.

Tens of thousands of officers and subordinate officers who had made brilliant careers during the four years of war and expected an even more brilliant future from victory; tens of thousands who as a result of demobilization had lost their calling; tens of thousands of the scions of Prussian Junkers and impoverished nobles, the progeny of long-established official families who had belonged to the upper state bureaucracy for generations and now suddenly found the approaches to offices and positions closed and, of all things, because they were occupied by elements on whom they had always looked with the greatest contempt (later they were dubbed "party-book officials"); the entrepreneurs who had fallen under the wheels as a result of the merciless competition of the big capitalists, a competition which in a Germany that had grown smaller had become more bitter; in short, the entire ruling class baggage whose hopes had been dissipated. They were the ones who planted the flag of imperialism, raged against democracy and socialism and became the pillars of fascism. This was a social formation which had always belonged to the ruling class, had always constituted its apparatus of force, had supplied its administrative cadres, which

was always on the side of the bourgeoisie.

This was the social formation which had carried on a "war on its own hook" in upper Silesia and in the Baltic. This social stratum perpetrated assassinations "against any one," as a fascist hackwriter expressed it. It was this stratum that formed the free-booters, that organized murders and supplied hall battles and broke up workers' meetings. Friedrich Wilhelm Heinz describes the composition of these free-booters as follows:

"These free-booters were composed of the most diverse elements: Officers and cadres . . . naval contingents . . . colonists from Baden and Franconia who wanted to win a new home for themselves, frontier Germans driven off their plot of land, farm hands looking for adventure, workers and soldiers . . . who used to like to see their locks fly from under their steel helmets, but also the scum from the big cities, looters and degenerate hangers-in who . . . hoped for plunder and an easy life. They included the bearers of old noble names from Baltic families."

These few lines paint a striking picture of that stratum which, after the unhappy outcome of the war, became the spokesmen of the imperialist drive for conquest and expansion. The collapse of their expectations, the sinking of their hopes, the disappointment at the loss of their booty, made them the most aggressive bearers of the conquest-mania of the big bourgeoisie.

Study the life course of the fascist "big men" more closely and you will invariably hit upon the closest connection between them and the ruling class. Indeed, large sections of this stratum were already declassed, uprooted, but this very circumstance made them so indispensable, so invaluable, to the ruling class. These shattered existences, clinging to the bourgeoisie with every fibre of their being, giving expression to its aspirations, did not have to impose any restraints on themselves. The large owners, aggressive and rapacious, constantly had to take into consideration the given situation, had to conceal their real feel-



ings, could often speak only by intimations and allusions. These wrecks, aggressive and rapacious, eager to make themselves felt, eager for power, eager for "income without effort," could speak up frankly, could hatch plans which, in case they failed, could be presented as the chimera of "irresponsibles"; they could fabricate plots, commit murders and perpetrate assassinations without the bourgeoisie being directly involved in them.

The experts representing the bourgeoisie immediately after the end of the war did not dare to demand the dissolution of the trade unions and all parties, the destruction of democratic institutions, the abolition of all personal liberties, the complete enslavement of the masses of people. The "irresponsibles" could do it at any time.

The "honorable" possessing class let itself be represented by a Stresemann or a "democratically" draped Schacht who defended its imperialist aims with care and moderation; but the vagabonds, the political foreign-legionnaires could cause trouble at all times, could proclaim to the whole world the slogan of "Greater Germany," the demand for colonies, the settling of accounts with France. These elements were the very thing for the ruling class.

But this social formation, the flotsam of German imperialism, was of especial value to monopoly capital for another reason also. Because although it was of the flesh and blood of the bourgeoisie, although it manifested its wishes, embodied its urge for conquest, nevertheless, as a result of its momentarily precarious situation, it could pretend "proximity to the people," it could deceive by a false show of "national passion" and "sorrow over the miserable condition of Germany." The masses of the German people would never have believed that a Krupp was concerned about the "fate" of Germany; his lamentations would easily have been seen through. The masses would easily have recognized that a cannon manufacturer wails because he can manufacture no cannon, can produce no armaments, and can

pocket no huge profits. But any old anonymous degraded hiringling of this same Krupp could shed crocodile tears over Germany's "poverty" without running the danger of being exposed. The more debauched, dissipated and depraved such a "national hero" was, the more prospect he had of stirring up declassed masses. A Ludendorff could not create for German trust capital that mass basis which it needed to carry through its plans in Germany proper and in the world arena; but emissaries of the defeated army, like the author of *Mein Kampf* who himself admits that he received a military commission to spy on the "German Labor Party" of which he became a member, declassed soldiers like Goering and Roehm, anonymous riffraff from Egypt and Argentina, brutish individuals from the White Guard hang-out—they could become the standard-bearers of imperialist aggressiveness, of the enslavement of Germany.

It is no accident that the "most prominent leaders" of the Hitler party are almost all political foundlings. It is no accident that at the head of this party figures were washed up from the sewers, from the dregs of capitalist society. Only with such leadership material could the German big bourgeoisie, bankrupt, "fallen," staggering from crisis to crisis, rotted away, compromised up to the hilt, set up a party of the most gigantic mass deception, of the most unbridled mania for imperialist conquest.

The German imperialist big bourgeoisie, greedy, defeated on the battlefields, ready for any act of violence, found in this social formation that prop which by force of its declassed character, by force of its degeneracy, became the merciless champion of the imperialist aspirations of the ruling class.

Closely related from a class angle, and from its entire position and "attitude," to finance capital, to the army, to the large landowners, this social formation, by its momentary *material* situation, was fitted "to go to the people" and to infect broad masses with the chauvinist poison which imperialism requires. This social formation was all the

more fit for it, since, having nothing to lose and yet always conscious of being a part of the ruling class, it could direct unrestrained attacks even against the bourgeoisie whose "practical politics" was not to its taste. If the bourgeoisie was compelled to make concessions, to retreat, temporarily to conduct "a policy of accomplishment," to base itself on Social-Democracy, to sing a "pacifist" tune and not to "recognize fascists on the street," then this anonymous bearer of aggressive but restrained imperialism could allow itself publicly to pillory this opportunism of the ruling class, to "fight against" it and in this way utilize the "anti-capitalist sentiments" of the broadest masses.

"It [that is, fascism—*F.L.*] impresses these masses," Comrade Dimitroff said at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, "by the severity of its attacks on the bourgeois government and its irreconcilable attitude to the old bourgeois parties."\*

This unrestraint of the fascists, the expression and outgrowth of their de-classed character, deceived not a few people who thought they saw a really anti-capitalist factor in this social formation which had been formed under special conditions, which had crystallized out of a bourgeoisie standing in the midst of the profoundest crisis. This unrestraint of its attacks against the "moderate" "practical political" thinking and acting wing of the bourgeoisie reflects a certain self-sufficiency of this new kind of social formation that is peculiar to every social formation. But it has nothing in common with socialism.

Monopoly capital, especially the monopoly capital of post-war Germany, frequently comes into conflict with various capitalist groups, with "outsiders" who will not fully submit to its dictates. Within the ruling class, the struggle rages for the distribution of the booty squeezed out of the toilers. By force of

its special position in society, the fascist formation is best suited to give expression to the imperialist aspirations of the most aggressive wing of finance capital, whereby it often calls down upon itself the ill will of other groups and strata of the bourgeoisie. If this social formation gets into the government, then it adopts measures from time to time which even hurt the interests of part of the bourgeoisie. It adopts decisions which are useful exclusively to the financial oligarchs, which favor them in the competitive struggle. These interventions have nothing whatever to do with socialism, even when they touch the "spheres of influence" of certain sections of the ruling class, for these interventions occur exclusively in the interest of *imperialism*, the policy of robbery and conquest.

This new social formation which in the course of the German crisis, the general crisis of capitalism, is constantly being filled up with new people who have been driven off their course, is plagued by constant unrest. It is no accident that ideologists of fascism speak so much of the "dynamics" of the leader states, of the necessity of "living dangerously," of the "thousand year Reich." The new social formation of the ruling class embodies the inner contradiction of a big bourgeoisie which has come out the loser, which is constantly ravenously hungry for booty, which is all coiled up and ready to spring to recover something from the "satiated." The "years of disgrace" when the finance capitalists of Germany had to give up their "place in the sun," that is, when they had to forego the plundering of foreign peoples, have been indelibly engraved on their consciousness. The bitter memories of this increase their greed, unleash their avarice, strengthen their rapacity—even if it is only in the form of "Aryanizing," that is, stealing a Jewish business to the greater honor of the "noble" Nordic race. But in the hour of "great" decisions, these bitter memories always frighten them back, make them uncertain and throw them into doubt. That is also the reason why, under fascist rule, Germany is dominated by a constant latent

---

\* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, p. 14. International Publishers, New York.

conflict, constant inner tensions and frictions.

After taking over the government, a very profound process of regrouping began in the camp of fascism which found its visible expression in the mass murder of June 30, 1934. The rebellious petty bourgeois, the declassed elements with an anti-bourgeois orientation, were repelled, partly murdered, partly put off with subordinate posts and transformed into docile praetorians. The heads of the Hitler party, on the other hand, fused completely with monopoly capital, were accepted in the ranks of the big bourgeoisie; and today, with their blocks of shares and their directorships, with the banks and enterprises directed by them, with their sumptuous homes and luxurious automobiles, they belong to the innermost circle of the ruling big capitalists.

The fascist social formation of German imperialism would not have been able to reach its goal if the national question in Germany had not been particularly acute and had not been sharpened still more by the Versailles Treaty.

The task of the democratic circles on the national question, especially after defeat in the war, consisted in breaking the power of the Prussian Junkers, in liquidating the survivals of feudalism whose intertwining with imperialism resulted in making the situation especially acute, in expropriating the large landowners and princes and distributing their vast lands among the land-hungry peasants and land workers. The task consisted in democratizing the public institutions, the entire public and state life from top to bottom, in promoting the independent life of the states and putting them on their feet, in finding and destroying the nests of counter-revolution, in dissolving the free-booting corps, in dispersing the conventicle of the reactionary conspirators and putschists. The task consisted in attaching Prussia to Germany and not, vice versa, Germany to Prussia. Such a democratic Germany which would have destroyed root and branch in its own home this evil spirit of Potsdam, the symbol of Prus-

sian militarism, which is a thousand times more barbaric, brutal and savage than Versailles, would have been able to achieve the liquidation of the Versailles Treaty in peaceful agreement with the peoples of the victorious powers and based upon a firm alliance with the land of socialism, the Soviet Union.

Not to have taken this road of the democratic solution of Germany's national question and of the question of the Versailles Treaty is the greatest historical offense of German Social-Democracy which took refuge under the wings of the East-Elbian Junkers, the White officers and the finance magnates right in November, 1918, as well as of the German bourgeoisie which once more showed that it becomes impotent in face of the Prussian lords.

Since the national question was not solved democratically, the fascists, misusing the "injured feelings" of the masses for their national aims, were able to transform them into a driving force of German imperialism. Since Versailles was not disposed of democratically, the fascists could transform the struggle against Versailles into a struggle for Potsdam, that is, for "Greater German" imperialism. The social formation which was gathered in the fascist movement and which had lost the ground from under its feet with defeat in the war, could identify its fate, the fate of German imperialism defeated on the battlefields with the fate of the German nation, could set itself up as the defender of the national interests of Germany and sweep broad masses along with it. These stranded existences which have nothing in common with the German people, with its great culture, with its historical, intellectual struggles, with its literature, with its language, could now appear as the great "national heroes" and condemn everyone who did not defend the same imperialist aims as themselves. It was this very declassed character, a declassed character which, as we have seen, tied it up most closely with the ruling peak of the big bourgeoisie, that made it the "suitable" organ and instrument of the German monopoly capitalists, of

German imperialism. They did not have to pay any attention to the real national interests of Germany if only they served imperialism.

German monopoly capital has drawn the enormous advantage of considerably strengthening its economic positions in Germany from the very defeat in the war. The cartelization and trustification of industry, the formation of tremendous monopoly combines, the concentration of wealth in the hands of a thin layer of big capitalists, the intertwining of industry with finance capital and the state apparatus made gigantic progress. But trust capital met inner and outer political barriers. The contradictions sharpened and drove toward a violent solution. At the same time, the defeat in the war supplied German imperialism with that social formation which because of its whole situation was fitted to become its

mass bearer, its merciless spokesman and defender. This social formation gathered in the fascist movement, in the Nazi party. Fascism is the flesh and blood *embodiment of German imperialism* and, indeed, of an imperialism which not only has to make up for its fourteen-year "standstill" but must shoot far beyond its original starting point and which must drive forward at a rapid tempo. Hence its aggressiveness which is always loaded with explosives, its insatiable rapacity.

[*A second article will undertake to show the mechanism of the fascist system, its domestic and foreign policy conducted exclusively in the interest of monopoly capital, and to illuminate those "arguments" with which the secret agents of fascism attempt to prove its "progressive" and quasi-"socialist" character.*]

---

---

# The Generation of Suffering and Struggle

BY MICHAL WOLF

FROM childhood on, the present young generation in the capitalist countries has travelled a road of suffering and the greatest privation. Born during the frightful starvation years of the imperialist World War of 1914-18, this generation grew up amidst wretchedness and the greatest poverty. Their fathers and brothers languished and bled in the trenches, their mothers were forced to maintain their children and themselves on scanty war aid. At that time, there was a lack of bread, milk, meat and butter. There was a lack of everything necessary for the physical development of the child. The effects of the imperialist World War on the health of the present young generation and especially on the working youth, were devastating. Tuberculosis, rickets, rheumatism, foot and other diseases raged and still rage among a large part of this generation. Physical weaknesses and unstrung nerves are evidences that this youth was born and grew up in the period of the first imperialist World War. Already in childhood, this youth was a victim of the war and, even today, millions bear the consequences of the imperialist war of 1914-18.

This generation grew up with the flaming hope for a brighter future. "When we grow up, we'll certainly be better off than our fathers and mothers." On this hope, the youth built their plans for the future. To shape the world anew, to win a secure place in life through creative work and to live in peace as free people—these were and still are today the ideals and plans for the future formed in childhood by this youth but demolished by reality. A large part of

the war and post-war generations had scarcely left school and taken the first steps in life when the first world economic crisis broke out. The plans for the future of hundreds and thousands and millions of youngsters were wiped out at a single blow by this crisis.

Many of them remained without a trade. Many of them had to give up their desire for future study. Millions of them without any support were unemployed and had to undergo a life full of torment and privation. Hundreds of thousands were robbed of the possibility to marry and establish a family. Joy and entertainment were rare visitors in the life of this youth during the crisis years. The war and post-war generation grew up under the hard blows of capitalism and partly under the lash of fascist dictatorship. After a few years of depression and a certain economic revival, this same generation *is being dragged into the vortex of a new economic crisis of capitalism and a new imperialist war.* Even greater privation, unemployment and uncertainty of the morrow await the youth in the capitalist countries. The second imperialist war, which in Europe has been started by German and Italian fascism and in the Far-East by the Japanese fascist military clique, threatens to destroy the lives of millions of young people.

## THE NEW ECONOMIC CRISIS

This generation which has already undergone so much suffering and privation is now confronted by two great enemies: *the imperialist war which has already begun and the new economic crisis.* What the new economic crisis will

bring to the youth is shown quite clearly by the terrible condition of the American youth. There are 4,300,000 unemployed youth in this land of most highly developed capitalism. In addition, there are 1,500,000 part-time workers. Altogether six million young people constituting 31 per cent of the entire employable youth are totally or partly unemployed in America. In New York alone there are 375,000 youth out of school who are able and willing to work but who have no possibility of finding a job. More than a third of these 375,000 youth never had a paid job that lasted more than a week. These figures cast a glaring light on the condition of the American youth and show unmistakably what the further development of the crisis will mean to the youth.

In England, the birthplace of capitalism, unemployment among the youth is growing extremely fast. In February, 1938, there were already *more than half a million unemployed youth* up to thirty years of age, almost half being young girls. Nearly 20,000 young boys and girls from the ages of 18 to 25 have been without work from one to five years. Many of them have never worked at all.

"The present crisis," as Comrade Stalin said in his historic report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.-(B.), "will be harder and more difficult to combat than the preceding crisis." That means that the economic condition of the youth in the capitalist countries will undergo a further serious worsening in the immediate future.

As in the years of the world economic crisis of 1929-33, hundreds of thousands and millions of unemployed youth will once more have to wander through the streets in the cities of the capitalist countries.

The profound tragedy which the youth underwent in these years threatens to be repeated on an even greater scale.

#### UNDER THE YOKE OF FASCISM

What is the condition of this generation in countries of fascist dictatorship?

The murdered and crippled Italian,

German and Japanese youth on the battlefields of Ethiopia, Spain, Albania and China offer an adequate reply to this question. A part of this generation *has already become a victim of the second imperialist world war* being waged by the fascist gentlemen of the so-called Berlin, Rome, Tokyo axis.

The fascist Hitler dictatorship has literally turned the youth into slaves of the big capitalists and big landowners. Tens of thousands of youth are being driven out of the cities, torn from their parents and chased into the country to perform serf labor. They must do the hardest jobs for the Junkers as servants and maids. They are not allowed to leave their "place of work" and must work for years under the most difficult conditions at the place of work assigned to them. The German youth is a youth without any rights at all. They cannot turn to anyone to register a complaint. If they complain, they can expect, not aid, but prison, the concentration camp or loss of their job. Tens of thousands of young girls are compelled to "learn housekeeping" without pay in the homes of the big bourgeoisie, that is, to work sixteen to eighteen hours a day as maids without pay. Ten to fourteen hours of work in the factories and, after work, drill in the barracks of the Hitler youth—that is the "life" of German youth day in and day out. The German youth cannot shape their lives according to their own free will. They are not master of themselves. At every step, they are prisoners of the fascist regime.

In fascist Germany, the youth lack the necessary means of subsistence for growing into healthy people. And that is not surprising for there the dominant principle is: cannon instead of butter. Meat, milk and eggs are unknown concepts to the German youth. This situation is ruining the health of the German youth. Thirty-six per cent of the German youth have flat feet, 46 per cent of the working and school-age youth have decayed teeth; according to a medical investigation, a third of the German working youth is not fully capacitated and suffers from various illnesses. More than 25 per cent

of all those called up for military service had to be rejected as unfit by the Military Commission. Thirty-four per cent out of 36,000 youth in highly industrialized Western Germany is undernourished.

Present-day youth is growing up *in the period of the decline and decay of capitalism*. Unlike its period of bloom, capitalism is no longer able to allow the same free development of industry, technique, culture and education. Particularly, the reactionary part of the bourgeoisie fears a further development of culture and education because this leads to a further strengthening of the working class and to raising the cultural level of the people. For this reason, the most reactionary part of the bourgeoisie retards this development. The capitalist social order has become an obstacle to the further development of technique, culture, science and human progress. This is expressed most clearly in those capitalist countries where the rule of the most reactionary bourgeoisie exist in the form of fascist dictatorships.

One of the most important principles of fascism is: "The lower the education and cultural level of the working class and people, the greater are our chances of maintaining power." Above all, fascism attempts to reduce the cultural level of the youth to the lowest stage. That is no accident! Fascism which is driving to imperialist war knows that a culturally highly developed youth will not follow its predatory policy. For that reason, it attempts to maim the young generation spiritually. The fascist dictators do not shrink from saying that the spiritual mutilation of the youth is "necessary." The Reichstag incendiary, Goering, declared the following on this question at the last Congress: "I must say that it seems to me that whoever thinks a lot, reads a lot, thinks a lot of his cleverness, is also most irresolute." This Goeringian explanation shows most clearly that fascism confronts the science and culture created by humanity in the course of many centuries only as a destroyer. This Goeringian attitude toward culture is the

standard for the "education" of the youth in fascist Germany.

The effects of the practical application of this Goeringian boorishness are devastating to the education of the German youth. At one time, German youth led many others in education and culture. The German working class and the German people who have worked enthusiastically at further developing technique, culture and science were proud of their off-spring. But in fascist Germany today, a semi-illiterate youth is growing up. Even the fascists are compelled to admit this openly.

According to data of the central organ of the Hitler youth *Das Junge Deutschland*, the entrance examinations of apprentices for the Commercial School at Cottbus, gave the following devastating results: In *mathematics*, 58 per cent; in the *German language* 37 per cent of all those examined were marked unsatisfactory. In the city of Rostok, 25 per cent *failed* in the German language and 36.7 per cent in mathematics.

However, one must bear in mind in this connection, that in the commercial field, a certain previous selection takes place. It must therefore be assumed, without exaggeration, that the figures cited only mildly express the intellectual mutilation of the German youth by fascism. This frightening lack of education of the German youth is due to the fact that fascism has driven out the elite of the German teachers and professors and has replaced them by brutalized S.A. storm leaders who are distinguished as murderers of German workers. Today, these wild animals in human form are running the German schools and universities as "teachers."

Fascism, which tries to undermine every force of human development by the most brutal means, *also destroys the intellectual replenishing forces of the people*. In 1914, there were 72,000 students in Germany and in 1931, there were 160,000. Today, in fascist Germany, there are all told not more than 60,000 students. These figures cry out to the heavens. They tell us that in the matter of replenishing the intellectual forces,

fascism has thrown Germany far behind the pre-war period. Fascism gives thousands and tens of thousands of young people no possibility of acquiring a higher education in order to become an engineer, a doctor, a teacher or a professor.

The intellectual replenishment of the German people is dying out under the regime of the fascist dictatorship. That this is so is also indicated by the wretched state of the once world-famous technical higher school in Munich whose attendance has dropped from 6,000 to 1,500. Simultaneously with the intellectual mutilation of the youth, fascism is also producing a moral disintegration of the German youth. It kills the most human and decent feelings in the heart of the youth, their urge to marry and establish a family. And that is not surprising because in the staff of Hitler youth, only he is a "real fellow" who can brag about the most affairs and seductions of women. Moral crimes among the youth have risen more than 400 per cent from 1933 to 1937. This percentage also is only a very mild expression of the moral disintegration of the German youth by Hitler fascism. The moral crimes committed by the Hitler youth leaders are innumerable but the officials close their eyes to them. Fascism tears the sons and daughters away from the protection of the parental home. The sole right to education of the German youth is assumed by the brutalized and morally degenerate leaders from the staff of the Hitler youth. It is easy to understand that under such conditions, criminal offenses are also rampant among the German youth.

The youth in fascist Italy is in a similar sorrowful condition. One of the chief worries of Italian fascism consists in keeping the youth away, with an iron hand, from everything that has any connection with culture. Mussolini's paper *Popolo D'Italia* even dealt with this question in a lengthy article entitled "The Harmfulness of Culture for the Fascist Youth." This paper of Mussolini forbids the spread of culture among the youth as an extraordinary great danger because the youth would begin to have

doubts on many questions and would lose their faith in the fascist verities.

Culture also arouses dissatisfaction, says the writer of the article in *Popolo D'Italia*, extends the range of vision and strengthens the critical sense of the youth. "In a word," the article concludes, "culture is a thing which brings the youth closer to the enemy. One thing is certain, a soldier should not be a scholar." In Germany as well as in Italy, fascism educates the youth in the spirit of disregard for science as well as generally for the books and works of the greatest scholars of humanity. Do not read and study, but march! This is everywhere the motto of fascism for the youth.

Today a similar slave life and intellectual and moral mutilation also threaten the youth of other countries which the German and Italian aggressors are attempting to subjugate. The Austrian and Czech youth already feel on their own bodies the frightful effect of the subjugation of their countries by German fascism. Just as, at one time, in the period of barbarism, the victors dragged the conquered people to their countries and sold them, so today thousands and tens of thousands of Austrian and Czech youth are being dragged off to slave labor in the Third Reich. They are forced to work at starvation wages on the construction of fortifications, on the draining of swamps and the construction of highways or are turned over as serfs to the German Junkers.

There are "politicians" in the bourgeois camp and in the leadership of the Second International who still do not understand why the present young generation is assailing fascism and is more and more uniting its forces against it.

We may reply to these gentlemen: Just ponder a little over the Golgotha Road of the war and post-war generation, ponder a little on how fascism, where it is in power, has mutilated and subjugated the youth. It is not surprising that this generation is listening less and less to your advice and, despite your attempts to dissuade them, will take the path of resistance, the path of struggle and not



the path of capitulation recommended by you.

#### THE EXAMPLE OF SOCIALISM

The war and post-war generation has many glorious examples before it which are its guiding star in its struggle for a happy future. Larger and larger sections of the youth are drawing the lessons from these examples for their own action. They have before them the example of the heroic struggle of the Spanish and Chinese peoples and their youth against fascism, the example of the courageous underground struggle of the German and Italian working class and their youth. The mightiest example, however, is the living figure of socialism, the Soviet Union, which shows the young generation the road to the future. No power of world reaction can extinguish the sympathies which are constantly growing stronger in the hearts of the millions of youth in the capitalist countries for the mighty land of socialism, for the Soviet Union. And that is easy to understand!

The youth sees in the Soviet Union not only the mightiest force for and defender of peace, but also the *future*. The times have passed when the reactionaries were able to frighten the youth with the alleged danger threatening them from the Soviet Union. It is the desire of an ever-larger section of the youth to see this "danger" arise in their own countries.

Before the eyes of the youth today, the land of socialism grows and becomes stronger day by day under the brilliant leadership of the best friend and helper of the young generation of the whole world, Comrade Stalin. Today, the youth knows there is also *another* social order than the one in which people are exploited by people. But today the youth knows even more; and it is more and more arriving at the conviction that the socialist order of society is *better* than the capitalist. *The criticism of the old social order and interest in the new social order are constantly growing among the youth today.* And that is not surprising!

The youth today sees that in the Soviet Union, where exploitation of man by man has been abolished, a generation is growing up which is able to realize freely all of its healthy ideals. The heroic and inspiring deeds and the struggle of the Soviet youth for the further development of progress and culture in all fields of human life, inspire and strengthen the desire of the youth in the capitalist countries to struggle for a life such as the Soviet youth already have. The present-day generation lives in the period not only of the decline of capitalism but also of the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the earth. This two-sided development puts a stamp on the ideology and mentality of present-day youth.

#### POLITICAL CHANGES OF THE YOUNG GENERATION

The great political changes in the world were also accompanied by *serious* changes among the youth. If we merely examine the period of the world economic crisis from 1929-33, it must be stated that although there was a strong anti-capitalist orientation among the youth at that time, there was a definite mood of depression and weariness. The youth suffered most from the consequences of this crisis. It was dissatisfied with bourgeois democracy and with all its political parties. A profound disillusionment with the regime gripped the youth. And in this situation, neither the bourgeois nor Social-Democratic parties showed the youth a clear road. They did not understand the problem of the youth. In most capitalist countries, the youth was frequently dominated by the sentiment: "Away from politics." Tens and hundreds of thousands of youth joined sport and cultural organizations at this time.

This period coincides with the beginning of an extraordinary activity of Hitler fascism in Germany. Fascism noted that the bourgeois and Social-Democratic parties paid no attention to the youth and that the youth itself was more and more ardently seeking a way out of its difficult situation: *The dissatisfied youth was, at that time, the weakest*

*side of the bourgeois-democratic regime in Germany.*

Fascism began a feverish struggle for this youth. It appeared before the youth as the force, the movement, of dissatisfied youth and promised it to build a "state of the youth" in which it could realize its ideals. In view of the anti-capitalist sentiments of the youth, fascism acted as if it were the opponent of capitalism. At that time, fascism in Germany was a new phenomenon for the youth. Many young people judged it on its speeches and promises. And these were very alluring. The youth could not yet judge fascism by its deeds because it was an oppositional force but was not yet at the helm of state. By this deceptive type of propaganda, fascism succeeded in breaking into the ranks of the youth and even into the ranks of the working youth. Thus fascism in Germany came to power with the most active support of the German youth that was deceived by it.

After Hitler fascism came to power in Germany, the fascists in other countries also began a brisk activity among the youth to which they hypocritically called: "We are a movement of the youth against the old world." In these countries, too, a part of the youth fell under the pernicious influence of fascism. In this period, the youth vacillated between fascism and the forces of democracy and progress. They still groped in the dark and did not yet recognize fascism as their mortal enemy.

The raging of the bloody fascist Hitler dictatorship in Germany and the smashing of all democratic and progressive organizations, the destruction of the youth organizations, the liquidation of all civil liberties, the war of annihilation against culture and all that promotes progress, the establishment of the labor service camps and the concentration camps, the murder and imprisonment of the best people in the labor and progressive movement, in culture and science—all this contributed towards opening the eyes of the youth. Among the youth, critical sentiments towards fascism began to develop. Under the influence of the ever-

stronger defensive struggle of the working class against fascism, it gradually began to draw the lesson of the defeat of the German working class and people. *And thus, the war and post-war generation is beginning to pass over from criticism to struggle, to the assault against fascism.*

As the protest of an entire generation against its exploitation, as well as against fascism and imperialist war, there arose a mighty uniform movement of the broadest sections of the youth in all capitalist and colonial countries. Dissatisfaction with the old world, a burning hatred of fascism, the flaming desire to win a free future worthy of human beings—these are the driving forces of this movement.

The hard and unkind life under which the young generation is growing up in capitalist countries is molding a *fighting*, a *politically thinking* youth which calls loudly and energetically for its rights and, with youthful elan, struggles for a free future.

Even bourgeois politicians who view the youth movement objectively must recognize the great changes that have taken place among the youth. In an article entitled "What English Youth Is Thinking" in the June number of *Contemporary Review*, Judith Cocoran writes as follows:

"The organized youth movement is of recent origin. The happy young creatures, the wild, pleasure-seeking young people of the 'twenties of this century, have disappeared and in their place, there has arisen a serious-minded, conscientious generation. In our days, we see nothing unusual for a young boy or girl to devote four or five evenings a week to political meetings, to work on committees or to the distribution of leaflets and the sale of periodicals. One does not have to look long for the explanation of this. An appeal to freedom has never remained long unanswered in this country. Mr. Hitler and his friends were able to achieve success among certain sections in this or other countries in undermining faith in democracy; but, at the same time, this led to the fact that youth became conscious of democratic

ideals and began to believe in them passionately. The recognition is constantly growing that democracy, to continue to exist, must be active and must acquire a much greater importance in the daily life of the people than is the case today. More and more young people are asking themselves the question: 'Is Great Britain really a democratic country?'

#### THE GENERATION OF STRUGGLE AND OF VICTORY

The diversity of political conceptions among these young people is receding into the background more and more. Because of their hard life, they all feel as though they are being treated like step-children and that they are the *most under-privileged part of humanity*. That which is binding them more and more into a close unity is the recognition that history has imposed a great responsible mission upon them: *the mission of becoming victors over fascism and over the old world*.

The present-day youth wants to fight in the front ranks beside their mothers and fathers in order to open a free road for the further development of human progress and to build up a new world in which youth can live happily, joyously and in peace. On the banners of the consistent movement of the younger generation are inscribed their just demands: This generation demands the right to work, education and leisure. It calls energetically for its economic, political and cultural demands. In countries like the United States of America and England, "charters," "youth acts," containing the just demands of present-day youth, arise which are worked out in common by numerous progressive youth organizations.

This demand of the youth for their economic, political and cultural rights falls on deaf ears among the rulers in the capitalist countries. But the youth energetically continue the struggle for their demands and strive to have these demands satisfied. They set themselves the task of honor to cooperate energetically in the destruction of fascism. This movement sets itself the task of deliver-

ing a military defeat to fascism in those countries and on an international scale where it is waging war and to prevent the fascist aggressors from extending the war, which has already begun, to the entire world.

This youth hopes that peace can be saved, not lost. Daily, the conviction grows in its ranks that if the people of England, France, the U.S.A., together with the one hundred and seventy million people of the great land of socialism, the Soviet Union, unite in a peace front and group around themselves all other people, it is possible to force the fascist aggressor to his knees and to save the world from a second imperialist world war.

The movement of this generation was tempered in the struggle for the support of the Spanish republic. In the bourgeois-democratic countries, hundreds of thousands of young people have enthusiastically aided in the support of the Spanish republic. By thousands they marched through the streets of London, Paris, New York, Stockholm and Brussels, and demanded that their governments give aid and active support to the Spanish republicans. This generation sent its best representatives to the fronts of the Spanish republic in order to fight fascism with weapons also.

Hundreds and thousands of French, English, American, Czech, Swedish, German and Austrian youth fought heroically in the glorious International Brigades against the superior force of fascism. Cowardice and vacillation before the fascist enemy are alien to the progressive section of the youth. It loves peace, but it is not ready to exchange peace for slavery. For that reason, in London, in Paris and Warsaw, in Belgrade and New York, it demands ever more energetically that its governments pursue a policy of resistance against fascism. For that reason, it struggles tirelessly for the formation of the kind of governments that do not conspire with the fascist aggressors, but, on the contrary, carry through a bold and resolute policy of resistance to it.

Despite the betrayal of the Spanish

republic, despite the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Albania, this youth believes in the possibility of victory over fascism. This youth replies to increased fascist aggression with an even more ardent struggle against fascism.

The strike of a million students in the U.S.A. against imperialist war and for collective security shows the glorious fighting spirit of American youth. It begins to understand more and more that the American people and its youth, in their own interest, must help and unite those forces in Europe that want to make further aggression by fascism impossible.

Millions of young people in England together with the youth of India are waging a stubborn struggle against Chamberlain's pro-fascist policy. They are unyielding in their persistence that an end be put to Chamberlain's pro-fascist foreign policy which sullies the honor of the English people. It calls for the formation of a government which is ready to defend the freedom and independence of nations.

The French youth are also following the same road. The students of the Latin Quarter, who engage in stormy demonstrations in the streets of Paris against Mussolini's plans of aggression, only express the readiness of all French youth to fight, to defend the inviolability and independence of France.

The Polish youth, which only a short time ago was under the influence of reaction, appears in the arena of Poland's political life. Their democratic organizations call upon the youth to unite. They energetically attack the capitulators and declare themselves ready to defend, weapon in hand, every foot of their country's soil against German fascism.

The Balkan youth are also in the process of awakening. The youth of all the peoples of Jugoslavia are forging a common front for the defense of their country against German and Italian fascism. Resistance, not pacts with the aggressor—that is their slogan!

The youth front for the defense of the independence of nations against German and Italian fascism is growing

stronger, particularly in those countries that are exposed to the immediate danger of fascist aggression. This youth is abandoning pacifism and is taking the road of active struggle, the road of resistance to fascism. This fighting spirit, this readiness to take up arms against fascism in order to preserve the independence of their countries, are the most important characteristics of the youth of all countries menaced by German and Italian fascism.

The attempts of the capitulators to weaken and disrupt this glorious fighting movement of the young generation are numerous. However, large sections of this youth are turning their backs on the cowardly capitulators. This youth does not want to become a generation of capitulation to the fascist aggressors. It feels more and more that it can gain a free and happy life only when it ties up its fate with a resolute anti-fascist struggle.

The war and post-war generation is approaching great and difficult struggles. These coming struggles will decide the fate of the peoples of the entire world and their youth. These great battles will decide whether the world will develop in the direction of progress or in the direction of reaction and barbarism. Here, in these struggles, all future questions of the youth will also be fought out. There is no doubt that these historical struggles will end in favor of progress and freedom. But this victory *will not come by itself*. Gigantic efforts must be made to achieve this victory.

Today, the youth is carrying on ardent discussions as to how this victory can be won. It seeks clarity and the correct road out of the present situation.

#### THE YOUTH AND THE WORKING CLASS

It is necessary that the young generation understand *that it cannot attain victory over fascism by itself*. In order to be able to defeat fascism, it is necessary for the young generation to rally around that force which has the historical mission of playing the role of gravedigger of fascism and the old capitalist world. What is this force? *It is the work-*

*ing class.* The war and post-war generation should rally around the working class and conduct their struggle under its care. Why?

"The working class is the most advanced class and the paramount force of modern society. Its vanguard unit has won victory over the dark forces of tsarism and capitalism on a sixth part of the earth, and has built up a new, socialist society. The international working class is supremely interested in finally smashing the chains of capitalist exploitation and slavery throughout the world. It is the most irreconcilable enemy of fascism and of all reaction, the most resolute and consistent fighter against all oppression and enslavement of peoples, against all kinds of wars of plunder.

"The working class is the backbone of the people. Thanks to its decisive role in the productive life of the country, to its numbers, its concentrated and organized character, it is the staunchest bulwark of the liberty and independence of the country."\*

That the working class is the chief force in the struggle against fascism has been clearly shown in the struggle against fascism in France also. Thanks to the fact that the French working class came forward united and resolute, the effort of the French fascists to seize the helm of state on February 6, 1934, could be defeated. If the Spanish people and its youth fought successfully against superior fascist forces for two and a half years, it is due primarily to the resolute attitude of the Spanish working class and its youth. Everywhere in every country, the working class is the motor and driving force of the anti-fascist struggle. The young generation should rally around the working class also because it is the force to whom history gave the task of winning a new world. To win this new world, however, is the innermost desire of ever larger sections of present-day youth. The youth is fighting ardently against fascism today not only because it prefers bourgeois democ-

racy to fascism but also because by destroying fascism, it will move forward towards the achievement of a new social order, a new world. *Energetically to support the working class and give it all around aid is the most important task of the young generation in its struggle against fascism.*

But the working class is hindered and obstructed in its struggle against fascism by the split in its own ranks. The split of the working class is the most important reason for the fact that up till now, no major successes could be gained in the struggle against fascism. If the working class were in a united front in the struggle against fascism, there would be an entirely different situation in Europe today. Were the working class united in its struggle against fascism, the Austrian, Czech, Spanish and Albanian people would not have fallen under the yoke of fascist imperialism. Only a united working class in every country and in the international arena—history teaches that—can halt and destroy the fascist aggressors. *For that reason, it is not only a task of honor of the workers but of the whole young generation of toilers energetically to cooperate in the establishment of the unity of action of the working class in every country and on an international scale.*

Today there is arising in the international movement of the working class a constantly stronger current for the establishment of its international unity of action, for the holding of an international conference of all labor organizations to deal with the question of uniform struggle against fascism and for the defense of peace. The young generation would make a mistake if it stood aside from this movement. It is seriously interested in the organization of this international conference of all labor organizations. The working class youth should raise its voice, together with all non-fascist youth organizations, for the holding of this international conference. The youth itself could place its problem before this conference and there is no doubt that such an international conference of all labor organizations would

\* Georgi Dimitroff, *After Munich*, p. 21, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

not only sympathetically receive but would energetically support all the aspirations and undertakings of the youth against fascism and for the improvement of their social conditions.

The resolute call of the great hero of the anti-fascist struggle, Georgi Dimitroff, for the international unity of the working class against fascism is conquering the hearts of ever greater sections of the workers. The workers want this unity. But a few reactionary leaders of the labor movement have a different attitude towards this. They are afraid of the unity of the working class and want to prevent the holding of such an international conference. The young generation—that first victim of fascist barbarism and of imperialist war—should also consider it its duty to break the resistance of these reactionary leaders and to work everywhere as an enthusiastic force for the unity of the working class.

#### FOR THE UNITY OF THE PROGRESSIVE YOUTH MOVEMENT

In the light of the great approaching struggles, it will undoubtedly be useful to view the youth movement itself, fighting for peace, freedom and progress, with critical eyes. What are the gaps and weaknesses in this youth movement? It is necessary to see clearly the weak sides of the youth movement also so that it can be built stronger and more powerfully. It should not be forgotten that the enemy tries to utilize every weakness and every gap in the progressive youth movement in order to disrupt it and deprive it of all fighting capacity. But what is the most important weakness of the organized youth movement that is so urgently necessary to overcome? This consists in the *insufficient participation of the working class youth organizations in this movement and in the split within the working class youth.*

For years the working class youth have been waging a tenacious and tireless struggle to establish unity against fascism. This struggle was crowned

with success in a number of countries. The heroic working class youth of Spain gave the working class youth of all capitalist countries a glorious example of how they can establish unity. A number of other countries also achieved unity of the working class youth organizations. But in many countries, the unity of the working class youth continues to remain unsolved. The Socialist youth leagues of many important countries, as, for example, France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Holland *still stand aside from the general movement of the youth against fascism*, and even the leadership of the Socialist Youth International does not promote the unity of the working class youth organizations. Is it true that the members of the Socialist youth leagues do not want to cooperate with the Communist and other anti-fascist youth organizations? No! A thousand times no!

They want to, and even demand it! There have been and are numerous efforts of the members of the Socialist youth leagues in the various countries to establish the unity of the working class youth organizations in order to be able better to fight against fascism. But these efforts of the members are always and everywhere stifled by a small group of leaders of the Socialist youth leagues hostile to unity. The members of the Socialist youth leagues have hitherto been unable to secure the triumph of their will to unity; nevertheless, their will to unity grows stronger day by day.

But it would be in place for the members of the Socialist youth leagues to fight *more energetically than before* for the establishment of the unity of the working class youth organizations. Indeed, a more energetic struggle for the unity of the working class youth against fascism is today more necessary than ever. The members of the Socialist youth leagues should recall their responsibility to the working class youth. The members of the Socialist and Communist youth leagues are the most militant and progressive section of the working class youth. It is their common task to rally the entire working class youth around

themselves and to bring them into the great fighting movement of the youth against fascism.

Is it not true that the lack of close cooperation between the two working class youth organizations is responsible for the fact that a large part of the working class youth does not display the necessary activity in the struggle against fascism? But whom does it serve? By no means the interests of the struggle against fascism.

Today, in view of the increased fascist aggression, the entire labor movement is seriously endangered and with it also all social and democratic achievements which the proletariat has won through decades of hard battles. For that reason, it is urgently necessary to establish the unity of the working class youth and to create a close alliance between their organizations against fascism. The working class youth needs this unity as it needs bread, air and sun! The working class youth has the task of becoming the most resolute and courageous battalion of the organized movement of the young generation. But for this, it requires its own unity. If the unity of the working class youth is established, if the collaboration between the two working class organizations becomes a reality in every country and internationally, then the fighting front of our generation will become even more powerful, even mightier. Our generation needs this unity. It is absolutely necessary in order to preserve it from the miserable fate of the German and Italian, Austrian and Czech youth. This unity is necessary in order to enable our generation to be-

*come truly the generation of victory over fascism and the old capitalist world.*

\* \* \*

Ever larger sections of the young generation are joining the anti-fascist front. That shows that this front has every chance for victory over fascism, for he who has the youth has the future.

The working class and all the democratic people's forces have a great responsibility to the present-day young generation. To help the youth and their anti-fascist democratic and progressive organizations is today one of the most important tasks of all parties, all organizations that want to defend peace against the aggressor and to free the world from fascism. This task also confronts all progressive intellectuals. Every people will be strong and invincible in the struggle against the fascist aggressor only when it understands that it must include its youth in the front defending its independence, when it understands how to inspire the hearts of its youth with the spirit of determined resistance against the fascist aggressor. The education of the present young generation in a spirit of love for the freedom and independence of its people, in a spirit of hatred for fascism—that is what all workers, the working class and all the democratic people's forces should enthusiastically come out for.

A great and mighty force against fascism is growing and developing in the war and post-war generation. To make this an ever mightier force is one of the most important problems of the coming great historical struggles between fascism and democracy.

---

---

## “Overtake and Surpass”

FROM A LECTURE TO THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES IN MOSCOW,  
JUNE, 1939

BY E. VARGA

**T**HE natural goal of Soviet society is communism, not that type of poor Spartan communism which the Utopian Socialists dreamed about centuries ago but a rich communism, a communism in which everyone can live according to his needs and work according to his abilities.

It is evident that the productivity of labor in the Soviet Union today is far from sufficient for such a communist society and that a very great exertion of all the forces of the Soviet state is still necessary in order to achieve the most immediate goal: to overtake and surpass the most advanced capitalist countries in the economic sphere. We say: overtake and surpass in the economic sphere, that is, that the production of the Soviet Union must be so raised that the same amount of products—of equal quality—is produced per capita as in the leading capitalist countries. That is how Comrade Stalin put the question in his historic report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks).

The following figures show how far the Soviet Union is still behind the U.S.A., the leading capitalist country in the economic sphere:

In 1938, the *per capita* for the following items amounted to (in some cases, 1937):

	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.
Coal (in kg.) . . . . .	2,700	781
Petroleum (in kg.) . . . . .	1,277	180
Electric power (kw.) . . . . .	1,120	233
Iron (in kg.) . . . . .	146	87
Steel (in kg.) . . . . .	217	107

Cotton cloth (meters)	58	16
Woolens (in meters)	28	0.6
Leather shoes (pairs)	26	1
Sugar (in kg.) . . . . .	12	14
Wheat or rye (in kg.)	205	361
Paper (in kg.) . . . . .	48	12
Soap (in kg.) . . . . .	12	3

These figures prove that the U.S.A. produces a considerably larger quantity of products *per capita* (it must be remembered, of course, that the production figures for the U.S.A. also include exports). The Soviet Union is ahead only in agricultural products, in means of subsistence. In the Soviet Union, there is more wheat and rye per capita than in the U.S.A. The share of sugar per capita is also greater. Of course, it must be taken into consideration that the United States, aside from wheat and rye, produces a tremendous amount of corn and has considerably more vegetables, fruit and dairy products. From these figures, it can be seen that production in the Soviet Union, above all industrial production, must be increased on the average two-, three- and four-fold in order to overtake the U.S.A. in the economic sphere.

Now, what has been the change in the relationship between the U.S.A. and tsarist Russia, and the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union? How is this movement progressing? Is the U.S.S.R. closer now to the level of production of the U.S.A. than tsarist Russia?

The following figures will serve as an answer to this question:



*Production Per Capita (kg.)*

	1913	1928	1938
Coal:			
U.S.A. ....	5,358	4,360	2,700
U.S.S.R. ...	209	230	781
Iron			
U.S.A. ....	326	328	146
U.S.S.R. ...	30	21	87
Steel			
U.S.A. ....	330	437	217
U.S.S.R. ...	30	28	107

These figures show that the difference between the level of production of the U.S.A. and tsarist Russia was considerably greater up to the imperialist war than in 1938. The Soviet Union, in the period between 1928 and 1938, approached the level of production of the U.S.A. at a rapid tempo. Despite this, even greater efforts and time are required by the Soviet Union in order to reach the immediate goal—to overtake and surpass in the economic sphere.

In what way did individual capitalist countries take the lead in the economic sphere? What can the Soviet Union utilize from these historical experiences and what can it avoid?

When we examine the historical development of capitalism we see that actually only two countries were strongly predominant over a period of years. One was England in the first half of the nineteenth century up to the 'seventies, and the other was the U.S.A. in the twentieth century. In the period between 1870 and the imperialist world war, Germany competed with both these countries; it outstripped England, but it lagged behind the U.S.A. more and more (which also outstripped England).

Are there any general factors in the development of these countries? I believe so, and they are the following:

First: Not one of these countries became a leading country on the basis of its own resources; all of them, in different ways, utilized the economic resources of other countries.

Second: They possessed considerable natural riches (if we take into account the technical level of that period).

Third: They applied the most pro-

gressive technique in their production which had developed in the course of previous decades.

Fourth: On this basis, they attained a considerably higher productivity of labor than their competitors.

And, finally, fifth: On this basis, the relative importance of agriculture decreased, the relative importance of industry increased; in the course of this, a marked differentiation occurred among the peasantry; the small farms were ruined, capitalism penetrated into agriculture. These are the general factors that can be recorded for those countries.

Let us look at these questions a little more concretely. England acquired tremendous economic resources by robbing foreign countries. Marx wrote that the treasures which were plundered by means of the division of Europe, by outright robbery, by the enslavement of the natives, by murder, flowed into the metropolises and were there transformed into capital.

The British government (in the years 1835-61) drew an annual sum of 29,000,000 pounds sterling in taxes from the impoverished population of India. Of this amount, only 66,000 pounds sterling remained in India for educational purposes. That was one of England's greatest sources of income.

Marx wrote that in 1792 alone, not less than 132 ships carried on the slave trade in Liverpool.

Aside from this, England received, not without applying force, large foreign loans from Holland, Northern Italy, etc. Thus the development of England was to a great extent based upon foreign resources.

What natural advantages did England have over other countries? Up to the epoch of railroads, it was especially important that there were rivers there which were navigable all year round; rivers which traversed practically the entire country; aside from this, its sea-coasts gave England a great advantage over other countries.

The presence of large coal deposits situated near the ocean, the presence of iron ore, etc., played an important role.

England was the first country in the world to apply the most progressive technique in the textile industry, the steam engine, steam power of vessels, etc. As a result of this development, England, as we know, became the industrial workshop of the world, and it occupied this position up to about the 'seventies of the last century.

These advantages enabled England to adopt the position of free trade because it had no dangerous competitors to fear. Aside from this, its industrial production was specialized for the world market. It is well known that there were tin mills in England which for decades produced tin of just one quality. There were textile mills which for decades manufactured only one number of thread. Naturally these were very great advantages. But with the development of industry, agriculture was exposed to almost complete destruction. In addition to this, there arose the well known conservatism of the English industrialists, which later on, when Germany and America entered the world arena, made itself very strongly felt.

As already stated, Germany and the U. S. began to overtake England in the period after 1870 and finally to surpass it. In the course of this, the U. S. gained first place in the world, which it has held up till now.

The development of the U.S.A. likewise followed a very singular course. America received large resources from abroad. A large flow of capital made its way from Europe to America. For example, half of the railroad shares at the end of the nineteenth century were still to be found in the hands of the English and other European capitalists. And what was even more important—America received a tremendous number of the best labor forces from Europe. In the course of the nineteenth century, emigration alone amounted to 40,000,000 people. In this connection it must be remembered that it was the most energetic people who decided to give up their old place of work, to leave everything old behind, to cross the ocean in order to begin anew there. It was a selection of

the best, most energetic people from all the countries of Europe.

As everyone knows, America's natural resources are tremendous. A large area, a good climate, rich useful resources, etc. Even the social conditions were favorable to the extent that, aside from the South, there were no feudal survivals anywhere hindering the development of capitalism. The whole profit went to the capitalists; they were not compelled to divide it with the landowners and agrarians as was the case, for example, in tsarist Russia.

These were the reasons for the stormy development of American economy. There arose an almost chronic shortage of labor power. Wages and salaries stayed at a relatively high level. The historian Shadwell stated with regard to the development of England, Germany and America in the nineteenth century that if the level of wages in England was taken as 100, it would amount to 70-80 in Germany, but 150-180 in America. As a result of the shortage of labor power and high wages in America, mechanical production, the application of machines and the great intensity of labor developed very extensively there. It is well known that many of the labor-saving machines had their origin in America. All agricultural machines, all automatic machines, automatic calculating machines, cash registers, etc., all come from America.

But when we speak about the development of America, we must not forget the unscrupulous rapacity with which the natural resources were pounced upon—the heedless squandering of the national wealth. Take forests, for example; they were reduced to a minimum. The result is a marked exhaustion of the soil, erosion; whole stretches are almost useless for agricultural purposes now because of the colossal dust storms which are usual there. For example, in one city that was illuminated by natural gas, the street lamps were not extinguished for decades because it was more expensive to hire a worker to light and extinguish the lamps daily than to let these lamps burn day and night for dec-

ades. The rapacity of the American capitalists is also directed against the most important productive force, against the working class. For example, one can read the following notices in American factories: Workers over 40 are not hired. Only young, fresh workers are able to stand the inhuman speed-up.

And now, Germany. The development of Germany differs from the development of England and the United States. Germany likewise received considerable resources from abroad—loans, and, in addition, extensive reparations from France (1871). The natural resources of Germany are of course considerably smaller than those of the United States. Germany has a smaller area; nevertheless, it has many useful natural resources—coal, brown coal, large salt deposits which constitute the foundation of Germany's mighty chemical industry. Aside from this, the border areas of Germany, Lorraine, also had iron ore, etc.

The most important factor consisted in the fact that after the railroad had become the decisive means of transportation, Germany's central position in Europe began to play an important role because all European highways lead through Germany, from the south as well as from the north, from the east as well as from the west.

The social conditions in Germany hindered the development of capitalism, because for a long time there were strong survivals of feudalism in Germany. We must also take note of the presence of another peculiar factor in Germany—the very strict labor discipline which is characteristic of the German worker as well as of the German people as a whole. Here the tradition of Prussian militarism which forced people to **work** under strict rules played a decisive role. Aside from this, the public schools and the other schools as well as the trade unions contributed to the development of labor discipline. As a result, a distinct type of very productive worker arose in Germany.

Another factor is characteristic of German capitalism—the very close con-

nection between science and industry. It may be said that such a close, direct connection between science and industry could be found nowhere in the world outside of Germany. On this basis, at the end of the nineteenth century, Germany succeeded in beginning to apply the newest, best technique, and in some branches of industry, above all in the chemical and electrical industry, etc., in becoming dominant.

We have briefly indicated here how the above-mentioned countries have achieved their predominance.

Can the Soviet Union learn anything from these experiences?

I believe that apart from the fundamental difference in the social system, the Soviet Union can still learn something from capitalism, can still make use of some things. It is clear that in the Soviet Union the technical processes are the same—that in this respect there are no differences in Germany or America either. But naturally, the socialist system of society excludes the use of methods which play a big role in capitalist countries. The Soviet Union does not plunder foreign nations; it does not accept any foreign loans which would place it in economic or political dependence, nor is there such a rapacious attitude in the Soviet Union towards the natural resources in the country, although these are very great. The Soviet Union has forever put an end to the exploitation of the working class which constitutes the foundation of capitalism; nor does it take the road of the destruction of the peasantry.

All these roads are excluded in the Soviet Union by the established socialist order of society. The Soviet Union follows a different road. Its road consists *in raising the effect of the labor of the entire people, in raising it to a higher level than in the capitalist countries.* Or when, from the viewpoint of production, the same level has been reached, then one can say that the Soviet Union *will reduce to a minimum the labor time contained in every single commodity.*

I must explain here why I separate the effect of the labor of the people as a

whole from the productivity of labor. These two things are not quite the same. I shall demonstrate that.

Upon what does the output of the worker depend? It depends on natural factors, on the means of production, on the intensity of labor, etc.

The effect of the labor of the people as a whole also depends upon additional factors. For example, upon the correct proportioning of individual industrial branches, on the correct selection of the site for the location of individual branches and enterprises, etc. When we therefore state that in individual enterprises of the Soviet Union, the labor output of a worker is the same as in the U.S.A., that does not mean that the effect of the entire social labor is likewise the same. Why? Because, for example, given the same output, it is possible that in one country the machines wear out more quickly than in others; it may be possible that in one country more raw material or fuel may be used up for the same purpose than in another country; it may be possible that in one country more waste is produced than in another, etc. Or let us take for example railroad transport. It may be possible that in one country the output of a railroader is no less than in another. But that still does not mean that the transport output as a whole is the same.

If, for example, cement is transported 10,000 kilometers, or if it happens that heavy rails are produced in the Kuznets district and are transported from there to the Ukraine, or if light rails are produced in the Ukraine which are used in Siberia and which are transported there, then the economic effect of the transport of the Soviet Union naturally does not correspond to the output of one individual railroad worker.

In the capitalist countries, the difference between the output of a single worker and the effect of labor of the economy as a whole is naturally considerably greater. There as a result of the intense speed-up, the individual output of a single worker is very high. But there, the social conditions do not permit any corresponding development of

the labor output as a whole. It is well known that in the capitalist countries, industrial crises break out every eight to ten years, which set back the development, that monopoly capitalism hampers the development of technique, that large parts of the production apparatus are never utilized, that there is permanent mass unemployment, etc.

The situation in the capitalist countries is such now that technical progress is taking place primarily in the field of war technique. War technique is developing rapidly. And for that reason, other branches must also adapt themselves to it to a greater or less extent.

The monopolies are so powerful that they do not allow any corresponding development of technique.

I should like to cite some figures to illustrate how, in America, the individual performance of the worker and the total output diverge. From 1920 to 1936 the individual output of the employed workers rose on an average of 4.4 per cent a year but industrial production only rose 1.3 per cent, that is, the output of a worker rose three times as much as the total production of entire American capitalism. What follows from this? Regardless of the fact that the individual output of the worker in America, in the capitalist world, grows, the tempo of development of industrial production constantly becomes less.

I should like to illustrate with a few figures the course which the curve of capitalist production follows. Between 1870 and 1890, the annual growth of industrial production amounted to 6.3 per cent; between 1890 and 1913, 5.8 per cent, and between 1913 and 1929 only 3 per cent; in the last cycle—1929-1937—0.4 per cent.\* The curve is unmistakably descending.

This is no accident, but rather follows from monopoly capitalism, from the crises of capitalism, from the nature of capitalist society. The difference between

\* The percentages are calculated on the basis of data of the German *Konjunktur Institut* and of the League of Nations.

the social order of capitalism and socialism is the guarantee in the historical sense that socialism will surpass capitalism. The task of the Soviet Union consists in seeing that this happens as fast as possible.

When we examine the tempo of development of industrial production in the Soviet Union, in the U.S.A., England, Germany and France, between 1929 and 1937-38, it is clear that a tremendous increase in industrial production has occurred in the Soviet Union, a ninefold increase over the production of 1913, while all capitalist countries have barely topped the pre-war level.

The question may arise whether there are enough natural resources in the Soviet Union to surpass America.

The following figures illustrate the most important natural resources per capita:

	U.S.S.R.	U.S.A.
Land (arable surface)	1.2	1.3
Forest .....	3.7	1.5
Coal (1,000 tons)....	10.0	22.0
Petroleum (tons) ...	51.0	17.0
Waterpower (kw.) ..	1.6	0.6
Iron Ore (tons).....	1,572.	724.0

What is the situation in the Soviet Union in regard to means of production?

In the reports of Comrade Stalin and Comrade Molotov to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), it was stated that the equipment of industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union is considerably newer and consequently qualitatively much better than in the capitalist countries. There, the introduction of new machines, of a new technique, is always directed against the interests of the capitalists who own large old factories erected on the basis of the old technique; the capitalists do not want their enterprises to be depreciated through the introduction of the new technique.

There are no such factors in the Soviet Union, and consequently technique develops at a much faster tempo and without the inner obstacles which are

characteristic of capitalism. The Soviet Union can also recruit its cadres from among a much broader circle of people than capitalism.

The student body of the universities of the capitalist countries is composed of youth whose parents possess the material possibilities to allow their children to study. Young people from the circles of the poorer population are a rarity, an exception at these universities.

In the Soviet Union, such a situation cannot exist. That is also a great advantage.

It must be kept in mind, however, that despite the fact that in the Soviet Union the natural resources are not smaller than in America, despite the fact that the Soviet Union is using a newer technique than America and that the tempo of development is faster in the Soviet Union and the selection of people is better, nevertheless in the economic sphere, the Soviet Union is still behind America. Why is the Soviet Union still behind?

First, although the Soviet Union has a good technique at its disposal, the extent of its equipment is still less than that in America. I shall not cite many figure. I only want to demonstrate that industry in America works with about 50,000,000 h.p., the Soviet Union with only 15,000,000 h.p. The American cotton industry works with about 30,000,000 spindles, the Soviet Union with 10,000,000. In America, there are 1,700,000 tractors, in the Soviet Union there are 500,000, etc. For that reason, the Soviet Union, as Comrade Stalin said in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), must still make very great efforts to overtake America; "considerable capital investments must be undertaken in order to extend our socialist industry in every way. . . . New factories must be built."\*

A second very important factor which is seldom thought of is the position of minors in the population. It differs

---

\* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York.

greatly in the Soviet Union from that in capitalist countries. The percentage of people from 15 to 65 years of age in the U.S.A. amounts to 65 per cent, in Great Britain—68 per cent, in Germany—69 per cent, in the Soviet Union—about 57-58 per cent. In the Soviet Union, there is a large number of youth who, of course, consume products, but who are not yet productively active. That naturally reduces the production per capita. But, on the other hand, this is very good, because in the future there will be a strong generation, while in the capitalist countries the scientists have already figured out exactly the year when the turning point begins and the population of the capitalist countries will begin to decline.

The third factor: In the Soviet Union there are difficulties in the transition of workers, accustomed to working in agriculture, to modern industrial technique. It should not be forgotten that twenty-two years ago half the population of tsarist Russia could neither read nor write, and that it is not so easy to train modern industrial workers out of such human material. The difficulties during the transition from agriculture to industry were well known to the entire country.

The next factor is that of labor discipline. Under capitalism, labor discipline is *a discipline resting on class rule*. The class of capitalists compel the workers to work. The collapse of the power of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union abolished the discipline in production resting on class rule; a new discipline has had to arise, but that is a rather protracted process.

For that reason, it is still necessary to continue to work towards creating the best organization for the control of labor, for the control of production discipline. At the same time, it is necessary to work towards deepening the Communist consciousness of all workers, towards explaining the importance of passing from the old to the new fully conscious Communist labor discipline.

These are the most important factors which explain why the development in

the Soviet Union did not proceed as fast as it might have.

The next very important factor: In the Soviet Union, the percentage of workers engaged in agriculture is considerably higher than in the leading capitalist countries. In the U.S.A. 22 per cent work in agriculture, in Germany—29 per cent, in the Soviet Union—about 58 per cent. As long as the majority of the population is engaged in agriculture, as long as it is engaged in supplying the means of subsistence and raw material for clothing, the Soviet Union will probably not be able to overtake America.

For that reason, we must remember the question significance of which Comrade Stalin emphasized, that one and a half million young collective farmers pass from agriculture to industry each year. Without a large transfer of human resources from agriculture to industry, the Soviet Union will not be able to overtake and surpass the capitalist countries. The possibilities exist for such a regrouping of people. It is well known that a part of the collective farmers, as Comrade Molotov said in his report, work little and can show only a very few workdays in the course of a year. The collective farms can also live without these labor forces, for the condition of the peasantry in the Soviet Union is altogether different from that under capitalism: they have the soil for permanent use. It is not burdened by any taxes. No sudden misfortune can rob them of the basis of their lives. Aside from this, the collective farmers also have their own economy, and therefore they can live without any great effort at their present standards which, even though rapidly rising, nevertheless are still not sufficiently high. Here it is a question of raising the cultural level of the peasantry so that they will want to live even better. And herewith they must be told that they can live better only when there will be fewer workers engaged in agriculture and more in industry.

The development in the Soviet Union was also hampered because sabotage played an important role. Undoubtedly

a substantial role is also played by the existence of the surrounding capitalist world. It is obvious that considerably greater means for capital investment could have been utilized if the defense of our country did not require such a large expenditure.

\* \* \*

To overtake the leading capitalist countries in the economic sphere is by no means an economic problem, is by no means a problem which the economists alone can solve. The chief task must be accomplished by natural science and technique. Why? The economists cannot find the natural resources. They cannot produce any better means of production. That is the concern of the scientists and the technicians. Naturally, the economists can and should also contribute something. They should take part in working out such problems as the division into districts, the selection of the best standard industry, the study of the result of various enterprises from the standpoint of their size, the most effective utilization of labor power, the best utilization of raw materials and the production apparatus.

I do not consider myself competent to say which tasks this or that scientist should solve. There is no person on earth who qualifies in all branches of science. I should like to say something here only as a layman.

Soviet geology, as is well known, has the task of further studying the rich treasures of the country; we do not yet know exactly what treasures are hidden in the Soviet earth. This problem must be connected with the problem of transport, because it is by no means a matter of indifference where the source of coal or iron ore will be located.

In the Third Five-Year Plan which Comrade Molotov described as the Five-Year Plan of chemistry, chemistry is confronted with a number of very important problems. It must be stated that in the Soviet Union there are still big contradictions between the important development of theoretical chemistry and the insufficient development of the chem-

ical industry. This must be overcome. Chemistry is confronted by a great many tasks. Here arises the problem of new material, of synthetic material, and in the distant future, also, the problem of freeing ourselves from the old type of agriculture, of freeing mankind from dependence upon the sun, climate, heat, in securing its means of subsistence. Naturally this is a matter of the distant future. But I am convinced that this will be the direction of development. It cannot be that mankind must remain dependent on all these factors. I believe that in the future other more up-to-date methods of work will be found in the sphere of agriculture. That, of course, does not mean that the practical tasks confronting the biologists, the agronomists, in the sphere of agriculture, should thereby suffer in the slightest.

Naturally, technique will be of decisive importance. In this connection, the Soviet Union is following the same road that the capitalist countries followed, which in the past, therefore, became leading countries because they applied the newest and best technique. In the Soviet Union this road is easier to travel than in the capitalist countries. In the Soviet Union, it is free. The Soviet Union is confronted with hundreds and thousands of the most diverse tasks. How does the development of technique look from the standpoint of the economist and where does it lead?

At first, man used tools which he manipulated with his own power; he worked on the basis of his own strength with the help of tools. In the next stage, machines were already at work; man served them, he became an appendage of the machine. In the third stage, the machines are already working automatically. Machines and apparatus work. Man merely watches over them. Such is the path of development. Under capitalism, this means that millions of workers are thrown out of work, that millions are robbed of all wages and must starve. Under socialism this development leads to a surplus of products which is necessary to pass over to the second phase of socialism—communism. And I hope

that the Soviet scientists and technicians will contribute towards bringing about this revolution in technique in the Soviet Union, in the land of socialism, more

quickly than in any other country, a revolution which will enable man to do no more than control the work of the machines and apparatus.

---

---

#### THE U.S.S.R.—A POWERFUL FACTOR FOR PEACE

“The U.S.S.R. is not what it was, say, in 1921, when it was just starting its peaceful, constructive work. We have to speak of this because even to this day some of our neighbors are apparently unable to realize it. And it must be admitted that the U.S.S.R. is no longer what it was only five or ten years ago, that the U.S.S.R. has grown in strength. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union must reflect the changes in the international situation and the greater role of the U.S.S.R. as a powerful factor of peace. There is no need to show that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is fundamentally peaceful and opposed to aggression. The aggressive countries themselves are best aware of this. Very belatedly and hesitatingly, some of the democratic powers are coming to realize this plain truth. Yet, in the united front of the peaceable states that are really opposing aggression, the Soviet Union cannot but occupy a foremost place.”—V. M. Molotov, *The Soviet Union and the Peace Front*, p. 15.

---

---



---

---

## Book Reviewing Is a Serious Matter

BY P. DENGEL

SOME time ago, Joseph Freeman, an American writer, published a book called *An American Testament*. The New York *Daily Worker* gave this book a favorable review and recommended it to its readers without criticism. Later on, the book was also published in England. The London *Daily Worker* likewise gave it a favorable review and recommended it to its readers without criticism.

We think that a Communist paper should recommend only such books to the workers as serve the workers' cause and strengthen them in their struggle. It need not always be books that are beyond reproach from the viewpoint of historical materialism, of Marxism-Leninism. The Communist press can also recommend books to the workers written by authors whose outlook is confused and idealistic but which are useful weapons in the struggle against capitalism and reaction. There are many examples of this right in the United States. In such a case, it is the task of the Communist press, in reviewing the book, to give the reader some pointers to enable him to read the book critically, while at the same time taking issue with the progressive author in a factual and comradely manner.

The Communist press, in particular, has the duty of warning the workers when books are published which pretend to be pro-labor and even "revolutionary" but which, in reality, contain more or less big doses of disruptive poison in more or less concealed form—books, which under the mask of "objectivity," suggest to the worker an anti-working class outlook and arouse sympathy for the enemies of the labor movement.

This happens to be the case with the

book by Joseph Freeman. The case is so much more serious because, as a collaborator of the *New Masses*, Freeman had become known to the revolutionary workers, and because, as far as we know, he was still considered a member of the Communist Party of America at the time of the publication of his book.

*An American Testament* is a sort of autobiographical narrative, of slight literary value, the typical hackwork of a writer whose imagination and creative power does not reach beyond a strong youthful experience. Freeman's intellectual physiognomy was determined by his association with the intellectuals of the well-known Greenwich Village, by the problems of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectual youth during the first years after the war. At that time, psychoanalysis was the prevailing fashion in these circles. Freeman did not go beyond this fashion. In his *Testament*, he tries hard to convert the reader to his "outlook," in the form of "reconciling" psychoanalysis with what Freeman considers to be historical materialism.

From 1924 to 1927, Freeman lived in Moscow and for a time did translations for the Executive Committee of the Communist International. This was the time of the historic dispute with Trotskyism. Freeman did not have the faintest idea of the magnitude and importance of this struggle. We could ignore the account of Freeman's very uninteresting personal experiences during this time if it did not pretend to give a sort of inner description of the circles of political collaborators of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. In this, Freeman mixes a little truth with a lot of

imagination in order to make himself personally "interesting." In this account, there isn't a trace of understanding of the great struggle in which the fate of the labor movement was at stake. The worker or intellectual reading it is repelled or misled. But two large Communist papers recommend this filth to their readers!

When the book appeared, the role of Trotsky and his supporters as enemies of the working class, as agents of imperialism and fascism, had already been clearly exposed. But Freeman portrays the spy Trotsky and his outfit in a sympathetic manner throughout. He cites long quotations from Trotsky, agrees with them, and tells how they enthused him and his petty-bourgeois friends.

*An American Testament* does not arouse any hatred for the vile Trotskyite enemies of the working class and the anti-fascist movement. It attempts to arouse sympathy for them as people who had given their "services" to the labor movement but had "erred." It is an underhanded defense of the Trotskyites. But two big Communist papers recommend this hackwork to their readers!

The editors of the *Daily Worker* in New York and the *Daily Worker* in London have evidently not read this book and did not sufficiently assure themselves

of the reliability of their collaborators. Unfortunately this is not an isolated case. In an issue of the London *Daily Worker* which appeared shortly before Christmas, 1938, the book of a German Trotskyite was warmly recommended. This was an author who had been waging a vile struggle against the Soviet Union and against the Comintern for fifteen years, an open Trotskyite.

The reviewing of books is an important task with which the responsible heads of newspapers and periodicals should attentively concern themselves. Such a task should be given only to thoroughly trusted, conscientious comrades who have enough training and experience. Working class readers trust their paper which correctly advises them on political questions. They also trust the judgment and the criticism of their paper in connection with books. What confusion may arise, when such a miserable and harmful hackwork as that by Mr. Freeman, who tries to suggest to his readers sympathy for Trotsky and the Trotskyites, is recommended by Communist papers without any qualification.

Book reviews are necessary. But it is no subordinate job. On the contrary, it is a very serious and important job which should be subject to the control of responsible Party comrades.



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