

**WORKERS of the WORLD
UNITE!**

BRAILSFORD EXPOSED



FEB. 15th, 1932

**COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL**

Vol. IX. No. 3.

Threepence

MODERN BOOKS LTD.

CONTENTS INSIDE

CONTENTS

Number - - 3

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French and Chinese, as well as English.

THE NEW MANOEUVRES OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The further sharpening and deepening of the crisis, the bankruptcy of the Social-Democratic theories of organised capitalism and economic Democracy—lead to the result that the Social-Democrats turn to new left manoeuvres to fight successfully shoulder to shoulder with the bourgeoisie. This article exposes the essence of the most recent manoeuvres.

THE UNFULFILLED TASKS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION.

(Preparatory to the IV. Congress of
the C.P. of Spain)

The first comprehensive description of the revolutionary upheaval in Spain— together with the instructions of the E.C. of Comintern to the IV. Congress of the Spanish C.P., i.e., the next tasks of the Spanish revolution.

THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF COMRADE PIATNITSKY'S BIRTHDAY

An absorbing brief biography and description of the work of a world-famous revolutionary leader, and immediate disciple of Lenin.

BRAILSFORD : "REBEL INDIA"

Brailsford's book "Rebel India" gives a very clear picture of the imperialist counter-revolutionary character of the I.L.P. which is frequently not against declaring in words that it is in favour (!) of the "right to self-determination" of India but is actively helping to enslave India and does all it can to defend British imperialism.

THE NEW MANOEUVRES OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

THE sharpening and deepening of the world economic crisis leads to growing difficulties in the situation of the Social Democracy. The economic basis of Reformism is crumbling as a result of the falling extra-profit, parts of which are utilised for the bribing of the aristocracy of labour. The growing poverty of the working masses, upon whose shoulders monopoly Capital transfers the burdens of the crisis, calls forth increasing dissatisfaction with the policy of Social Democracy, which consists in the complete support of the measures of Finance Capital.

Under pressure of the growing discontent of the workers and their mass desertion from Social Democracy, the latter, revealing its impotence in the face of the crisis and unemployment, is compelled in order to deceive the masses to resort to "Left" demagogue manoeuvres and in *words* hypocritically advocates a shorter working day and a five-day week, extension of social insurance, disarmament and a fight against Fascism.

In *deeds*, however, by these manoeuvres Social Democracy *helps Capitalism* to carry through its attacks on the standard of living of the working class to consolidate its dictatorship, to accelerate the fascisation of the bourgeois State, to suppress the mass resistance to Fascism, to retard the spontaneous striving of the broad masses of the workers for the united front and to conceal the preparations for war against the U.S.S.R.

This statement of the 11th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. has been fully confirmed during the time which has passed since the Plenum. The further sharpening and deepening of the crisis, the bankruptcy of the Social Democratic theories of organised capitalism and Economic Democracy, the growing ferment in, and the desertion of, the camp of the Social Democrats by the workers—all lead to the result that the Social Democrats turn to *new* left manoeuvres in order to fight successfully shoulder to shoulder with the bourgeoisie.

At a time when the crisis of the capitalist system and the Socialist advance of the Soviet Union places the question before the masses of: *Capitalist or revolutionary way out of the crisis*, the manoeuvres of the Social-Fascists concentrate themselves on the question of the way out.

In the last few months these "left" confusionist manoeuvres have been utilised with a wild and desperate energy so far unheard of, and the half-demented social democratic swindlers in desperate need, grasp at especially subtle "theoretical" arguments of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism,

and the Right renegades of Communism, who are hurrying to their aid.

The "theoretical" basis of the new social democratic programmes, proposals, and slogans, which, like all their quack remedies, shoot out of the ground like mushrooms, give an indication of the degree of the crisis of Capitalism.

First consideration must be given to this.

I.—THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC EVALUATION OF THE CRISIS.

Whereas the Social Democracy for a long period, as is well known, insolently denied the existence of the world economic crisis, whereas at that time its most famous theoreticians, as, for example, Otto Bauer, consoled the workers up till May, 1931, with statements on the imminent ending of the crisis, their latest proposals, especially since the occurrence of the credit and banking crisis, are exactly the opposite, and they find themselves hardly capable of a sufficient mass of superlatives on the crisis in order to disguise themselves sufficiently with "radical" statements. "The collapse of capitalism" is already an expression which is too modest for the Social Democracy. It is the "final crisis," it is the "complete catastrophe," writes the leader of the I.L.P., the "leftest of the lefts," Maxton. "Therefore, no way out of this crisis can be seen," writes the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung* of 11th October, 1931. In a similar vein, Max Adler and Seydewitz write in the *Roten Büchern* that the present crisis of capitalism is completely insoluble.

Are the "theories" of the Social Democracy, especially those of the "lefts," merely the products of a panic in which the lackeys of capitalism have fallen, due to the collapse of the banks, bankruptcy of States, and the fall of the pound? By no means! The catastrophe theories of the Social Democracy have a much deeper meaning. These apparently revolutionary prophecies on the automatic collapse of capitalism have, namely, the function of raising tendencies of *fatalism and passivity* in the ranks of the proletariat suffering from the capitalist offensive. If the crisis cannot be solved, then the proletariat has to wait until capitalism collapses and socialism enters "of itself," i.e., without the proletarian revolution, without the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to exclude the activity of the proletariat, they go further and infer that the collapse of capitalism is already here :

"Il s'est détruit (le capitalisme) déjà, quand il a prouvé son incapacité à remplir ses obligations vitales, quand il est contraint de renier ses propres lois, quand il est frappé dans sa foi en lui-même. (Résolution de II. Internationale, 31 Octobre, 1931.)

The dissemination of fatalistic conceptions regarding the collapse of capitalism is, in the present phase of the crisis, and the class struggle, one of the *main manoeuvres* of the Social Democracy to hold the proletariat back from struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis. Therefore its exposure is one of the most important tasks in our struggle against the Social Democracy. It is equally necessary to carry on an energetic struggle against the penetration of Social Democratic conceptions into our own ranks, mechanical theories of collapse, un-dialectical conceptions of "no way out" of the crisis, "the self-destruction" of capitalism, and so on.

II.—CONTROL OF THE BANKS.

The "socialist" programmes of the Social Democracy, like the Social Democratic "theories" of the complete collapse, and the impossibility of any way out of the crisis of capitalism, have all one and the same purpose—to hold the proletariat back from revolutionary class struggle, and actively support all measures of the capitalist offensive against the proletariat.

Therefore the Social Democracy issues the deceptive slogan of Control of the Banks, in consideration of the Bank collapse, and its devastating results for the workers as well as the small-savings depositors.

For this reason the Second International manoeuvres, in consideration of the credit crisis, which paralyses the entire process of the circulation of capital, with the proposal of an international organisation of credit.

For this reason it invents and conceals with a veil of phantasy in a swindling manner the reality of the approach of State Capitalism. For this reason the Social Democrats add to the chorus of capitalist "planned economists" their own projects of "planned economy."

The most plausible of these "socialist" plans was the demand for the "Control of the Banks," issued by the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Labour Party. In the present swift exchange of confusionist manoeuvres and deceitful slogans which the Social Democracy issues in rapid succession, in each new expression of the crisis, the "Control of the Banks" is momentarily pushed into the background, but will be again put forward in various countries to meet new bank crises.

The Social Democratic Reichstag's fraction has issued the slogan "State Control over the Banks." The election programme of the Labour Party sounds "still more radical," demanding the "Nationalisation and (!) Control of the Banking and Credit Systems." The German Social Democracy has greeted the order issued by the Brüning Government for the institution of a State Banking Office as a triumph of "socialist principle." The *real* control of the banks consists in the fact that the State is granted the "right" to save the tottering big banks, by taking over their liabilities, and meeting them with the money of the toiling masses. The *reality* of the "Control of the Banks" signifies that still more power is concentrated in the hands of a handful of financial kings, in the hands of robber finance capital, who are granted the control over other groups in the form of "State supervision," and the centralisation of the credit and bank system, under the dictatorship of finance capital, is still more accelerated. But all this has absolutely nothing to do with a control of the banks, in the sense of a "limitation of their power," the prevention of their "misuse of capital," their "speculations," as the Social Democracy pretends, and partly greets as progress already achieved. For this reason it is also an error, if it is accepted on the communist side, that the control of the banks "constitutes the last battle-cry of threatened capitalism." Control of the banks is by no means the last deceitful slogan of the Social Democracy, to disguise the strengthened dictatorship of finance capital.

What do the proposals made by the Second International for an international credit office and international credit control mean? They are nothing else but the momentarily suitable formulae of the theory of *super-imperialism*. Precisely as the Kautskian theory of super-imperialism is based on the possibility of a peaceful elimination, and overcoming of imperialist contradictions; the swindle of the international regulation of the credit question is based on a similar view, namely, that the credit crisis is caused only by the defective organisation of credit, and that the contradictions of the imperialist groups can be excluded side by side with the maintenance of imperialism. This is the reason for the perpetual mendacious and positively idiotic appeals of Hilferding and Naphtali to "reason," and correspondingly their wails about the unreasonableness of those in power.

The proposals for a credit office proceed from the conception that the credit question can be regulated according to a plan, corresponding to the needs of the bourgeois States. Leon Blum, Hilferding and Co. repeat the proposal of Keynes,

pharisaically, that the financially strongest States should give credit to the financially weak ones. But the credit policy is not an equalising instrument, but an instrument of power in the hands of monopoly, with the help of which they endeavour to subjugate their competitors (e.g., France against Germany), or, correspondingly, to drive them from leading positions. Only complete idiots, or the most cunning deceivers, can believe, or try to persuade others to believe, that the credit relationships can be planfully arranged under capitalism "for the welfare of the community."

The proposals of the Second International and all Social Democratic Parties for the creation of an international credit organisation (a credit office, an international finance and credit conference, etc.) are silent on the fact that although monopoly capital has succeeded to postpone the beginning of the credit crisis, it has broken out, with all the greater force, that it is the unavoidable result of the entire world economic crisis, *a part of which it is*; that industrial crises, sharpening of the agrarian crisis, bank, stock exchange, and currency crises, are all interlocked elements of the world economic crisis; and infer, in a swindling manner, the possibility of an isolated solution of the credit crisis by means of organisational measures. They also maintain complete silence on the fact that the bourgeoisie, by no means accidentally, combines precisely these organisational measures, with an unheard-of plundering of the proletariat and the toiling peasant masses, as the chief method of the way out of the crisis.

Those attempts which have appeared also in our ranks, to deal with the credit crisis, as a special limited phase "of the crisis," are only capable of arousing false conceptions, on the inter-connection of the credit crisis, with other features of the *entire* crisis.

III.—STATE CAPITALISM AND PLANNED ECONOMY.

The same swindle regarding Control of the Banks is repeated by the Social Democracy in the question of State capitalism, although on a larger, more generalised scale. The new manoeuvre, with State capitalism, is engineered by the Austrian Social Democracy, but possesses here, nevertheless, considerable significance, as, in general, this deceit supplies, so to speak, the ideological arsenal of the Second International.

The bankruptcy of the theory of organised capitalism has occasioned the Social Democracy to follow its old aims with new ideological manoeuvres; to swindle the masses, that the development of capitalism of itself automatically leads to socialism; that in the capitalist countries we already find ourselves in a "transition period between capitalism and socialism" (Otto Bauer,

speech at the Grazer Party Conference of the Social Democratic Party of Austria). This theory has the aim of holding the workers back from struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, from struggle for the real socialism and not that put forward by the swindlers, and to disguise all the anti-working class measures of robber finance capitalism as "Socialist" measures favourable to socialism. Therefore it stands in the closest association with fatalistic conceptions, regarding "no way out of the crisis" for capitalism, and the Social Democrats base their manoeuvres of sophistry on this completely false basis.

First of all the "planned economy—State capitalism" is put forward as a programme demand. In the employment programme of the Austrian Social Democracy it says: "The economic crisis is a result of the anarchy of the capitalist method of production. It can only be overcome by a gradual transition to planned economic organisation."

After a series of "Five Year Plans" of Austrian economy have been outlined, these State capitalist measures (foreign trade monopoly, wholesale trade monopoly, transfer of the industrial concerns of the Austrian Kreditanstalt into State property) are combined into a "system": "The occupation of the commanding heights of economy will build a broad State capitalist sector in the private capitalist economy, a broad sector of State planned economy in capitalist anarchy."

The Social Democracy has not only made State capitalism the object of its longing, but also has found the fulfilment of this longing in the practice of finance capital and the bourgeois State. The guarantees, or correspondingly the transferred debts of the bankrupt big banks in Austria (Kreditanstalt), in Germany (Darmstädter Bank, Dresdner Bank), in Italy (Banca Commerciale), are adduced as proofs that State capitalism is already introduced in reality. "The epoch of finance capital is followed by the epoch of State capitalism: the rule of the banks over industry is followed by the rule of the States over the banks which rule industry."

"State capitalism which arises from the collapse of finance capital is not yet Socialism. But when the State rules the banks and through them industry, so will State capitalism transform into Socialism (!) as soon as the masses, who work in the factories, take the State power. No doubt, it is still a long way off." — Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*, 7th November, 1931.

In these passages this theoretical deception and its practical purpose, to hold back the workers from struggle, for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, have received a concentrated expression.

The latest Social Democratic swindle-manoeuvres are given a "Marxist" appearance, by means of expressions, taken from Marxism-Leninism, the sense of which is completely falsified with insolent unscrupulousness. On the basis of the theory of the mechanical collapse of capitalism, the latest events of the bank crisis are made out to be a new era of "State Capitalism." The essence of these events is, in reality, the further progress of the grafting of Finance Capital on to the State, which, during the period of the crisis, assumes particularly sharp forms. The very important State capitalist elements which were to be found, for example, in Germany, at the time of the imperialist world war, under the special circumstances of the blockade, are by no means to be confused with the contemporary events. "State Capitalism" serves Otto Bauer and his associates only to conceal the fact that finance capital utilises the machinery of State more than ever before, to concentrate finance capital; to more easily re-divide the national property in its own interests, and liquidate the crisis, at the cost of the working masses.

"Organised" capitalism has the function of deceiving the workers that high investments and capitalist rationalisation, the stabilisation of wages, with increased output, and intensity of labour, with the co-operation of the reformist trade unions, is Socialism.

"State Capitalism" has the function of presenting the crisis, the falling wages, and the transfer of all burdens of the crisis, on to the shoulders of the toilers; to them as the "way to Socialism." At the same time the force of the proletariat against the dictatorship of finance capital, to fight for its overthrow—and this is the purpose of this practice—shall be paralysed and broken, in so far as it is led astray as to the essence of the new events. It is only logical that Otto Bauer perceives "State Capitalism" as having been realised, especially in Italy. "State Capitalism exists precisely in Fascist Italy, in the most astounding extent and purity" (Speech at the Grazer Party Conference, Social Democratic Party of Austria).

At the same time, certain "successes" of the Soviet Union are "recognised" in a hypocritical way, but, however, as the result of State Capitalism, planned economy, whereby at the same time the old counter-revolutionary juxtaposition of Fascism and Bolshevism is continued.

It is very symptomatic that the Menshevik interventionists heartily endorse the Bauer theory of State Capitalism. For instance, Theodore Dan, who regards the "planful regulation" discovered by Bauer as the invention of a genius so much that he demands its extension not only

to national economies, but on a world economic scale as rapidly as possible (read: united advance against the U.S.S.R.), "The Capitalist Earth Quakes," *Marxist Tribune*, November, 1931. Vol. 1, No. 3.

The Social Democracy has been so unlucky in its manoeuvres, which group themselves around "State Capitalism," that the facts of reality have pitilessly struck the most beautiful formulas of deceit over "State Capitalism" full in the face: the Social Democracy has barely proclaimed "State Capitalism" as a new era, when the Austrian Kreditanstalt, this "prototype" of "State Capitalism" is handed over to foreign private capital, and as misfortunes never come singly, also the "nationalised" Darmstädter Bank is once again passing into private hands, in connection with a colossal concentration and fusion with the Kommerz Bank, whereby the State will fulfil its "State Capitalist" function in the form of a permanent loan of millions to the Darmstädter Bank.

The Emergency Decree of the Brüning Government of 9th December, 1931, which dictatorially reduced wages throughout the whole of Germany 10 to 15 per cent., supplies a classic proof that the "State intervention" demanded and highly praised by the Social Democrats of all countries, and especially from the "left" Austro-Marxists as "Socialist measures," is nothing else than the utilisation of the bourgeois State machinery for the unheard-of increase of the exploitation of the workers and the working masses. The "State intervention" means the further rapid Fascisation of the State, the sharpening of the reactionary dictatorship for crushing down the growing resistance of the rising masses, and finds in the state of siege created in Germany by Brüning, its police expression, and the Social Democracy declares, true to its treacherous rôle, through its mouth-piece, Hilferding, in the Committee of Supply of the German Reichstag, that the Emergency Decree constitutes a confirmation of the Socialist ideology (!)

The organ of the big capitalists of the Rhineland, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, can find no other possibility of justifying the fearful mass plundering and crushing of the mass resistance, by the dictatorship of finance capital, than to follow the footsteps of the Social Democracy and also name it "State Capitalism." *The cleverest organ of the German bourgeoisie borrows its arguments for the capitalist way out of the crisis from the "left" Social Democrats.*

This swindle with State Capitalism is enlarged and varied in a whole series of special questions. So in the question of the foreign trade monopoly, in the programme of the Austrian Social Demo-

cratic Party, as well as the programme of the Labour Party, the monopoly of foreign trade is now introduced as a new burning demand.

Just as "State Capitalism" serves Social Democracy in masquerading as "Socialist" before the masses, measures which in reality mean their more intense impoverishment, so the "Monopoly of Foreign Trade" of the Social Fascists is nothing more than a cover for the new high protective tariffs of Monopoly Capital, which are being erected in one capitalist country after another. The new protective tariffs which were initiated immediately following the English credit crisis and which are leading to a tariff war of "all against all," which instead of preventing the wild struggle for markets, causes it to wage with more intense violence, and causes the most fearful reduction in the standard of living of the masses—these are the tariffs which Social Democracy conceals by its insolent demagoguery of Monopoly of Foreign Trade, and on which it pronounces its blessing. The Monopoly of Foreign Trade in the hands of Monopoly Capital signifies nothing else but the Fascist programme of "autarchy," i.e., the self-sufficiency of the Capitalist State, a reactionary Utopian slogan, the real sense of which lies in the sharpening of irreconcilable Imperialist contradictions.

The "Monopoly of Foreign Trade" put forward by Social Democracy is realised in the same way as all their other measures, which are camouflaged by chatter about "State Capitalism." High protective tariffs are introduced by England, France and Italy, one after the other, and repeatedly increased. Germany plans retaliation, and so on. It remains for Social Democracy to mask this new campaign of robbery directed against the toilers by stealing the slogan of the Monopoly of Foreign Trade from the U.S.S.R., the realisation of which, through the Workers' State, commands the agreement and sympathy of the broad masses, but which in capitalist countries serves to mask their deception.

The Labour Party in its Election programme also demands Import and Export Boards, i.e., protective tariffs.

Helene Bauer's remarks in the *Kampf* are specially characteristic:—

"The successes of large commercial capital, the content of the continental treaties signed by them, can but clarify and determine the correct position of a country in the world market, bring with it a conscious and wished-for adaptation" (H. Bauer, "Socialism in one country," *Kampf*, No. 11, 1931).

Helene Bauer justifies Protection on the grounds that it is necessary in the interests of

lowering unemployment. (Just like the Election swindle of the English Conservatives.)

IV.—SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

The theory of the impossibility of Socialism in one country, i.e., in their own country, plays a great rôle in connection with the attempts of Social Democracy to restrain the masses from struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The present day Social Democratic theories, which prove this impossibility of commencing the establishment of Socialism in one's own country, are based on the denial of the possibilities for establishing Socialism *anywhere*.

The Austro-Marxists have worked out this argument in the greatest detail in Austria. "We are a poor small country." Should Austria introduce Socialism, then the capitalist countries would blockade it and starve it out in two weeks, etc. This swindling argument has a great international significance beyond the frontiers of Austria. In general it not only serves Social Democracy in the "small countries" as a justification for the counter-revolutionary policies of Social Democrats, but also serves for the "big countries." Thus, according to the logic of the Social Fascists, Socialism cannot be established in Germany, because Germany is also financially dependent on foreign countries, because Germany must export abroad, received credits from abroad, etc. Thus it is also impossible to establish Socialism in England, because then the Dominions and the Colonies would sever themselves, or if England was blockaded it would be incapable of feeding the population without them, and would be correspondingly starved out. Put in a nutshell, if no country can begin unless the other countries already have Socialism, then Socialism in *all countries* will be "postponed" indefinitely. In this way the Trotskyist theories of the impossibility of Socialism in one country serve all the betrayers of Socialism on an international scale as an argument.

This "theory" which Otto Bauer now adopts and dresses up for the needs of Western European countries, can best be tested by the *deeds* of Social Democracy. In 1919 when the Soviet Republic was established in Hungary, and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in Austria was likewise in the order of the day, *then* a Socialist Austria would not have been encircled and isolated. But what did Otto Bauer and Adler do at that time? They exercised all their powers in hindering the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialism in Austria, and to bring the Soviet dictatorship in Hungary to grief.

The impossibility of Socialism in one's own country is the reasonable variant of the Trotsky-

ist opinion of the impossibility of Socialism in one country. Under the influence of the growing sympathies of the Social Democratic workers for the land of Socialist construction, an admitted *exception is made* of the U.S.S.R.—but this withdrawal, this recognition of the achievements of the U.S.S.R. is used in a hypocritical and mendacious fashion only for manoeuvring again, for emphasising the impossibility of Socialism in one's own country. This is the sense of Renner's latest discovery, who declared at the Conference of the Austrian Social Democratic Party held in Graz: "Socialism demands industrialisation—but in Austria we cannot industrialise. Of course, in Siberia—there, there is some sense in industrialisation! Give me a Siberia, then we will industrialise also . . ." This economic variation of the impossibility of Socialism in one's own country deserves our attention, because it can likewise obtain an international significance.

The manoeuvre of the "poor little country" would not be complete without the pathetic appeal for the Great Day "when it begins." "We must be prepared so that as soon as the decisive hour strikes between Capitalism and Socialism throughout the great wide world, as a consequence of the world economic crisis, the Austrian working class can also utilise it to overcome bourgeois class domination in the State, and capitalist domination over economy" (Resolution of the Graz Congress of the S.P.A.).

The "left" opportunist waiting for the Great Day "when it starts" is formulated excellently in the above. What is not understandable is—when and where can the "hour of decisive struggle" strike, if the small countries cannot commence the revolution because they would be swiftly defeated, and because their territories are too small to manoeuvre in, if conquered Germany cannot commence it, as a consequence of its dependence on the victorious countries, if England—one of the victorious countries in the Great War—cannot commence it, because it risks starvation without its Colonies and Dominions, etc., etc.

V.—"SOCIALISM" AGAINST THE FIGHT FOR DAILY DEMANDS.

One of the most infamous manoeuvres of the Social Fascists—who falsify the idea of Socialism in every possible way, and transform it into its opposite—is to play off "Socialism" against the daily struggles of the proletariat. The formula for this was already found at the Vienna Congress of the Second International. "If it was formerly said that the movement is everything and the aim nothing, now we say that the aim is all," said Austerlitz.

With this formula Social Democracy tries to keep the proletariat back from the daily struggle for work and bread, against wage-cuts, against the reduction in the social services, and therewith from the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

This line is expressed in the most crude and clumsy way by the S.P.D., and in the most subtle cunning manner by the *Vie Socialiste*, the organ of the *Right-wing* of French Social Democracy.

German Social Democracy discovers—in order to justify its cessation of any opposition to the destruction of the social services, which is being carried through step by step by Brüning—that there is no more point in carrying on social-political struggles. For "the system of capitalist profit economy is bankrupt." Therefore what faces us to-day is "the great decision," i.e., "Socialism."

The *Vorwärts* writes: "The Social Democratic front-line trench is to-day—to continue to speak in military terminology—*near the theatre of war*. The chief theatre of war lies on the economic-political field: here the general decision will be achieved, which, finally, is also the decision about social policy. The great struggle between the economic principles of capitalism and socialism is under way" (*Vorwärts*, 7th September, 1931).

This announcement means that Social Democracy in the future will also give up its sham struggle against the atrocious measures which the Emergency Decrees bring with them in all spheres of social policy in Germany.

The French variation of this deceitful manoeuvre is undertaken in the form of a cunning demagogical "retraction" of reformism. "*The time for reformism is past*," declares the right Renaudel wing of the French Socialist Party, following the line of Louis Vallon in the *Vie Socialiste* of November 7th. Reformism has, up to the present, "fought" for distribution. But "the reformism of distribution is now past. The urgent socialist work lies in the field of production." According to this, the fight for unemployment insurance is also now without sense. But neither can wages be defended.

"The chronic unemployment which increases from day to day makes any effort to defend wages illusory, which is not supported by an action which is directed towards production."

In the same measure every fight for bread and wages is fruitless according to "the critics" of reformism, so long as we do not control production. But to control production, to want to seize power in one country, is senseless. This can only be done by an "international action" . . .

Another shining light of Social Democracy, Paul Löbe, writes just in this sense:—

"The crisis from which we are suffering can only be overcome *internationally*." "Further, the crisis which we are suffering from can only be overcome by quite *radical measures*."

In this way the Trotskyist conceptions against the daily struggles of the proletariat are utilised to dishearten and confuse the working class. The points common between Trotskyism and the most right reformism meet in complete identity. Not only socialism, but also every fight for the maintenance of the standard of living of the workers is impossible in one country. This is the sense of the teaching of the "urgent socialist international action," which makes its appearance in the form of a "criticism of reformism" and which is only a logical formulation of the opinions of Trotsky and Bauer.

VI.—INTERNATIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

The *international relations* of one country are used for the most varied manoeuvres, with the help of which the belief is inculcated that the fight for daily demands or the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of proletarian power, is impossible. International connections play for Social Democracy, in the methodological sense, the rôle of objective "circumstances," the rôle of factors independent of our will, against whose overpowering influence the subjective factor is powerless. This kind of fatalism plays the greatest rôle in the whole argumentation of Social Democracy against the proletarian revolution.

Social democracy manoeuvres particularly with the "priority of foreign policy" as against home policy. This same enormous betrayal is repeated in various forms: in order to bar the way to the masses from the revolutionary way out of the crisis, in order to make it impossible for them to take this way of *struggle* against their own bourgeoisie, they are swindled by the priority and pre-eminence of foreign policy. In corresponding fashion, the Labour Party announced that the American bankers wanted to force their dictatorship on England and that MacDonald's "tragic mistake" consisted in that he capitulated before the dictates of the American bankers—later it was called the dictates of New York and Paris. This was said at the time of the overthrow of the Labour Government and the formation of the first "National Government." This same swindle was dressed up in French clothes by Leon Blum and repeated in the *Populaire*. This pre-eminence of foreign policy was one of the central arguments of German Social Democracy long before the present crisis—since 1919, in fact—against every revolutionary struggle of the German proletariat against the German and

international bourgeoisie. The same in Austria, Hungary and so on. When the foreign political factors are the decisive ones, then there arises essentially from this the co-operation with their own bourgeoisie, which is only an object of "foreign" attacks. Just as in the imperialist war the home bourgeoisie was at that time relieved of its responsibility for the world war, so to-day they are relieved from their responsibility for the crisis.

The priority of foreign policy as against home policy, this old thesis of reactionary imperialism (defended especially by the ideologists of German imperialism) has been renewed by *fascism*, and placed as the centre point of their policy by the social fascists. It is repeated the more, the more the class contradictions sharpen within the country itself, the more the enormous accentuation of the crisis places before the proletariat the task of preparing for decisive struggles with their own bourgeoisie.

The concentration of the main point of policy on the "international circumstances" is according to its method the same manoeuvre as the wail of Otto Bauer about "poor, small Austria," which, by itself, cannot establish Socialism. It is all the more important to expose this argumentation, these Social Democratic swindles, since their influence sometimes penetrates into our own ranks (as, for example, when the Young Plan is explained as the cause, or as the central problem of the crisis for Germany). The *Reparations question* supplies a particularly broad field for the "international" swindling manoeuvres of Social Democracy. At the time prior to the Lausanne Reparations Conference where the Lords of London and Paris High Finance threatened America with a moratorium for the war-debts payments, Leon Blum and Hilferding-Wels promptly discovered that America was responsible for the crisis and all misfortunes. "L'Amérique complique tout," wrote Mr. Blum. "Europe, defend yourself," seconded the *Vorwärts*. "European solidarity" against egotistical America, this is the newest variation of the "international" manoeuvres of Social Democracy which naturally only means a *powerful* relief and support for the bourgeoisie.

VII.—"GIVE US POWER."

"Socialism in our time"; control of the banks, planned economy, State capitalism, monopoly of foreign trade—all these various manoeuvres, which are carried through with an unheard-of utilisation of the most cunning demagogy, radical phraseology and confusing sophistry, are based as far as their class content is concerned, on one and the same point. Their task consists in hold-

ing back the proletariat—seeking for a way out of the crisis, and seeing this way out in Socialism—from the *class struggle*, from the *struggle for power*. Therefore, the placing of the question of power is of decisive central importance for the exposure of the Social Democratic swindling manoeuvres which are possible and necessary in the most various combinations. All the recipes and programmes of Social Democracy which are introduced under the treacherous mask of “socialist” slogans are based on the fundamental Social Democratic betrayal, *the displacement of the class idea by the classless idea*. When the S.P.D. demands “State control of the banks” and sees the fulfilment of this “socialist” demand in the Brüning Bank Dept., it thereby places the State above classes, in the same way as when Otto Bauer greets State capitalism as a transition to Socialism, or when the S.P.D. gives out the slogan, “Enough for the present, State! intervene.”

The Social Democratic manoeuvres of treachery are based on the lying theory of the classless character of the State in the *question of the conquest of power*. The Social Democracy which regards the conquest of power by the proletariat as a peaceful taking over of the ready-made bourgeois State machinery and as the path to this, the securing of a parliamentary majority, including participation in parliamentary governments, is forced, after the discrediting of the coalition policy and of the “Labour” Government before the masses, to produce new “left” phrases and also to shout about the conquest of power. In this way, for example, the election manifesto of the I.L.P. speaks of the “winning of power for Socialism.” “This is the immediate and decisive way out. We can no longer ignore it. We must carry on the fight to the end” (*New Leader*, September 7th). Every second word in the articles, programmes and manifestoes of the I.L.P. is adorned with “socialist fighting policy for the conquest of power,” but all this chatter does not in the least prevent them from declaring in their programme of action that a *Labour majority in Parliament* is the aim of “the political struggle.” During the election campaign the I.L.P. laid it down that the Labour Party “had broken with the reformist traditions and is consciously striving for economic power” (Brailsford) by its fight against the National Government and its election programme. Two months after the election the I.L.P. has already become “left” again in its criticism of the Labour Party, and concludes that the Labour Party is just as “gradualist” as before.

The more the entire development of the class struggle places the question of the conquest of

power on the order of the day the more are the “left” scoundrels concerned in holding back the proletariat from the only way of conquering power, from the only way to Socialism, namely, the violent destruction of the power of the bourgeoisie. In order to give their strategy of treachery a left complexion, Otto Bauer, Max Adler and Co. declare themselves in agreement with the “Russian way,” but for Russia and only for Russia.

“No, it is an illusion to believe that the working class can now, in times of peace, repeat anywhere (!) what war and defeat made possible in Russia. In Central Europe any attempt to forcibly shatter democracy would end to-day not with victory of the proletariat but with the victory of fascism” (Otto Bauer).

In their attempts to sidetrack the workers on the seizure of power by the workers, to club their struggles and to enchain them, international Social Democracy uses various tricks, such as:

(1) The repetition of the old formula about the parliamentary conquest by a majority (“Give us a majority, give us power.” This is what the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* wrote on 5th August).

(2) To shout in full chorus about “Socialism,” “control,” etc., but to remain absolutely silent on the fact that Socialism, control, socialisation, can only be *realised* under such conditions as when the proletariat has overthrown the power of the exploiters by revolutionary force.

This method was utilised by the Labour Party in the election campaign—as in England, where the Labour Party has never previously raised the slogan of Socialism—broad masses of English workers voted for it under the illusion that it had now really changed its policy.

(3) When it is necessary to deceive class-conscious workers who have no more trust in the “peaceful conquest of a parliamentary majority,” then they attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the workers with the aid of “theoretical” recognition of force. The leaders of the I.L.P. are masters of this art.

“When a revolutionary situation already exists it is the task of the Socialist pacifists to develop a technique which will satisfy the masses in order that power may be secured with a minimum of force.” — (Fenner Brockway, *Daily Herald*, August 26th, 1931.)

This contemptible parsonic hypocrisy on the part of these “revolutionary” socialists—the leaders of the I.L.P.—really constitutes a record. The talk about this “technique” of the “minimum of force” (probably the “arming of the workers” with walking-sticks against machine-guns) has

clearly no other aim than the physical and moral disarmament of the proletariat, which will be followed by the physical annihilation of the revolutionary working class by the bourgeoisie, using a *maximum of force*.

The experiences of the last month show that the "left" manoeuvres in connection with the question of power as far as Socialism is concerned, has not yet been seen through by broad masses. The task which the 11th Plenum of the E.C.C.I placed before the parties, that of freeing the masses from the influences of Social Democracy, can only be carried out when these manoeuvres are not only exposed, ideologically and theoretically, but in their *practice* also.

When Social Democracy to-day puts forward its deceitful "socialist" programme in order to keep the workers back from the struggle for practical daily demands, it is the task of the Communists to show the masses that the proletariat cannot *conduct a successful fight for its final aims*, without the daily fight for its interests. The masses, who even to-day are the victims of the blackguardly "left" manoeuvres of Social

Democracy, will see through them all, to the degree that they convince themselves of the treacherous activities of Social Democracy and the necessity for the revolutionary way out of the crisis in the practical struggle against impoverishment, against Fascism, against the bourgeois dictatorship in all its forms.

"In exposing the manoeuvres of Social Democracy, in deeds, the sections of the C.I. must, on the basis of a concrete platform of every-day demands, expose in a manner intelligible to the masses every single act of treachery on the part of Social Democracy, and organise a joint struggle with the Social Democratic workers against the capitalist offensive, against International War and Fascist reaction."—(Theses of 11th Plenum E.C.C.I.).

These directives of the E.C.C.I. only assume an increased importance in view of the newest "socialist" manoeuvres of Social Democracy. To realise them means to expose Social Fascism before the masses, and to lead the masses on to the path of decisive struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis and for Socialism.

THE UNFULFILLED TASKS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION (Preparatory to the IV. Congress of the C.P. of Spain)

I. ESTIMATION OF THE GENERAL POLITICAL SITUATION IN SPAIN.

THE revolutionary events which have taken place during the last few days in Spain entirely confirm the correctness of the instructions of the Communist International, which were embodied in the letter of the Western European Bureau of the E.C.C.I. to all members of the Communist Party of Spain.

"*The immediate prospects,*" we read in this letter, "*are fraught, not with 'social peace,' or stable political 'equilibrium,' but with severe class struggles, a new outburst of the revolutionary storm . . .*"

The revolutionary movement of the Spanish proletariat, after several months of comparatively slow development, has once more entered the path of revolutionary upsurge.

What characterises the present political situation in Spain?

There exists, without doubt, a further *sharpening of class contradictions and class conflicts*.

The sharpening of the class struggle was most clearly shown in a number of *mass general strikes* in the largest towns and industrial centres of the land (in Barcelona, Seville, Bilbao, Malaga, Corunna, etc., etc.), *in the local political move-*

ments of the agricultural proletariat and peasantry (thousand-strong political strike of the agricultural workers in Badajoz, the seizure of the lands of the landlords by the peasants of Almarce, Ferio, Tselamei, etc.), *the spontaneous efforts of the workers and peasants to disarm the gendarmerie and small military units and to arm themselves* (disarmament of the gendarmerie by the workers of Mandesa, Corunna, Sagunto, disarming of the gendarmerie by the peasants in Castille Blanco, confiscation of military supplies by the workers in Saliente, attack upon the Suria arsenal, seizure of arms by the coalminers in Salsone and Figolse, etc.), *in the seizure of Governmental and municipal institutions by the revolutionary masses* (in Berga, Suria, etc.).

The general strike in *Seville*, as well as the strike movements in *Ponta Vedra, Alicante, Cordova*, are of an especially militant nature, and are led entirely by the Communist Party of Spain. They are taking place under the following slogans:

A 25 per cent. increase in wages for all workers.

Immediate realisation of the demands of the railwaymen.

For the 7-hour working day.

Immediate expulsion of the large landowners and return of the land, without compensation, to the peasants and agricultural workers. A 100 per cent. increase in the wages of agricultural workers.

Against the Defence of the Republic laws.

Against the prohibition and persecution of the Spanish Communist Party, the Anarchist Iberian Federation and other workers' and peasant organisations. For the immediate release of all political prisoners from among the workers and peasants.

For the immediate disbandment of the Civil Guard.

For the dissolution and expulsion of religious institutions.

Against the Government of hunger, misery and unemployment.

For the workers' and peasants' revolutionary government.

These slogans go to prove that the Spanish Communist Party has quickly learned to combine the partial demands of the workers with the most actual political slogans of the moment in their mass struggle.

At the same time, even before the new upsurge of the mass movement towards the end of January, 1932, attempts could be found in the working class movement in the direction of creating a *united revolutionary front from below*, led and organised by the Spanish Communist Party.

Several strikes (for example, the November strike-wave in Bilbao, when 8,000 workers went on strike in three undertakings which up to then had been the strongholds of the reformist unions) were carried on successfully on the basis of the united front tactic from below, in the struggle against the owners, and the leaders of the General Workers' Union.

In Saragossa a meeting of the reformist railwaymen's union was dispersed, because the participants refused to allow one of the leaders of the Socialist Party, Triphen Gometz to speak, by shouting "Down with Prieto!" (a social-democratic minister), "Long live the united front," "Long live the strike."

The reformist union of typographical workers demanded the dismissal of the gendarmerie and the annulment of the Defence of the Republic legislation, introduced by Largo Kabalero, the Socialist Minister, against the Communists and the revolutionary trade union organisation.

In reply to the invitation sent out by the trade union organisations of San Sebastieno, which are under the leadership of the Spanish Communist Party, to all the Spanish trade unions, requesting them to take part in the Trade Union Unity Conference in February of this year, over eighty

organisations, with a total membership of over 170,000 members, of whom many belong both to the reformist General Workers' Union and to the syndicalist National Confederation of Labour, answered in the affirmative.

The Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions have taken the first serious steps along the road towards winning over the majority of the working class to their side. The tactic of the united front from below in connection with the struggle for the immediate demands of the workers and on behalf of trade union unity, wherever it has been adopted, has given the party the opportunity of increasing its influence, of getting roots among the masses and of drawing them into the struggle under the Party's influence. The initiative shown by the Party in connection with revolutionary trade union unity was extremely successful in the autonomous trade union organisations and in those organisations which were affiliated to the General Workers' Union and the National Confederation of Labour, despite the open sabotage of their leaders, and met with a mighty response among the unorganised masses.

The Party and the revolutionary trade unions are ever more actively preparing strikes and stimulating the workers' fights (among the railwaymen, the metal workers and so on); they are gradually penetrating into the factories and are trying to establish connections in the workshops.

The Party is extending its organisation throughout various districts and acquiring a basis on a national scale. Its membership is increasing. The daily Party organ, *Munde Obrero*, has already undergone constant repression by the republican powers, and has become the true organ of the masses of workers and peasants. A clear example of the support given by the toiling masses to the Communist Press is the extent of the subscriptions made to the Party organ during December, which, in the course of a few days, amounted to about twenty thousand pesetas. The circulation of the paper is 25,000, which is more than that of the Socialist Press, and is well on the heels of the circulation of the anarcho-syndicalist organ.

However, in spite of these successes in connection with the united front tactic and the increased influence of the Party, the movement, nevertheless, remains to a considerable extent *spontaneous*. The anarcho-syndicalist illusions and methods of struggle are still very strongly-rooted among the masses, and very considerably hinder attempts at *organised struggle*. The Communist Party does not sufficiently lead the *organisational consolidation* of the successes gained by the proletariat. Most characteristic in this respect is the *inactivity of the workshop-commit-*

tees, which were elected during the height of the Seville strike in the summer of 1931; and this is not the only example. At the same time the task of *organising the proletariat*, of *organising and leading the revolution*, is the most important, the central task of the moment.

The degree of development achieved by the movement is *unequal* throughout the country. Side by side with those regions where the movement is *advanced*, where the Communist Party has gained decisive influence among the masses of the proletariat (Seville) or where it is on the road to this (Bilbao), where the struggle of the proletariat is distinguished by its comparatively clear economic and political slogans, and is an *example of organisation and discipline* (we should mention, without going into a survey of the whole tactic of the Party in the developing movement, that the general strike in Seville and in other towns began on January 26, i.e., a day earlier than was appointed by the Communist Party), there are *backward* regions (as regards class-consciousness and organisation), where the movement is not so far ahead.

Among these regions we find Catalonia, and especially the very large proletarian region, Barcelona, where the Communists, despite the favourable conditions and the wide development of the mass revolutionary, spontaneous movement, and because of an *underestimation of the importance of the national question*, and because of *sectarian mistakes* in operating the united front tactic, were not able to gain predominating influence among the masses of the proletariat, and where, in consequence, the leadership of the mass movement of the working class remained with the anarcho-syndicalist National Confederation of Labour, which is in a state of disintegration. Meanwhile anarchist-syndicalist leadership in this district, which is of vital importance to the fate of the proletarian movement in Spain, disorganises the proletariat and delays their political struggle against the Republican Government and their fight for partial economic demands, thus subjecting the proletariat to the influence of the bourgeoisie and limiting their activities to fruitless, unorganised activities under vague, unclear slogans.

It is just the same in Bilbao, an extremely large proletarian centre, where the influence of the Communist Party is growing, where recently the Party has been successfully leading several strikes in the factories which were previously very strongly reformist; here *the influence of the Socialists cannot in any way be considered to be undermined as yet*.

It is absolutely obvious, however, that without winning over the majority of the working class

in those regions of the country which are of vital importance—and this beyond all doubt includes Barcelona, Bilbao, and so on — it is useless to think of a successful, victorious struggle to overthrow the bourgeois-landlord system and to set up a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in the form of Soviets.

The Party's backwardness is most clearly shown in the fact that the Party is still *not at the head of the mass strike movement*, which breaks out spontaneously very frequently against the will of the Socialist and Anarchist-syndicalist leaders in many parts of the country. Indeed, who is leading the wave of strikes which has seized almost the whole of Spain? In the overwhelming majority of cases, it is not the Party, not our trade union organisations, but the Anarchist-syndicalist organisations, which are leading the strikes to defeat. True, the Party and our trade unions led the strikes which broke out recently in Seville. The work of the Party during the recent Biscay strike was also very considerable. The Party is working actively in connection with preparations for the strike movement in Madrid. But throughout the rest of the country, the leaders of the National Confederation of Labour are leading and betraying the strikes.

Meanwhile, without leading the strike movement and making short work of the manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie, the Socialists and the Anarchist-syndicalists to smash the strikes, it will be impossible to lead the revolution successfully.

It is obvious, furthermore, that the Spanish proletariat (primarily in view of the weakness of its political vanguard—the Communist Party) has not yet been able to organise the *peasantry* and rouse them to the struggle; the movement of the peasantry, although it has developed during the last few months, is still in the majority of districts on a *low level*, and does not embrace the main sections in the most important areas in Spain. The Social Democratic and Anarchist-syndicalist survivals, as well as the insufficient resistance to those who are inclined towards Trotskyism, to the muddlers inside the party, have served to explain the insufficient activity shown in the work among the peasantry. Although in this respect a change has taken place of late, nevertheless, even the latest appeals sent out by the Party to the peasantry have not been sufficiently concrete and, which is especially important, have not sufficiently assisted the organisation and development of the revolutionary agrarian movement. Thus, for example, in these appeals the Party did not define its attitude towards the slogans of the peasantry in the advanced sections of this mass movement, the

seizure of the landlord's lands by the agricultural labourers and peasants, the redistribution of the land, the *seizure and redistribution of the landlord's grain*, the organisation of resistance to the landlords and gendarmerie, the armed defence of the lands confiscated from the landlords. Meanwhile the *fundamental unit*, which will be able to rouse and organise the agrarian revolution, is to be found in just these demands of the peasantry and in the task of creating *peasant committees*.

The weakness of the work of the Communists among the peasantry could not but reflect itself also in the situation in the *army*, which despite the fact that the Communist Party in several towns was able to organise demonstrations in the barracks, and that considerable dissatisfaction existed among the masses of soldiers, nevertheless *taken on the whole*, the army remains obedient to its officers and takes part in the class struggle on the side of the landlords and bourgeoisie against the people. The *passivity* of the party to a great extent was responsible for the fact that the soldiers' movement lagged behind revolutionary events. At the same time, the *struggle for the army*, side by side with the struggle for the *arming* of the workers and peasants, is the actual *practical* task of the moment.

The Party itself is still far from being a *mass Bolshevik Communist Party*. For a long time "it was, and still, unfortunately, remains a *victim to sectarian and Anarchist traditions*" (see the letter of the Western European Bureau of the E.C.C.I.) It is this state of affairs inside the Party (together with the Party's right-opportunist mistakes and tendency) which has hindered its mass work, has prevented the formation of strong ties between the party and the masses.

* * * *

All these weaknesses of the movement, however, in no way lessen the importance of the growing struggle of the proletariat. Events prove that there are gigantic revolutionary possibilities inherent in the masses of the heroic Spanish proletariat; that the proletariat can be an enormous force under the leadership of the Communist Party, when it has learned to overcome its confidence in Anarchist-syndicalist and Socialist leaders, when it finally lives down the democratic and syndicalist illusions, which are still very strong in its midst (although they decrease from day to day) and which hamper its energy and initiative, direct its struggle along false roads, which offer no perspectives either of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and landlords, or even of the organisation of any sort of successful resistance to the increasing

attacks of the bourgeoisie and landlords upon the standard of living of the proletariat and toiling masses, upon their elementary political freedom, upon their revolutionary organisations (and first and foremost the Communist Party).

The attacks of the exploiting classes upon the toiling masses grow more energetic and stubborn every day.

The further sharpening of the economic and agrarian crisis, the drop in the exchange value of the peseta, the curtailment of industrial production, the diminished returns on the soil and decreased harvest of agricultural cultures, the catastrophic drop in exports—all these manifestations of the economic crisis are accompanied by mass dismissals of workers from the factories and from agriculture (the number of unemployed workers in Spanish towns and villages already exceeds one million), by fresh attacks on the workers' wages both in the form of a direct cut by the owners and by means of transferring the burden of social insurance to the shoulders of the workers (the decree of Largo Kabalero, "working class," Socialist Minister, concerning compulsory social insurance for maternity at the expense of the workers and not the bosses), by the systematic smashing of the revolutionary trade union organisations by the local republican authorities, by mass arrests of Communists and revolutionary Anarchist-syndicalist workers, and last but not least, by the white terror of the gendarmerie and monarchist officers, which increases daily throughout the country.

The Spanish bourgeoisie makes use of, and cultivates to the utmost, the fact that the Spanish proletariat is split among several organisations; it sets these trade union organisations one against the other; it does its utmost to prevent the working class from fulfilling its desire for unity; and on this basis it carries out its offensive. The bourgeoisie tries to make civil war among the workers, systematically provoking conflicts among its separate detachments, using revolvers, etc., in order to prevent the civil war of the proletariat from developing against the bourgeoisie. The leaders of the Reformist and Anarchist-syndicalist trade unions work directly on behalf of the boss offensive amongst the working class, sometimes openly organising strike-breaking and splitting tactics, sometimes masking their treachery behind all kinds of "left" observations about the "impossibility of carrying on the economic struggle during the crisis," about the "excessive demands of the workers being prohibitive since they are a menace to the victory of the revolution," etc., etc.

The bourgeoisie and bourgeois-landlord, republican Government, however, not satisfied with

these services of the Socialist and Syndicalist strike-breakers and traitors, are continually to an increasing extent, using methods of *open suppression* against all signs of struggle, including the struggle for the economic demands of the Spanish working class. The months which preceded the recent events were witness to *growing political reaction* and at the same time to the increased revolutionary mood among the masses of workers and peasants; they were witness to the beginning of violent attacks upon the working class and peasantry by the factory-owners and bourgeois-landlord State (helped by the Socialist Party and the leaders of Anarchist-syndicalism). The mass shooting of peaceful demonstrators by the gendarmerie and military, the bloody repressions against the revolutionary peasantry, the murder of unarmed revolutionary workers, guilty merely of trying to maintain their present level of wages by means of strike action, has spread throughout the entire country.

In the beginning of December last year, the gendarmerie tried to drown the big strike in Guisona in blood (four workers being killed and twelve wounded); in Saragossa the strike against forced insurance at the expense of the workers was paid for by *one worker killed and one heavily wounded*; on December 14, the gendarmerie shot down a *peaceful demonstration*, organised by the Syndicalist trade unions in Huesca to commemorate the death of the heroes of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, who fell in the fight against the monarchy; as a result *many workers were wounded and one was killed on the spot*; on December 27, shots were fired at the demonstration of *agricultural workers and peasants in the Almarja village — two being killed and many wounded*; in the same way the gendarmerie attempted to suppress the movement of the agricultural workers and peasants by armed force in the Badajos province; here eighty thousand persons took part and the *murder* of one old peasant by the gendarmes was revenged by the revolutionary masses *disarming the gendarmes*. In January, the repressions increased. On January 2, the gendarmerie shot down the peaceful demonstration in Salomea (*two workers were killed and many wounded*), in Heres *two workers were killed, in Puertolano, one*; on January 3, the gendarmes *killed two striking workers and wounded eleven* during a demonstration in Epila (near Zarozzi); the gendarmes soon after this, created bloodshed in the little town of Arnedo—here they shot down a *peaceful demonstration of strikers, all of whom belonged to Reformist Trade Unions—four women were killed instantly, one man and one three-year-old child; thirty men and women were wounded, three of whom died*

the following day. On January 17th, in Bilbao, there was a bloody conflict between the Social Democratic workers and the Catholics (members of the "Traditionalist Club"), which was provoked by the latter, and *three workers* and one Catholic *were shot*. Following upon this a general strike broke out in Bilbao and mass demonstrations of the population took place.

The bourgeoisie and landlords are launching civil war, thus seeking to drown the revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement in rivers of blood, to drain the strength of the proletariat, to hinder the proletariat in its work of training revolutionary leaders, by mass arrests, to drive their revolutionary organisations (first and foremost the Communist Party) underground.

The developing revolutionary struggle of the proletariat—the general strike in Seville, Bilbao, Barcelona, and so on, which began in the middle of January, 1932, is proof of the further intensification of the revolutionary crisis, and forces the bourgeoisie and landlords to mobilise all their forces to put down the revolutionary movement by bloodshed.

The bourgeois-landlord government of Asalia and Kaballero is making mass arrests among the Communists (in Barcelona, in Seville, and so on). The whole of the Communist Press has been suppressed. Strong armed forces are being sent to those districts where military activities are most violent; the republican government is sending a squad of cavalry, artillery batteries, squads of army aeroplanes, cruisers, to Barcelona and Seville and the surrounding districts. On the eve of a general strike in Seville, which was called by the revolutionary trade unions and the Communist Party for January 26; all the strategic points in the town were occupied by troops, machine guns were trained from the roofs, the buildings of workers' organisations closed down. The head of the counter-revolutionary government, Asania, on behalf of whom a vote of confidence was passed by the bourgeois-landlord, republican-Socialist parliament, and who was given dictatorial powers, now declares that he will energetically suppress all agitation; the chief of the punitive expedition sent to Barcelona threatens to deal severely with the people and "to tolerate no abuse or threats either in words or deeds." The troops and gendarmerie are already storming the reinforcements sent forward by the revolutionary people. In the district of Berga-Salient-Manros (a province in Barcelona), armed conflicts between the workers and armed detachments went on for several days.

The Socialist Party, the Government Party, acts as the *chief instigator of counter-revolution*. It incites the government, the troops, the gen-

darmerie to increasingly inhuman reprisals against the workers and peasants, against the Communists. Its central organ *El Socialista* considers that the hangman government of Asania, which shoots down workers and peasants, is showing a degree of "tolerance, which the enemies of the republic regard as weakness." All their agitation is aimed *against the Communist Party* — the only party of the proletariat, — *against the general political strike*, which was called by the Communist Party for January 26th, and which was brought about in Seville.

"The extreme red elements are rising," writes the *El Socialista*, . . . "these fanatics make license of a freedom which they do not deserve. . . We hope that the republican government will drop its present position of tolerance and refuse to allow one province after another, one town after another, to suffer the deplorable events which threaten to develop into civil war."

The leaders of the Anarchist-syndicalist movement have taken up a position closer to the Governmental Social Democratic Party now that the revolutionary mass struggle has begun to develop throughout the land; they support Social Democracy from outside, carry on strike-breaking tactics together with Social Democracy, they fought in unison with Social Democracy against the general strike of January 26th. For instance, the Anarchist-syndicalist Trade Unions of Asturia, Galicia, Saragossa, published an appeal to the workers not to take part in the general strike organised by the Communists. The Anarchist-syndicalist leaders thus revealed their truly treacherous nature, their rôle as auxiliaries of the bourgeois-landlord Government of Asania-Kaballero, as supporters of the butchery by the republican gendarmerie and militarists, who hide their true nature behind demagogic "left" phrases and adventurist actions (harming the cause of the working class and serving the ends of the bourgeoisie).

* * * *

What was the cause of this open transition of the bourgeois-landlord government to its present policy of suppressing and smashing the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants of Spain?

The further differentiation of class forces in the movement, the further revolutionising of the toiling masses, which have begun to lose their old illusions, their confidence in the capitalists and landlords, their faith in Socialist and Anarchist-syndicalist leaders, the increasing insolence of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, and the step to the right taken by that section of the town and petty bourgeoisie who follow in its

train. Here we find the difference between the political situation to-day and the situation which came about immediately after the revolutionary events of April 14, 1931.

"The re-grouping of classes and parties which began during the April days is now quite clearly defined. We are now faced with a new alignment of class forces and parties. The republican big bourgeoisie are playing the leading rôle in the counter-revolutionary camp, and are actively supported in this by the forces of monarchist counter-revolution—the landlords, the church, the military officers, and, subject to them, the town bourgeoisie and its party, and the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeois parties of the Catalonia nationalities.

"The revolutionary camp consists of the proletariat and the peasantry." (From the letter of the Western European Bureau of the E.C.C.I. to all members of the Spanish Communist Party).

The bourgeoisie, which came to power by means of a bloc with the agrarian elements after the downfall of the monarchy, has not fulfilled one of the fundamental tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Spanish bourgeois republic, which in the Constitution styles itself the "Republic of the toilers of all classes" has maintained in almost exactly the same form as before, all the class privileges, feudal and bourgeois, which existed before the downfall of the monarchy.

The problem of nationalities and the oppressed nations of the colonies is without solution. The position of cultural autonomy which was extended to Catalonia is nothing but a bargain between the central Spanish Imperialist Government and the rich local bourgeoisie in the interests of still further exploiting the toiling masses of oppressed nationalities and of suppressing the revolutionary movement.

The separation of the Church from the State (the abolition of religious orders and confiscation of their property), which was passed in principle by the constitutional assembly, has not been put into operation, and the church maintains almost all its privileges. Only during the last few weeks, owing to pressure brought to bear upon it by the outbreak of the revolutionary movement, has the Spanish Government tricked the masses with its regulation concerning the exile of Jesuits and confiscation of the property of the Jesuit order. It should be borne in mind, however, that all the capital of the Jesuits was invested in banks in the names of non-Jesuits even during the time of the monarchy (when the Jesuit order was prohibited), so that this new governmental decree is just so many empty words, with which to fool the masses.

What is the position in Spain as regards the agrarian question, the central question in the bourgeois-democratic revolution?

It appears that there is a further sharp intensification of all class contradictions on the basis of the maintenance of all the old social relations in the village. The semi-feudal survivals are untouched in the village. The constitution has not destroyed a single feudal privilege. The "Foros," "Rabassa Morta," "Condo Minis" and so on, all continue to exist. It is quite clear to the agricultural workers and toiling peasantry that the agrarian reform of the republican government aims at *maintaining the authority and incomes of the landlords in the village*. These reforms are also for the purpose of *transferring an insignificant handful of the agricultural bourgeoisie (kulaks) on to the side of the counter-revolutionary parties of bourgeois "law and order."*

Through the shining glitter of all kinds of demagogic promises already tarnishing, however, on the part of the left-republican, Socialist, Anarchist-syndicalist politicians, the following fundamental tendency has crystallised in connection with all and sundry bourgeois reforms; to assist the Spanish landlord to capitalise his income, at any rate in parts of his landed property, at the expense of further robbery among the basic masses of the peasantry (this is the class essence of the drafts for the redemption of the lands of the landowners); to install a thin strata of "firm property-holders" among the peasantry itself, a strata of the peasant bourgeoisie and conciliatorily disposed towards landlord ownership of the land; in this way they hope to prevent the development of the agrarian revolution.

It is quite obvious that even agrarian reforms, elaborated in this way, are doomed to certain bankruptcy. Parliament has already turned down both the extremely "radical" draft concerning the *redemption* of part of the lands of the large landowners and concerning its division *at a fixed price* among an insignificant handful of the peasant population. The new draft "reforms" cover merely the redemption of part of the lands of the landlords which are "not cultivated" or are lying "fallow"; and even so "always bearing in mind the financial situation of the State." Moreover, the landowners themselves must fix the price and extent of the lands redeemed.

The decree concerning "collective" leases aims at eternalising and extending *the bondslave system of mutual responsibility* on the part of the peasants to the landlords for the timely, full payment of land-rent, and merely adapts this system to the new conditions of bourgeois credit.

The decree of compulsory arbitration in agriculture and concerning mixed agricultural commissions is for the purpose of placing the majority of the strikes of agricultural workers *outside the law*, and of subjecting *to the free will of the local landlords*, the gendarmerie, the police and the landlords, all decisions concerning conflicts between the agricultural workers and peasants on the one hand, and the landlords on the other. At the same time the drafts concerning agricultural credit have in view the distribution of part of the credits among the kulak strata of the Spanish village, and are clearly calculated to buy over this exploiting section of the village.

It is quite obvious that all these reforms not only fail to mitigate the agrarian crisis, not only cannot solve the agrarian question, not only fail to lighten the incredible need and poverty of the masses, but, on the contrary, *increase class contradictions*, contribute to the further increase in the poverty, despair and, at the same time, revolutionary struggle inside the Spanish village.

It is quite obvious that the Socialists and Anarchist-syndicalists are absolutely incapable of solving the agrarian question. The Socialist leaders give their support to the decrees of the republican government, which are directed towards enriching the landlords and kulaks at the expense of the expropriation of the vast masses of peasantry. At the very time that the republican government, on the one hand, sent punitive expeditions and the gendarmerie to deal with the outbursts of national fury, and defend the property of the big landowners at the point of the bayonet against the spontaneous seizure of lands by the peasants, we find the leaders of the Anarchist-syndicalist movement, on the other hand, declaring themselves against *small* (i.e. peasant) private ownership of the land, and utilisation of the land, against the revolutionary demands of the peasantry for the *redistribution* of the lands of the big landowners.

"Everything that has been said about possible distribution is entirely unfounded," says Valyin, the Anarchist-syndicalist, comforting the landlords. "The Andalusian worker, non-political and revolutionary, knows that distribution means disaster."

The leader of the Anarchist-syndicalists, Pestania, is united with the Right Republicanists, Zamora and Maura, on behalf of "collective" forms of land ownership and tenure, and against the revolutionary slogan of the peasantry: — "Expropriation of the property of the landowners without compensation in favour of the agricultural labourers, the poor and middle peasantry." The Anarchist-syndicalists inter-

preted the formula of Pestania and Zamora, by declaring through Valyín that the "peasantry will be syndicalised, on a compulsory basis," and the landlords will receive the purchase price of their land in "redeemable bonds." The republican government put this formula into operation in its decree of "collective" rent, i.e., in its decree to maintain bond-slavery and feudal methods of mutual responsibility.

What, however, follows from all that has been said?

That the *agrarian revolution as a fundamental element in the bourgeois democratic revolution* is not less *actual* in Spain to-day, but more real than ever.

That the proletariat has every *possibility* of mustering all the toiling strata in the villages, and first and foremost the *village poor*, around its own movement.

That all the bourgeois parties, including both the Socialists and the leaders of the Anarchist-syndicalists, are defending the bourgeois-landlord method of robbing the basic masses of the peasantry on behalf of the landlords who have become bourgeois, and an insignificant handful of kulaks; that the *only* party in Spain, capable of leading the agrarian revolution to victory in the interests of the workers and peasants, of consistently pursuing its policy of completely destroying all the survivals of feudalism and clearing the way for the straight fight for Socialism, of safeguarding the rapid transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the Socialist revolution, is *the party of the proletariat — the Communist Party*.

Is it to be wondered at, therefore, if, in circumstances of intensifying economic crisis as a result of the increasing intensification of all the unsolved contradictions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, there rises up a new, extensive movement of the proletariat and peasantry, driven on by the violent repressions and white terror of emboldened counter-revolution, and menacing the very foundations of the bourgeois-landlord system?

* * * *

The political situation is fraught with the possibility of vast class conflicts in the near future. The revolutionary masses are set upon fighting, having learned more and more from their experiences of the class struggle that Communist leadership is essential. There is a slacking off of democratic illusions and Anarchist-syndicalist traditions of struggle, although they still represent a great obstacle in the way of successful revolutionary activities on the part of the toiling masses. The influence of the Communist Party is growing; however, the spontaneous movement

still keeps ahead of the Party's readiness and ability to lead the most extensive activities of the revolutionary people. The Socialist Party and the Anarchist-syndicalist leaders do all they can to prevent the revolutionary upsurge and to subject the movement to the influence of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The classes in power are letting loose civil war, thus trying to drain the blood of the workers and drive their revolutionary organisations underground.

What must the Communists do, first and foremost, in these circumstances, in order to organise victorious resistance to counter-revolution, to safeguard the successful organised counter-attack of the proletariat and toiling masses led by them; in order that the movement may lose its Anarchist-syndicalist, spontaneous features and lead to the decisive victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to the setting up of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in the form of soviets?

The following is essential :

First, *the movement must direct its line of fire against the extremely dangerous counter-revolution*, whose representatives are those forces which stand on the side of parliament and the bourgeois-landlord government of Asania and Kaballero, i.e., the bourgeois-landlord bloc; for which purpose *democratic and syndicalist illusions among the proletarian masses must be systematically and stubbornly overcome*, since they heavily hamper the movement; an extensive economic strike movement must be organised and *the revolutionary initiative of the masses must be developed for the purpose of fighting against bourgeois-landlord governmental organs* (disarming of the gendarmerie, arming of workers, etc., etc.).

Secondly, with the developing revolutionary struggle of the masses, it is essential *to win over the majority of the working class by the correct adoption of the united front tactic from below and by strengthening organisationally all successes achieved* (organisation of trade union opposition in the General Workers' Union and the National Confederation of Labour, formation of factory and workshop committees and, where the essential factors are present, of soviets of workers, peasants' and soldiers' deputies, as organs for mobilising the masses for the direct struggle for power); for this purpose the *Anarchist-syndicalist traditions* and methods which *disorganise* the movement of the working class must be completely overcome.

Thirdly, the allies of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution — the peasantry and town poor — must be won over *to the side of the proletariat*; for this it is essential that the

agrarian revolution be launched, and the movement of the peasantry immediately broadened along the lines of independent seizure and division of the lands of the landowners, and confiscation of the landlord's grain, already taken in the leading districts; *the struggle of the toiling masses of the national minorities and oppressed colonial peoples against the Spanish imperialist bourgeoisie and its government must be given leadership.*

It is quite obvious that *the essential* factor which will solve these enormous political tasks should be the further *Bolshevisation* of the Communist Party, its conversion into a *mass* Bolshevik Party, living an active political life and organised on the basis of democratic centralism; both in the theoretical and practical work of the Party organisations, all sectarian, Trotskyist, Anarchist-syndicalist and right opportunist deviations must be *surmounted* once and for all.

II.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST CONSTITUTIONAL-DEMOCRATIC AND ANARCHIST-SYNDICALIST ILLUSIONS.

The fact that the broad masses of Spanish workers and peasants are imbued with democratic and Anarchist-syndicalist illusions is the main big obstacle in the way of the further development of victorious revolutionary struggles in Spain.

In what way does the bourgeoisie primarily deceive the masses at the present time?

The biggest weapon of the bourgeoisie in deceiving the workers—and it is used first and foremost by Social Democracy, although the leaders of the Anarchist-syndicalists are also not loth to use it—is to *intimidate the masses with the prospect of "reaction," the terror of monarchist counter-revolution*, as compared with which the "left" republican government of Asania and Co. which rules to-day is declared to be *not only the "lesser evil," but almost the most perfect "democracy of the toilers of all classes" to be found in the world.*

The Communist Press must constantly and patiently unmask this *powerful political manoeuvre* of the Spanish counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, must explain the insolent deceit of bogeys of this kind, which in view of the prolonged revolutionary crisis aim only at bringing the proletariat under the heel of the counter-revolutionary, anti-national butcher government of Asania-Kaballero—a government which is pursuing a policy of bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution, and which brings together all the old forces of monarchist counter-revolution, thus clearing the way for the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy.

"The danger of a counter-revolution from the Right"—i.e., the restoration of the monarchy,

about which all the Social-Fascist and Anarchist-syndicalist press is uttering such cries of despair, is being created by the very Spanish bourgeoisie which holds the *reins of power* (in alliance with the landlords).

In similar circumstances, in the period between the February and October revolutions in 1917; Lenin wrote the following:

"It is to the advantage of the bourgeoisie (and essential to the perpetuation of its domination) that it deceive the people, and make out that it represents the revolution in general, and that counter-revolution is a menace that emanates from the right, from the Tsar."

And again:

"The bogey of Tsarist counter-revolution was purposely brought forward and flourished by the charlatans, in order to frighten fools, in order to present the philistines with a political sensation, in order to distract the attention of the people from the really serious counter-revolution."

("They can't see the wood for the trees." Lenin's Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. 21, pages 83, 84).

The Communist party is therefore obliged to explain systematically to the toiling masses all the bourgeois deceit of the Socialists and the bourgeoisie; to explain that without open revolutionary struggle against the "really serious counter-revolution," against the Asania-Kaballero government, which collects together and organises around itself all the chief influential counter-revolutionary forces in Spain, there can be no successful struggle against the *possibility* of a Monarchist restoration, which is certainly being created as a result of the counter-revolutionary nature of the bourgeoisie which holds the reins of power (together with the landlords). The most direct, determined line of fire must be trained against the speculations of the Socialists about the danger of reaction from the right which, according to them, opposes the democratic government of Asania-Kaballero. The Communist Party must systematically unmask the calumnies spread from the bourgeois republicans, the Socialists to Maurina, who try to pretend that the consistent, irreconcilable struggle of the Communist Party against the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship, which is embodied in the parliament and the Asania-Kaballero government, is a form of "joint action between the Communists and the Monarchists."

Certain local Communist organisations, yielding to this "democratic" pressure which is actually counter-revolutionary, make the mistake of entering into a united front *from above* (as in

the case of Bilbao, when a demonstration was arranged against the Catalonian murders, in which the Communists marched side by side with the local leaders of the Socialist and Syndicalist organisations and even with the local civil authorities headed by the Governor).

The working masses can be drawn from the influence of the *Socialists* only if the democratic deceit of the latter, and their counter-revolutionary speculations about the danger of counter-revolution from the right are determinedly and relentlessly revealed. It is the present government of left radicals and Socialists that is following the policy of bourgeois counter-revolution, with only a fig-leaf attempt at hiding up the "democracy of toilers of all classes" in circumstances of growing revolution. This government is organising the mass murder of workers and shooting of demonstrations of workers and peasants; it suppresses workers' strikes, passes decrees illegalising workers' strikes if they take place without a special warning from the workers to the capitalists and the local authorities eight days before the strike is called. It sends punitive detachments to the villages to suppress the peasantry who have begun themselves to seize the lands of the landowners, and to burn down their estates. It has flooded the workers' centres with gendarmes and counter-revolutionary military units. It continues its imperialist policy of enslaving and exploiting the masses in Morocco, basing its foreign policy upon French imperialism — the worthy successor of Russian Tsarism to the position of all-European gendarme.

III.

THE REVOLUTION MUST BE ORGANISED.

The correctness of the *political* line of the Party (in its estimate of the character of the revolution, its driving forces, the nature of the government, etc.) does not in itself guarantee that the party will be successful in leading the mass movement.

The revolution must be *organised* by the Communists.

The anarchist and sectarian traditions inside the Party, the high and mighty, careless attitude to organisational and political work, sectarian fear of the masses, lack of confidence in the creative energy and initiative of the broad masses of the proletariat, can no longer be tolerated in the Party. A severe struggle must be waged against the habit of lagging behind events and manifestations of anarchist spontaneity.

The Communist Party must once and for all understand that the *political situation*, which has *changed* since the overthrow of the monarchy and the entry of millions of the masses into the struggle, demands a corresponding *change* in

forms and methods of work on the part of the Party, in forms and methods of mobilising and organising the masses.

What has changed?

Millions are entering the movement. Millions have awakened and are awakening to political life and struggle. They must be *trained to fight by the Party*. They must be *organised*; in the Party, in the trade unions, in the numerous organisations sympathetic to the Party. They must be guided by a concise, versatile network of organisations, capable of mobilising them for action in the shortest possible period of time. In the shortest space of time the Communist Party must become a mass party. Every factory must become a *stronghold* of the Party. If we cannot get *factory and workshop committees* in every large factory; if in the villages we are unable to create committees of action elected by the peasants themselves — *peasants' committees* — and if these committees are not linked up firmly with the Communist Party and led by it — then the Communist Party will continue to be a General Staff without an army.

New forces are rushing into the movement.

"The importance of *organisation* grows most especially in moments like this . . ."

" . . . There must be no retreating from the task of *organising the revolution*" (Lenin).

But to organise the revolution means, first and foremost, to *organise the Bolshevik Party*.

Rotten opportunism, foul sectarianism, the remains of isolated organisational circles of workers, these are the tendencies responsible for statements to the effect that there is nobody to carry on Communist work. On the contrary, it is especially during revolutionary upsurges that the revolutionary party finds innumerable reserves among the masses from which it can draw new forces.

In Spain at present, just as in Russia in 1905, there is a "*tremendous* widening out of the movement. Unknown channels, inconceivable numbers of allies, innumerable comrades, friends and sympathisers" (Lenin).

Only "give more room for all kinds of avenues of work in the groups and circles of all kinds, always remembering that the correctness of the road they take, quite apart from our advice, will be safeguarded by the inexorable demands of the movement of revolutionary events itself" "We must recruit more boldly, more extensively, and more rapidly and get young fighters into the ranks of our organisations, all and sundry." (Lenin).

Sectarian passivity in the work of *recruiting* new members to the Communist Party is absolutely fatal and impermissible. Ten thousand

members of the Communist Party is a mere drop in the ocean of revolution. All the objective conditions are present for building up and increasing five-fold our Party organisation in the shortest possible time. We lack the *boldness* and capability of recruiting the best revolutionary proletarians—the poorest peasants. There is already a broad section of *sympathisers* around the Party both in the towns and the villages. The doors of the Party must be opened wide to them. Extensive and consistent propaganda must be carried on among them against sectarian, anarchist, right opportunist viewpoints inside the Party. At the same time organisational measures must be taken against *incurable* sectarians, narrow-minded Philistines, who hide their true natures behind “left” phrases about the Communist Party which give the impression that it consists of a select, pure 100 per cent. conscious handful of revolutionaries, and who are afraid of an influx of new revolutionary proletarians into the Party; persons of this kind must even be removed from Party organs and excluded from the Party in cases of stubborn adherence on their part to their mistaken viewpoints, despite the decisions of the party. Not only must we boldly recruit workers into the party, but we must no less boldly *send these new members of the Party forward to new work*, systematically training them, controlling their work, correcting their mistakes as they go.

Moreover, this work must be done quickly, because the revolution cannot wait.

“The years of revolutionary crisis have presented all the necessary objective conditions . . . for the Communist Party to win decisive influence and stable organisational positions not only among the proletariat of the towns, but also among the village proletariat and the peasantry. This the Party has not done.” (Letter of the E.C.C.I.).

Where is the fundamental, radical cause of the fact that the Party *lags behind* events. It lies in the *sectarian viewpoint*, the *anarchist methods of work*, in *opportunist passivity in the ranks of the Party*, the old methods of isolated work in circles, which is still to be found in the internal Party work.

The IVth Congress of the Spanish Communist Party must make a distinct *change* in the Party’s methods of work from the nucleus to the district Party Committee and the Central Committee. An end must now be put to the state of affairs where organisations are led, not by Party organs elected and selected on the basis of democratic centralism and working on the basis of Party and collective work, but by groups of friends, formed during the many years when the Party was

underground and divorced from the masses, who frequently command, but cannot be said to lead. A definite stop must be made to the situation where, instead of there being well set up, disciplined, Party organisations, working carefully, united by one political line, closely connected with the masses, the localities and the factories, and truly led by Party organs which are an authority for all Party members, there exists, as has been the case to a large extent up to now, a system of “sectarian-propagandist groups” of “chosen Communists.” (Letter of the E.C.C.I.).

It is quite obvious that the system of isolated circles, with little connection between each other, which predominates in the Party, is a basis both for Right opportunism and for anarchism, which are allied on the common stand they take of bowing before *spontaneous action*.

And on the other hand “Both these tendencies, the opportunists and ‘revolutionists,’ remain inactive in the face of the predominating craftsmanship, refuse to believe in the possibility of getting rid of it, fail to understand our first and most urgent practical task; to create an *organisation of revolutionaries*, capable of guaranteeing energy, stability, and perpetuity of political struggle.” (Lenin, Russian edition. Vol. IV., “What is to be done.” Page 441).

What must be done now, on the eve and during the course of the IVth Congress, in order to bring about a *change* in the work of the Party?

We must, first of all, *have a wide discussion of the E.C.C.I. letter to all members of the Spanish Communist Party in all Party nuclei*. In the light of this letter the *work* of every organisation must be *verified*; on the basis of fearless *self-criticism* we must reveal the sectarian, anarchist, Trotskyist, right-opportunist mistakes, and wage a constant, relentless struggle against all deviations from the Party line and on behalf of *ideological, Bolshevik monolithic single-mindedness* in the Party. We must, not only during the pre-Congress period, but also during the period which will follow, guarantee a *discussion upon all political questions* in the Party nuclei, so that all members of the party will become fully conscious of the line and tasks of the Party, so that, at the same time, we may obtain the *disciplined operation* of all decisions once they are made. Moreover, *the experiences of the work of the Party* must be summed up and learned, as well as concrete experience of strikes, demonstrations, methods of agitation and of organising the masses, etc., etc., since the system of isolated, disconnected Party circles, the routine and so on in Party organisations has its roots not only in anarchist sectarianism and

opportunist passivity, but very frequently in the *inability* of the Party members to organise Party work, in the fact that they are not always in *possession* of experience in Bolshevik work and organising the masses. One of the most important slogans of the Party must be : *to learn to lead* strikes, demonstrations, peasant activities and so on in a truly Bolshevik manner; *to learn to organise* the trade unions, trade union opposition, factory committees, peasant committees, etc., in a truly Bolshevik manner.

Secondly, during the period before and after the Congress, there must be built up, systematically and consistently, a strong and active *Party leadership*, composed mainly of *proletarians, working collectively and closely connected with the masses* (and not with the masses "in general" but in a concrete form; with such and such a factory; with such and such an important agricultural district, etc.).

Party organs on a town, local and district scale, must be created and strengthened.

From among the composition of the leading organs there must at the same time be removed all incorrigible sectarians and opportunists who hinder the Party from making the change required by the instructions of the Communist International; this must be done without any hesitation.

The whole of the work before and after the Congress must be accompanied by an explanation of the tasks and the line taken by the Party Congress to wide masses of the non-Party workers, and a bold recruiting campaign set on foot for new members of the Party, and pushing them forward in Party work.

Only if these conditions are observed will the Communist Party of Spain achieve decisive successes in the work of *Bolshevising* its ranks, and becoming a centralised, mass, Bolshevik party, the true political vanguard of the Spanish proletariat.

* * * *

It is quite obvious that it is possible to organise the Party only by developing a timely struggle to win the *majority* of the working class, to gain the *leadership* of its struggle, to ensure *allies* for the proletariat in the revolution. To organise the revolution means, in the first place, to be able to find the *key problems* of each stage of the struggle, to concentrate the main attention of the Party and the toiling masses led by the Party especially upon these tasks; to organise the revolution means to *correctly concentrate the forces of revolution in order to solve the main tasks at the decisive points*.

In order that the Party may win the majority of the working class it is essential, first of all,

to concentrate the attention of the Party on work *in Catalonia*. The Party cannot win the majority of the working class in Spain until it has won this district, where the key industries and the maximum concentration of branches of industry are to be found.

Moreover, the incorrect line taken by the Party on the national question hinders it from winning the majority of the working class in Catalonia. The Party must bring the peasantry on to the side of the proletariat, isolate the nationalist parties, and thus bring the revolutionary movement in the nationalist districts into the main stream of struggle against the bourgeois-landlord government of Spain.

The Party, quite obviously, underestimates the importance of the national question in developing the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Even the anarchists are correcting their position; the *Solidarida Obrero* for the first time in its existence (previously it was against the independence of Catalonia, and even mentioned the need for strikes to prevent independence), has come out in favour of national independence, assuring the public that "the advanced representatives of anarchism and the National Confederation of Labour always advocated complete autonomy." (See the *Solidarida Obrero* for 19/12/31).

Our party still sticks to the old sectarian viewpoint on the national question, and instead of carrying on energetic work among the workers and peasants of Catalonia, instead of self-sacrificing defence of the right of nations to self-determination, even to the separation, and the formation of independent States, our party, in opposition to bourgeoisie autonomism, offers the Soviet system, assuring all and sundry that the independence of Catalonia will be possible only under the Soviet system. On the national question the party follows the erstwhile sectarian position taken up by the "ultra-Lefts." But is it possible to imagine that the party can win a leading rôle in the revolutionary movement of Catalonia (and other national districts), if it continues in future its anti-Leninist position on the national question, thus helping to consolidate the influence of the Catalonian bourgeoisie upon the Catalonian proletariat and toiling peasantry?

Of course it is impossible. The correct line in the national question is an essential factor rendering it possible for the Spanish Communist Party to win the majority of the working class of Spain and to bring the peasantry on to its side.

It goes without saying that the main lever in the cause of fighting for the majority of the working class is the tactic of the united front from below against capital and against the leaders of reformist and syndicalist trade unions, which play

the rôle of lackeys on behalf of the bourgeoisie inside the working class. Only by taking this road has the party gained significant achievements.

The party *does not sufficiently unmask*, however, the "disastrous nature of the tactics of the anarchists and anarchist-syndicalists of the National Confederation of Labour; their resistance to the strike struggle; their instruction prohibiting the workers to declare two strikes at the same time in one and the same town; their theory that the general strike is identical with the proletarian revolution; their methods of substituting the organised struggle of the masses for action on the part of individual 'selected activists'; their theory that in the period of economic crisis the strike struggle for partial demands is impossible and unnecessary; their high-handed attitude towards the unemployed" (Letter of the Western European Bureau of the E.C.C.I.).

Moreover, the correct operating of the united-front-from-below tactic presupposes, as an essential factor, the most energetic campaign to unmask the treacherous leaders of the General Amalgamation of Workers and the General Confederation of Labour, the most energetic liberation of the proletariat from the influence of the socialists and leaders of anarchist-syndicalism. At the same time the party should launch a consistent struggle against the *attempts to split the movement by the National Confederation of Labour*, and on behalf of the direct realisation of the amalgamation of workers in one, united, trade union organisation; for this purpose efforts must be made to organise a united, militant front with the socialist and anarchist workers, and also with those anarchist leaders, who actually fight against the capitalists and against the bourgeois-landlord, counter-revolutionary régime of the republicans, socialists and anarchists, but at the same time granting them no concessions of principle, and criticising their mistakes.

Our party is still far from understanding this tactic and frequently evinces intolerable passivity in its work in the reformist and syndicalist trade union organisations. For instance, at the conference in Lavidà, where the leaders of the National Confederation of Labour summed up their work for the last few months, it transpired that the National Confederation of Labour in Catalonia is in a state of complete disintegration. During something like two to three months it has lost about 50 per cent. of its membership (120,000 members), including the metalworkers' union, which is under the leadership of the anarchists, and whose membership has dropped from twenty to eight thousand. At this conference the political narrowmindedness of the leaders of the

anarchists and anarchist-syndicalists, and their incapability of aiming at concrete tasks on behalf of the struggles of the working masses, was clearly revealed. All this had to be shown to the masses; the criminal tactics of the anarchist and anarchist-syndicalist leaders should have been shown up against our revolutionary tactic of militant unity. And yet the Communists were not present at this conference at all. They were guilty, therefore, of missing the opportunity of carrying out the most important task of organising a *trade union opposition* against the leaders of anarchist-syndicalism on the platform of class unity in the trade union movement.

Unity can be forged among the proletariat, and the majority of the working class won over to Communism, only in the course of *revolutionary struggles*. It is in the course of revolutionary crises, in the course of the struggle, that the masses learn. Both the Communist Party and the trade unions under its leadership should put forward *partial demands*, develop the economic struggle for the day-to-day requirements of the workers, and make these demands the basis of the united front. They must do this, for without it it is impossible to raise the political life of the *backward* sections of the toilers. It would be downright opportunism to *limit* the movement, in the existing circumstances of revolutionary crisis, to a struggle for partial demands. Every strike, even economic strikes, must be looked upon as preparation for the struggle for power. To no less extent is it essential at the moment to *launch the revolutionary movement boldly*, to combine the struggle for economic demands of the workers (against the offensive of the owners on wages, for social insurance of unemployed at the expense of the State and the owners, etc.) with political demands which will arouse the proletariat to the direct struggle against the bourgeois-landlord government in their capacity of the *leaders* of the revolution, in their capacity of *organiser* and leader of the struggle of the peasantry, the toiling masses against the bourgeois-landlord régime. The revolutionary organisations must discontinue once and for all the practice of anarchist *revolver tactics*, all forms of petty-bourgeois adventurism and terrorism; at the same time there must be energetically launched a mass struggle of the proletariat *for the streets*, for the right to organise open revolutionary *demonstrations*, for the right to organise *factory workshop committees*, against *shootings* and *white terror on the part of the gendarmes*, against persecutions and arrests among strikers, and active revolutionary and trade union members, on behalf of *their immediate release*, on behalf of the *disarming of the gendarmerie* (in existing circumstances of mass

struggle and an extensive movement), for the arming of the workers, for the formation of military workers' guards from among the strikers as a form of resistance to strike-breakers and the police, for organised, disciplined *preparations for the struggle for power*.

The party, while not refusing to assist and develop the struggle of the peasants against individual feudal privileges (Rabasa Morta and so on) and taxation, but, on the contrary, widening and intensifying their struggle, should at the same time bear in mind the experiences of the more advanced districts, and call upon the peasants and agricultural workers, where a broad mass movement has developed, to the open *seizure of the lands of the big landowners, monasteries and the State*, to the transition of the land through peasant committees to the agricultural workers and peasants without compensation to previous owners, to the organisation of *armed resistance*, to the attempts of the landlords and the gendarmerie, to seize back the divided lands and suppress the growing peasant movement by means of punitive expeditions.

The party should at the same time bear in mind the mistakes made during the last few months, when it was far from using all the revolutionary possibilities presented by the objective situation for serious attempts, where possible (as was the case, for example, during the Seville strike in the summer of 1931), of putting into actual practice the slogan of the formation of Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers' deputies, as the organ for mobilising and organising the masses for the struggle for power. Moreover, it must be clearly understood that the network of factory committees and revolutionary committees of agricultural workers and peasants, in putting into practice the united front tactic in connection with

the struggle of the town proletariat and peasantry, could become the transition stage in the policy in favourable circumstances of growing revolutionary movement, since the organisation of Soviets is the task which faces the movement in the further course of revolutionary struggle. This, however, does not exclude the possibility and necessity of the transition to the direct creation of Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers' deputies, all the necessary factors for such transition being present. Moreover, it is absolutely obvious that the party must keep in mind the possibility of creating Soviets (having in view the unequal development of the revolutionary movement), and consequently also of forming armed revolutionary forces at first only in parts of the country; this, however, requires, moreover, that all forces should be mobilised to develop and lead the mass movement throughout the land, to concentrate forces in the important key centres; in other words, to win the majority of the proletariat on to the side of the party.

In the work of combining the partial slogans of the movement with the fundamental slogans, the party must fight *on two fronts*, always remembering the words of Lenin:

"The economists and terrorists bow before different poles of the spontaneous tendency: the economists — before the spontaneity of a 'pure working class movement,' the terrorists before the spontaneity of the most heated indignation on the part of the intellectuals, who are unable to, or have no opportunity of, linking up their revolutionary work into one united whole with the working class movement." ". . . both the terrorists and economists underestimate the revolutionary activity of the masses." (Lenin, Russian Edition, Vol. VI., "What is to be done?" Pages 219-421).

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMRADE PIATNITSKY'S BIRTHDAY

THE whole conscious life of our comrade-in-arms, Piatnitsky, is spent in proletarian revolutionary action, the glorious life of a Bolshevik.

Towards the end of last century, when in the biggest centres of the country the revolutionary proletarian mass movement of Tsarist Russia entered upon the first stage of its development, a young apprentice joined one of the small illegal social democratic workers' circles in the provinces. He was given the first number of the Leninist "Iskra." No sooner had he received it, than he became one of its distributing organisers. He went through his first years of training in the Leninist school, and while still a young worker became a professional revolutionary. His training meant not only the reading of periodicals and books; it included persecutions, arrests, imprisonment, heroic escapes, emigration, exile.

Piatnitsky, the professional revolutionary, received his training in the course of self-sacrificing, tireless, stubborn, everyday work to embody Bolshevik ideas in revolutionary organisation and revolutionary action; to create and strengthen illegal contacts between the political centres of the Bolsheviks abroad, where Leninist ideas were forged, and the illegal party committees scattered throughout the land, which supplied the Leninist centre with living material from the experiences of their mass work, and which, in the fight against the narrow conditions of work inside the scattered circles ("Kruzhkovschina"), and on behalf of the revolutionary workers' party, prepared for the triumph of Bolshevism. His work was to organise party nuclei in factories and workshops, to use both legal and semi-legal methods of work, to organise strikes, mass demonstrations . . . to carry on his exemplary work of preparing the masses for the armed uprising. And all this was done in the struggle against opportunism on the right and the "left."

There exists no kind of important revolutionary work which has not been carried on by Comrade Piatnitsky, always faithfully following the teachings of Lenin. In the difficult years when the workers' organisations were being organised into a strong, centralised party, when the Party treasury was almost empty, in the years when the Leninist "Iskra" was fighting against the economists, and in the years following the Party Congress of 1903, the first years of struggle between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Piatnitsky was the skilful organiser of the transport of illegal party literature and illegal party workers across the vigilantly guarded borders of Tsarist Russia. During the 1905 revolution, the dress rehearsal of

October, Piatnitsky was a committeeman, one of the leaders of the Party Committee, organiser of revolutionary mass organisations and mass revolutionary fighting in Odessa. In the days when the mass movement was on the ebb, during the years of darkest reaction, Piatnitsky was again the organiser of the illegal apparatus of the Bolshevik centre abroad.

During the period of struggle against the liquidators, he helped to organise the Prague Conference in 1912. Soon afterwards he was again in Tsarist Russia as an agent of the Leninist Central Committee, the organiser of illegal work on the Volga, until he was arrested and exiled to Siberia. After the February Revolution, freed from exile, he became the railwaymen's organiser, one of the leaders of the armed uprising in Moscow, and later secretary of the Moscow party organisation. Of late years, Comrade Piatnitsky has been a member of the supreme party organs of the C.P.S.U.—the Central Control Commission and later, the Central Committee; he is also the leader of organisational work in the E.C.C.I., a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and one of the secretaries of the E.C.C.I.

All this merely marks the most important stages in the life of this strong, tireless, tested Bolshevik, who has never wavered even in times of greatest doubt, and has always actively fought and is still fighting on behalf of true Leninist teachings, defending its every position, and evincing masterly skill in the art of putting Leninist theory into practice.

It is no easy task to characterise the activities of Comrade Piatnitsky in the Communist International. Not a hundredth part of what he has done and is doing to lead the work in the world party of Communism is ever heard of. His training as a professional revolutionary, under the leadership of Lenin, reveals itself in every detail of his work—the work of a professional revolutionary who, suppressing even the appearance of all that is personal, is always ready with extreme modesty to serve comrades and organisations, whom, with enormous caution, and taking into consideration all the attending circumstances, he leads and welds together with a firm, sure hand.

Within the limits of his general political leadership of the Communist International, Comrade Piatnitsky strives to pass on and to use the historic experiences of the party and mass work of the Bolsheviks in the sphere of organising the work of the leading organs of the C.I., with the ardour of a Bolshevik—builder of parties and organiser of masses.

In stubborn fights over many years against the remains of social-democratic traditions, both political and organisational, against spontaneity inside the party and the consequent under-estimation of the rôle of the party as the leader and organiser of the masses, Comrade Piatnitsky fights for the triumph of Leninist organisational principles and methods in each separate section of the Communist International, and primarily for the reconstruction of the Communist parties on the basis of factory nuclei. He does this with unyielding perseverance and iron consistency. This required not only direct experience of many years of party work in the ranks of Lenin's party, but detailed knowledge of the peculiarities of each Communist Party, its cadres, its membership, conditions of work and the struggle inside the factories, detailed knowledge of the policy, the methods of organisation, and the work of the enemies of the proletarian revolution, and first and foremost of social-democracy and the reformist trade unions. During the last few years, Comrade Piatnitsky's permanent and direct work has been concerned with revolutionary trade union work as the most important section of mass work in the Communist parties.

The sharp criticism which is aimed by Comrade Piatnitsky, irrespective of persons, against all who are fighting with insufficient determination for the reconstruction of the Communist parties on the basis of factory nuclei, and on behalf of revolutionary mass work, against all who justify their weaknesses by pointing to the difficulties and obstacles in their way, is always based upon an all-round understanding of the situation, upon a complete verification of all available facts, upon a Bolshevik estimate of the connection between policy and organisations, and upon a careful survey of the peculiarities of each section of the struggle. The leading idea of all the activities of Comrade Piatnitsky, which manifests itself in an extremely concrete form, is to make the sections of the Communist International truly capable of pursuing a Bolshevik policy, capable of bringing about the collapse of social-democracy, winning over the majority of the working class, and organising and leading decisive struggle for power; to make them capable of gaining the victory in the revolution.

In order to achieve this complicated task of bolshevising the world party of Communism, it was essential that the leading organs and apparatus of the Communist International should become organs of differentiated and operative, organisational and political leadership instead of organs operating primarily along the line of propaganda and agitation. Comrade Piatnitsky's revolutionary understanding of actualities is as much the result of many years in the Leninist school, which

so correctly evaluates events, fits them into their political background, and presents the question in its true concrete form, as the result of his extremely wealthy knowledge of the whole international work class movement. This understanding of realities remains the most important condition for the correct leadership of a complicated sphere of work and struggle like the international revolutionary movement—the proletarian, peasant, national and colonial liberation movement.

This Bolshevik realism, combined with true Bolshevik principles and ardent, stubborn, revolutionary endeavour to make the sections of the Communist International capable of dealing with their historic tasks, is clearly manifested in Comrade Piatnitsky, in the form of hatred towards all kinds of Right opportunist canting as regards Party decisions, towards all forms of passivity, masked behind "left" phrases. For this reason Comrade Piatnitsky is a jealous fighter against all divergences between word and deed, a fighter on behalf of the revolutionary fulfilment in practice of all decisions made. For this reason his speeches and written works are always noted for the concrete explicitness with which the problem is tackled, and for the crushing force with which he always finds and reveals the true essence of the matter.

Comrade Piatnitsky is a granite-hard Bolshevik, an exemplary leader of the International Communist Movement.

(Signed) PIECK

MANUILSKY

VAN-MIN (C.P., China)

KUUSINEN

THORES (C.P., France)

SCHVABOVA (C.P., Czecho-Slovakia)

KNORIN

LOZOVSKY

BROWDER (C.P., U.S.A.)

BELA KUN

HOPNER

SLAVINSKY (C.P., Poland)

KATAYAMA

GUSEV

HATHAWAY (C.P., U.S.A.)

KOLAROV

OKANO (C.P., Japan)

MITSKEVICH

MANNER (C.P., Finland)

CHEMODANOV (E.C.C.Y.I.)

VARGA

ANGERITIS (C.P., Lithuania)

CODOVILLA

TSHAKAYA

TRILLIA (C.P., Spain)

ISKROV (C.P., Bulgaria)

MADJI (C.P., Italy)

HANSEN (C.P., Norway).

BRAILSFORD: "REBEL INDIA"

DURING the last few years the English Labour Party, the General Council of Trade Unions and the Independent Labour Party have been actively engaged in strengthening the domination of British Imperialism in India.

The English bourgeoisie made use of the Princes when it put forward the idea of a Federation; it is now organising the Hindu-Moslem "crisis," restoring the Khalifat and so on and so forth; and while continuing negotiations with the Indian bourgeoisie and the National Congress, it is strenuously preparing, by means of bloody terror and martial law, to attempt the destruction of the growing revolutionary struggle of the Indian workers and peasant masses.

The treacherous work of the national reformists, especially the "lefts," who are seeking to undermine and disorganise the revolutionary camp from within and thus help smash the Indian revolution, is part of the general mobilisation of counter-revolutionary forces.

The Independent Labour Party actively supports, and at times even organises, the treacherous work of the national reformists.

In 1930 and 1931, Brailsford and Fenner Brockway, leaders of the Independent Labour Party, made a tour of India. They made public their impressions and plans in a series of articles, published in India and America, which, with certain changes, have now been published in book form.

Brailsford's book, "Rebel India," is interesting in that it gives a very clear picture of the imperialist, counter-revolutionary character of the Independent Labour Party which is frequently not against declaring in words that it is in favour (!) of the "right to self-determination" of India.

The book, just as the whole of the activities of the Independent Labour Party, clearly shows that the I.L.P. is not only not in favour of self-determination for India, but is openly and actively helping to enslave India and does all it can to defend the policy and activities of British Imperialism, by advising the British bourgeoisie to hide up its exploitation of the Indian people behind cunning, tricky manœuvres.

Mr. Brailsford in his book tries to show the way out of the Indian crisis. Whole masses of the population, Brailsford tells us, are dissatisfied with the existing régime, and only the National Congress keeps them back from warfare and uprisings.

"Uncompromising the Congress may be, but to the 'left' of it there are groups of young men ready for terrorist action and guerilla warfare, which wait only for the acknowledged failure

of its non-violent tactics. A minority it certainly is not. In all the vast area north of Bombay (guerilla warfare—V.) it has the active support and allegiance of the mass of the Hindoo population, in the villages no less than the towns." (Page 3.)

About the "uncompromising" (?) attitude of the National Congress we shall speak a little later. For the time being it is sufficient to note that Brailsford understands that only the National Congress is at present holding back the masses from a revolutionary uprising. He sees the coming revolution and is seeking the way to fight against it.

In the first part of his book Mr. Brailsford, to express his "sympathy," sheds crocodile tears about the poverty and suffering of the toiling masses of India. In spite of all his efforts to gloss over the position inside the country, he is compelled to admit that hunger, poverty, sickness, backwardness and semi-slavery are typical of the land.

"I have heard an English officer say that the first thing one has to do with Indian recruits is to teach them to eat. The average 'coolie' lacks the physique which instinctively resists wrong by an impulsive movement of the fists." (Page 66.)

Mr. Brailsford writes of the Indian village as follows:—

"To it" (the village) "comes the bania for interest and the zemindar for rent, and behind them both looms the overshadowing bulk of Government, with its courts and its police." (Page 57.)

The result of feudal-imperialist exploitation is well known and Mr. Brailsford is compelled to admit that the peasantry can live no longer in this way.

"On an acre an Indian villager, who uses no manure, but waters well, raises six to eight maunds of wheat (the maund being 82lbs.), though I heard in the Punjab of a capable farmer who achieved twelve. With eight maunds at the price then quoted at Delhi in the daily paper, a peasant would make 16 rupees, with a trifle extra for the straw, but the usurer, who is also the local dealer, would give less. Prices this year are half of last year's figures, but rents do not stop with prices. The reader can do the sum in subtraction, which will show how much remains for the cultivator after he has paid a rent of 30 rupees out of a yield of 16 rupees. Even the favoured few who paid a rent of 10 rupees would have a negligible

trifle, when they had set aside seed (say, 3 rupees) and fed their bullocks . . .

"I might have distrusted them, had I not found confirmation in a cold official publication." (Pages 58, 59.) "Millet and gram (the grain used for horses in India) are its (the peasants!—V.) daily diet, and it eats little else. The children . . . looked like shadows nourished on debts. Most of them had some disease . . . many had the swollen belly that indicates a spleen enlarged by malaria." (Pages 53, 54.)

The position of the workers is no better. In the towns tens of thousands of people sleep on the pavements, 97 per cent. of the workers of Bombay live in one room, with an average of six to nine persons to a room. In Ahmedabad 92 per cent. of the workers live in the same conditions.

"Resulting evils are physical deterioration, high infant mortality and a high general death rate." ("Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India," June, 1931.) (Page 277.)

The wage of the agricultural labourers is equal to ten shillings a month. As for the workers in tanneries, Mr. Brailsford is forced to admit that in Bombay their wages are 18 rupees a month and they work twelve hours a day. Among them are to be found ten-year-old children who also "work twelve hours a day, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year." (Page 78.) They live under roofs covered with galvanized iron—veritable ovens, the size of which dwellings are 23 by 18 feet, and in which thirty persons are housed. And for this five shillings a month is paid. There are only three faucets for about 400 persons. "Among the refuse heaps," writes the "impressive" Mr. Brailsford, "the great rats were already hurrying." (Page 79.) "Beside that faucet of hot water, under the three-foot shelter," writes Brailsford, defending the interests of imperialism in a more subtle form, "the virus of Bolshevism might flourish with the rats and mosquitoes." (Page 80.) . . . "I left the court trying to reckon out how many faucets one might erect with one thousand rupees a day" (the Crown prosecutor receives a thousand and twenty rupees—390 dollars—daily, working on the Meerut trial) "spread over two years. It might have been a cheaper method of assuring King George's sovereignty over India." (Pages 80, 85.)

Mr. Brailsford, though hiding the true picture of poverty and slavery which exists in India, nevertheless, was compelled to recognise a few facts. But when it comes to explaining the reasons, here the imperialist speaks out his mind. The Indian people, it seems, are responsible for

everything, and they cannot even appreciate the bountiful, civilising (!) rôle of British imperialism:

"This sketch has deliberately underlined the factors inherent in the social structure of India and in Hindoo belief which explain her poverty and militate against economic progress.

"In them, and not in the evils of foreign rule, lie the direct potent causes of poverty and over-population" (page 178).

Mr. Brailsford and the whole of the Independent Labour Party try to fool the English proletariat and depict the imperialists as the carriers of civilisation and well-being to the so-called savage Indian people. And yet at the same time it is a plain and obvious fact that British imperialism not only relentlessly robs, violates and enslaves the Indian people, but also that it maintains and supports all the feudal survivals to be found in India, artificially fans the flame of Hindu-Moslim enmity, supports the caste system and behind lying, pharisaical talk of its so-called "neutrality," upholds and cultivates bond-slavery throughout the land. Mr. Brailsford, by distorting the true state of affairs in India nevertheless has to introduce facts in various parts of his book which, despite all the assurances of the leaders of the Independent Labour Party, show that it is only the struggle for emancipation against British Imperialism which will finally destroy feudal survivals in India, and that *only the cleansing fire of the Indian anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution will sweep away bond slavery from the land.*

"Much more startling, however, was the sudden abandonment of purdah in the more backward North . . . But even in the North this year has opened the doors of countless purdah homes . . . The Congress movement beckoned the women to every form of national service, and with courage and devotion they answered its call. They spoke at its mass demonstrations. They did most of the picketing work. They went in thousands to prison . . . All this was interesting enough in Bombay, which has never had the purdah system for Hindoo women: *It was startling in the north.* In Meerut, which is far from being an advanced or exceptional town. . . the women met together to consider how they should protest against Gandhi's arrest. Nothing seemed adequate save a procession; but they had lived all their lives in purdah. Out of it they came without hesitation, and four or five thousand walked openly through the streets. *They never went back to their seclusion*" (page 96.)

And after Mr. Brailsford had been compelled to admit in despair that the complete liberation

of women in India, is possible only by means of the struggle against British imperialism, and its destruction, he has the audacity to declare that British imperialism plays a civilising rôle, and that the Indian people themselves are to blame, that "the responsibility lies with Indian customs and beliefs, etc. (Page 139.)

Mr. Brailsford praises the rule of the English bourgeoisie. It appears that the bourgeoisie has brought peace, the abolition of hunger, national health, railways, and so on and so forth, to India.

"The balance of benefit, social, political and economic, is overwhelming." (Page 169.) Of course, "agrees" Brailsford, there are defects, but for these the Indians are to blame.

Thus the imperialist Independent Labour Party supports British Imperialism and tries to educate the English workers, to uphold Imperialist traditions and viewpoints; it tries to demoralise the English workers and eternalise the capitalist system in England itself. In advocating the independence of the English workers from the Empire, the Independent Labour Party tries to convince the workers of the solidarity (?) of interests between the English proletariat and the bourgeoisie and thus keep the workers eternally under the yoke of capitalism — the British slave-owning Empire.

The whole of Brailsford's book is devoted to an open defence of Imperialism. The English bourgeoisie hopes with the aid of the National Congress, including its "lefts" to smash the revolutionary movement. The leaders of the Independent Labour Party are not satisfied with this, but themselves actively instruct the "left" national reformists and help them. Mr. Brailsford, during his sojourn in the Punjab, helped to form the Punjab Socialist Party. This is an anti-revolutionary, anti-Marxist, anti-national organisation, with the theory of non-violence as the basis of its programme, which tries to disorganise the agrarian revolution by promises of agrarian reform. The Independent Labour Party ardently assists the reformists in the labour movement. Mr. Brailsford considers the Ahmedabad Textile Workers' Union, led by Gandhi and Anusayaben Sarabhai, the sister of one of the largest factory-owners in Ahmedabad—a trade union which systematically betrays the workers and helped to bring about the defeat of the Bombay textile workers in 1929, to be a fine example of positive work in the trade union movement. (Page 116.)

The leaders of the Independent Labour Party hold out high hopes for the National Congress. The general programme of the Independent Labour Party is somewhat simple and "modest": to keep India in its place as a colony, to increase the size of the drain upon India's national income,

at the expense of further exploitation of the Indian people. Brailsford's mouth waters.

"Everyone has heard of her fabulous hoards of gold and jewels . . . and estimates which look fantastic, but may in fact be sober. . . . The one fact that is certainly known is that India annually imports as part payment for her exports, gold to the annual value (taking an average over the last five years) of 53 crores of rupees (198.7 millions)." (Page 164.)

This gold, Brailsford sadly informs us, cannot be obtained by the Anglo-Indian Government or the banks,

"but it is possible, however, that patriotism might conjure a part of it out of the ground. . . . I believe that a really dynamic party could achieve this miracle." . . . (Page 165.)

i.e., with the help and agreement of the bourgeois National Congress.

Mr. Brailsford draws up hopeful plans: to raise the productivity of labour by 20 per cent. and to send "missionaries" to drain the inner resources, etc., etc.

The Independent Labour Party is not against raising the productivity of labour of agriculture, but goes no further than committees of the Royal Agrarian Commission, and does not intend to encroach upon the rights of the landlords and moneylenders. The Independent Labour Party allows of the industrial development of India, within certain limits: the production of clothing, the building of houses and even "gramophones." While allowing partial concessions to India as regards the textile industry, the leaders of the Independent Labour Party, together with British imperialism, declare: "Not a step further; we shall give no more. India must remain the economic appendage of England. Consequently, those "Indian thinkers and politicians who rely upon a policy of high protection to foster their national industry, are ignoring the fundamentals of the problem. Tariffs may be a proper means to use . . . but they may impoverish the peasantry further." (Page 159.) British imperialists as the defenders of the peasantry—is that not an engaging spectacle?

Mr. Brailsford recommends in its place that the handicraft workers should be assisted. "Could one then move on to co-operative workshops? In that case why should not one call in electric power?" Mr. Brailsford tries to put India in its position as a semi-feudal country, kindly agreeing to provide it with electric light and gramophones. The Independent Labour Party, while against independence for India, advocates Dominion Status, but, of course, within the same framework as that which is offered by the English bourgeoisie. The Independent Labour Party

demands guarantees: first of all that the British Army remain in India as the "strategic reserve in the East" against China and Russia and against the Indian people. Gandhi demands the same. "It is, however, chiefly an insurance against various internal risks, ranging from communal riots, and the possibility of attacks on the European cantonments, up to the risk of another Mutiny. The grant of self-government is meaningless, unless it has diminished and, indeed, abolished this risk." (Page 221.)

Of course, Mr. Brailsford supports the deceitful game of a Federation and of making use of the Princes. If the Princes enter the Federation then "the Federation and the Paramount Power are bound to protect them, and to defend them against a menacing agitation by their subjects, even though it should be for the conquest of rights which obtain throughout British India." (235). See how categorically Mr. Brailsford writes in his rôle of defender of the oppressed. Discussing the question of how poorly the interests of the peasantry will be represented in the future "parliament," Mr. Brailsford agrees that there should be no universal adult suffrage, and comforts himself with the thought that a way out is possible, namely "by inviting the Co-operative Credit Societies to choose representatives of the peasants, as the Trade Unions may do for the workers." (Page 236).

Mr. Brailsford, of course, considers that Hindu-Moslem enmity is the main obstacle on the road of Indian development, and has the audacity to state that the Hindus and Moslems are themselves to blame in this. And here we find the finest piece of hypocrisy on the part of the Independent Labour Party, which "educates" the workers by order of the English bourgeoisie: "I am not sure that the British Government does right to preserve its *passive* attitude on this question." (Page 245).

British Imperialism actively organises Hindu-Moslem "strife," and the Independent Labour Party assures us that the imperialists adopt a "passive" attitude towards it, and that the workers and peasants of India are to blame. Perhaps Brailsford would kindly explain why it is that the English bourgeoisie introduced electorates on a religious basis, and who it was, for example, that arranged that "Care is taken in Bombay Presidency that precisely one-third of the veterinary surgeons shall pray with their faces to Mecca" (i.e., are Moslems . . .). (Page 250). True, in India it is a well-known fact that it is British imperialism that organises religious conflicts. "I am sure, it is a crude slander to say, as Indians usually do, that the bureaucracy con-

sciously stirs up strife between the two communities." (Page 251).

The leaders of the Independent Labour Party entirely support MacDonald's policy and advise that certain insignificant concessions should be made to lessen (!) the Indian national debt a little (at the same time not forgetting to point out that in artificially raising the exchange value of the rupee, British imperialism at one blow increased the Indian national debt by 11 per cent. (page 194) and that these debts consist of expenditure on all kinds of plunderous wars). The leaders of the Independent Labour Party demand the curtailment of expenditure on the army and the transference of a small section of this expenditure to the British Treasury. At the same time Brailsford stoutly defends the Budget policy of the Government. "It is a grave mistake to suppose that the Indian Government is extravagant. On the contrary it is excessively economical" (page 198). Yet this "economical" Government spends over 70 per cent. of the budget on the army, the police, the prisons and the payment of interest to England. Brailsford recommends a curtailment in army expenditure of 25 per cent. This heroic step can be explained quite simply, for since 1929 the cost of everything used by the army and the fleet has fallen by 36 per cent. Therefore it is possible to grant "concessions" to the Indian bourgeoisie and still lose nothing, explains Brailsford mockingly.

In his eagerness Mr. Brailsford is even prepared to talk about the abolition of private ownership of the land, but like Nehru he compels the peasantry to pay compensation (page 197), i.e., increases their poverty and hunger. But the Independent Labour Party and the English bourgeoisie, together with the National Congress, are not prepared to take this step, for they neither wish, nor dare, to undermine landlord ownership, which is an indispensable part of Imperialist domination. Mr. Brailsford is satisfied with the work of the Round Table Conference, but understands that in circumstances of deepening crisis and growing revolution among the workers and peasants, the rôle of the National Congress is a very subtle, "honourable" one, for it must help to disorganise the masses.

"My own belief," declares Brailsford on pages 254 and 255, "is that if this struggle should be resumed with a trade depression as its background, it will develop inevitably into an agrarian revolution, which will shake the structure of Indian society as well as the Imperial connection. The struggle will not for long remain non-violent; the next phase may be an attempt to use Sinn Fein tactics, and terrorism with its blundering cruelty will break out." This would be a mistake,

declares Brailsford, both for the English and for the National Congress.

Therefore Brailsford recommends two plans to the Indian bourgeoisie with which to smash the Indian revolution.

The first, which he considers is the best and "most probable," is that "the result of the Conference will seem to Congress neither good enough to accept, nor bad enough to resist" (page 255).*

In this case the National Congress will not resume "civil disobedience," nor boycott the elections, nor take office in the Government, but will remain as before "a critical, irresponsible Opposition." In this case the policy of Hindu-Moslem "strife" will continue, landlord ownership will remain, the peasantry will gain nothing, the workers and peasants will be exploited still more, but the "big modern capitalist interests will have their way" (page 257).

The National Congress will have to split and then "the Left Wing of Congress, meanwhile (especially if Mr. Gandhi should quit politics and retire to his ashram), will go its way as a party of peasants and workers, attempting to solve the problem of Indian poverty sometimes by efforts within the elected chambers, more often by rent-strikes and a resort to the tactics of civil disobedience" (page 258).

Mr. Brailsford foresees that there will be sporadic agrarian uprisings, against the Princes as well, which will "attract the sympathetic interest of Moscow" (page 259). Along this road of development, hand in hand with the Indian bourgeoisie, the leaders of the Independent Labour Party are hoping to maintain the domination of imperialism and the right to continue plundering the Indian people, and consequently at the same time the English proletariat as well.

The second prospect which Mr. Brailsford considers the best, but which he does not recommend at present, is that the National Congress having openly accepted the "Constitution" should enter the Government. Mr. Brailsford warns us in advance that the Constitution will be very dock-tailed, but the right will remain to introduce insignificant improvements, clearly with the consent of British imperialism, the Princes and the landlords.

Mr. Brailsford once more repeats the programme of action of a "National" Government (!) of this kind. "It might tap the hoards of buried gold for its constructive purposes. . . . It might launch on a wide front a campaign of en-

lightenment to bring intelligence into agriculture, to create village industries, and raise the standards of health and housing" (page 261.) The leaders of the Independent Labour Party are prepared to concede very little to the Indian bourgeoisie. In the second case as well, declares Brailsford, the National Congress will be unable to maintain unity. Differentiation is inevitable, hence the rôle of the "Lefts," and it is of extreme importance to make use of them (page 262.)

The result of the work of the Round Table Conference up to now, shows that the National Congress intends "neither to accept . . . nor to resist." The National Congress, and particularly its "left" wing, while not definitely refusing to present its "demands" to the imperialists, and making use of new "left" manoeuvres (boycott, the threat of civil disobedience), is mobilising all its forces to ensure for itself leadership of the national struggle and to prevent the growth of the Indian revolution. The counter-revolutionary camp is mobilising and the leaders of the Independent Labour Party are taking an active part. The special task of the Independent Labour Party is to unite with the "left" national reformists (Bose, Roy and others) for the purpose of preventing the creation of an Indian Communist Party and holding back the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in India.

A concrete examination of the trend of development once more confirms the fact that the victory of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, the conquering of full State independence for India, the abolition of the landlord-feudal ownership of the land, and social reconstruction, can be achieved *only under the leadership of the Communist Party*, and in the struggle not only against imperialism and its usurious-feudal supporters, but also against its ally, the Indian bourgeoisie and the National Congress.

For this reason, the creation of an *all-Indian Communist Party* is the essential prerequisite for the victory of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution in India. A determined fight must therefore be waged against limiting the Party to circles of a provincial type. It is therefore essential that the workers and the Party should play a most energetic part in the anti-imperialist struggle, and support every kind of activity which is truly aimed against imperialism and its allies, at the same time mobilising all revolutionary elements around the Communist party, who are prepared to fight, and striving for the hegemony of the proletariat in the national movement.

The Independent Labour Party is a counter-revolutionary anti-working class party. It helps to enslave India, and at the same time disorgan-

*Brailsford's book was written before the conclusion of the Round Table Conference.

ises the English proletariat with its pseudo-Socialist phrases. The Independent Labour Party talks about the civilising rôle of the English bourgeoisie, it is against Indian independence, it supports and propagates imperialist traditions among the English workers with considerable artifice (not clumsily like the Conservatives).

By summoning the workers to support the usurious British Empire, it at one and the same

time calls upon them to support the capitalist system inside England.

The struggle for State independence for India is a necessary condition for the liberation of the English proletariat. This also demands the most determined, daily unmasking of the Independent Labour Party, a continuous struggle against it as the party of British Imperialism and the enslavement of colonial peoples.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE? We all want to know. How Lenin answered. (2/-, 50c.)

For March 8th—Women's Day. How the Chinese masses are exploited. *Chinese Working Women and Peasants.* 2d.

The Commune Anniversary. Lenin's deductions in *The Paris Commune.* (1/-.) Both this and *The Revolution of 1905,* (1/-), throw much valuable light on the conclusions Lenin drew from the working class in action. The new issue in the Little Lenin Library is Lenin on *Religion* (1/.) This meets an urgent need and is sure of a wide sale. (On Religion, Yaroslavsky's new work is in the press.)

To meet the War Preparations on the Soviet Union spread the truth about the workers' State. Carry around *Success of the Five Year Plan* (6d.), and *The Five Year Plan and the Triumph of Socialism* (6d.), by Commissar Molotov. Also *Free Soviet Labour versus Capitalist Forced Labour* (2d.),—an extremely valuable theoretical pamphlet, full of facts as well. Gives the ground argument of Socialist freedom as revealed in the Soviet Union.

In the Press is the 2d. *Five Year Plan*—The C.P.S.U. Resolution, with an Introduction.