

The **Communist**
International

Vol. XVII No. 1

JANUARY, 1939

Sixpence

Lenin's Bequest

The Path of the Bolsheviks

**The Colonial Demands of German
Fascism**

K. FUNK

**The Experience of History
Calls for the
Unity of the Working Class**

F. FUERNBERG

The Nature of Soviet Patriotism

A. CLAIRE

I found this little slip of paper, 6.25 x 1.25 inches, slipped inside this issue of January, 1939 London-published "The Communist International.

---marty November 2023

ERRATUM

No. 1. January 1939. Owing to a printer's error, the two columns on page 16 were transposed. The right hand column should be read first and the left hand second.

Please insert this slip in your January issue of "Communist International"

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. XVII

JANUARY, 1939

No. 1

CONTENTS

Lenin's Bequest 3

Editorial Notes

"With Fire and Sword..." 12

"And They Will No Longer Be Free..." 15

Peter Forster 18

"Neutrality or..." 20

"Towards the Baltic" 22

German Fascism Undermining Switzerland 25

"Anschluss" in South America 29

The Struggle for Democracy in Cuba 32

Pirow, South Africa, and German Fascism 35

The Fighting in Palestine 40

Theory and Practice

The Path of the Bolsheviks.

Conclusions of the Book "Short History of the C.P.S.U." 43

The Colonial Demands of German Fascism . . . K. FUNK . . . 50

The Experience of History Calls for the Unity of the Working Class

F. FUERNBERG . . . 57

From the Soviet Union

The Nature of Soviet Patriotism A. CLAIRE . . . 62

Lenin's Bequest

FIFTEEN years ago a man died who had changed the world as no man had done before him and who brought mankind perceptively nearer the realisation of its boldest dreams. That man's name was Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov, known as *Lenin*.

In front of the tomb of the great deceased crowds queue up to see the face of the man who, immortal, lives on in his creation, in the revolutionary doctrine which he bequeathed to posterity, in the victorious Socialist revolution whose leader he was, in the mighty Socialist State which he founded, in the peerless Bolshevik party which he created, in the iron ranks led by Stalin which he inspired with his own spirit, in the Communist International in which he united together the most advanced workers of all countries, in the whole international working-class movement to which he lent wings by his example, his teaching and his work.

Lenin's work lives on in all struggles and victories of the working class, in the irresistible evolution and development of Socialism. The image of Lenin lives on in the hearts of all fighters for liberty, in the sagas and songs of all peoples for whom he is the incarnation of their own struggle for liberty. The example of Lenin lives on in the Bolsheviks from whom Stalin demanded:

“. . . that politicians should be as clear and definite as Lenin was, that they should be as fearless in battle and as merciless towards the enemies of the people as Lenin was ; that they should be free from all panic, from any semblance of panic, when things begin to get complicated and some danger or other looms on the horizon, that they should be as free from all semblance of panic as Lenin was ; that they should be as wise and deliberate in deciding complex problems in which a comprehensive survey and a comprehensive consideration of all pros and cons is required

as Lenin was ; that they should be as truthful and honest as Lenin was, and that they should love their people as Lenin loved it . . .”

Many a great revolutionary leader of the masses has written his name in indelible characters on the pages of history but none of them equalled Lenin in blending into perfect unity theory and practice, life and doctrine, daring anticipation of the future and firm moulding of the present. There is no break in his being; his life and his cause were always an undivided entity. Not even his worst enemies were able to dig up a single unclear episode, any detail lacking transparency in the life of Lenin. He was monolithic—all of a piece like the party which he created in his own image. The banal biographers who indulge in psychologic interpretations and whose interest is roused by the inner contradictions of a personality found the life of Lenin a subject beyond their capacity. They are frightened away by the greatness, the unity, the overwhelming straightforwardness of this life. Here there was nothing to “reveal,” here everything was as clear as the proletarian revolution itself or, if we look at it with the eyes of bourgeois observers—as mysterious and unfathomable as the proletarian revolution itself.

This revolution, the transformation of all social conditions predicted by Marx and Engels and put by them on a scientific basis was for Lenin an immediate political task. He saw elements of the maturing revolution in the seemingly quite unimportant problems of the day to day struggle, organisation and propaganda. Nothing could elude his attention. He recognised in the tiniest rivulet the water of the great flood which would wash away all the old things and lift the new things on its crest. Because he never regarded the proletarian revolution,

the fall of capitalism and the victory of Socialism as an indistinct dream but always as the real and immutable object of the movement his approach to all problems of the revolutionary struggle was in the highest degree realistic. In sharp opposition to those reformist "realists" who harboured the convenient illusion of a peaceful evolution toward Socialism, this mighty realist of revolution created a party capable of bringing about the victory of the revolution. For Lenin the revolution was the supreme reality and precisely for this reason he was better able than anyone else to judge situations soberly and estimate all forces and counter forces.

Even for the best leaders of the Second International the goal of the movement, i.e., the proletarian revolution gradually receded into the distance and became more and more unimaginable. Even for men like Bebel the revolution was finally only an ever stranger, ever more mysterious catastrophe, a sort of day of judgment, a hazy twilight of the gods of capitalism, entirely unrelated to the daily problems and daily struggles of the present. Lenin found this division into Trade Union and Parliamentary reality on the one hand, and the mythical revolution on the other, this breach between theory and practice intolerable. He considered the split between theory and practice to be the most repulsive feature of the old bourgeois society and regarded the unity of theory and practice as a characteristic of Marxism. Opportunists who mistook their own shortsightedness for common sense called the leader of the Bolsheviks a dreamer and thought this a complete condemnation. Lenin was very far from being a mere dreamer—he was capable of creative dreams. He himself had unforgettable words to say. Dealing with the necessity of bringing out a revolutionary paper on a national scale, he described in his pamphlet, "What is to be done?" how this paper would contribute to the organising of the Party and the kindling of the fires of revolution.

"That is what we ought to be dreaming about!" he wrote, and added:

"We ought to be dreaming . . . !" I wrote

these words and became alarmed. I imagined I was sitting at a 'unity congress' and opposite to me sat the editors and contributors of Rabocheye Dielo. Comrade Martynov rises and turning to me says threateningly: 'Permit me to inquire, has an autonomous editorial board the right to dream without first obtaining permission from the party committee?' He is followed by Comrade Krichevski who . . . continues even more threateningly: 'I go further. I ask has a Marxist the right to dream at all?' "

In reply Lenin quoted the words of Pisarev:

" . . . If man were completely deprived of the ability to dream in this way, if he could never run ahead and mentally conceive, in an entire and completed picture, the results of the work he is only just commencing, then I cannot imagine what stimulus there would be to induce man to undertake and complete extensive and fatiguing work in the sphere of art, science and practical work . . . "

This power of the creative dream, the power to see the complete picture of the work which is just beginning to take shape in the hands Lenin possessed to a very high degree. This force enabled him not only to see in advance, in the first germs of the revolution, the full development of that revolution, but also to recognise in their first germs the last consequences of political errors and deviations.

This is why he opposed seemingly quite unimportant distortions and falsifications of Marxism with such inexorable vigour. Liberal-minded Social Democrats completely failed to understand the burning vigilance of this man who foresaw in the deviations of to-day the headlong descent of to-morrow and after-to-morrow. "It is the beginnings that you must resist," said an old philosopher. Lenin opposed false beginnings, false principles with ruthless energy in order to ward off mortal perils from "the complete picture of the work," his work, the proletarian revolution, the putting into practice of Socialism. The weaklings, the opportunists, the betwixt-and-betweens often took Lenin's ruthless frankness amiss. But Lenin knew that the working class could cope with its gigantic, almost superhuman task only if it was not afraid of any truth, if it criticised unmercifully all weaknesses and mistakes, if it inexorably lopped off

all that was rotten or hostile. Only merciless criticism and self-criticism in good time can protect the working class from being poisoned by the germs of capitalism and prevent little scratches from developing into dangerous centres of infection. The sharp criticism of Lenin was of the greatest assistance to the party and for every party member. It was a decisive element of his solicitude for the movement itself and for every single individual who devoted his forces to the movement. The man who took the greatest trouble to secure decent accommodation and decent food for the delegates at a congress, who looked after every comrade with loving care, who despised the "great men" who could not be bothered with the "personal affairs," the troubles and cares of the rank-and-file—this man was the same man who struck with a heavy hand whenever a principle was at stake. These are merely two different forms of his *solicitude for cadres*, for personnel and for the movement, indissolubly bound up with each other. Lenin fought for every single one of his collaborators with the same passion, the same persistence and the same indefatigability with which he fought for the masses of the people—but his love for any human being ceased abruptly if that human being abandoned the cause which was Lenin's whole life. His life was the people, revolution, Socialism.

This inexhaustible life could not be shaken by any blow. It was inexhaustible because it was rooted in the depths of the masses of the people. "Only the people is immortal," said Stalin in a speech he made to the directors of factories. It was this immortality of the people which flooded the life of Lenin. We all know how Lenin could speak to workers, to peasants, to the nameless men and women of the people, how he questioned and cross-examined them, how insatiable he was in listening to what they had to say, how indefatigably he digested their opinion. We all know how zealously and how patiently this great teacher of the masses learnt from the masses, how thoroughly he checked all his plans and conclusions by

the experiences of the masses themselves. He was penetrated by the people, he was flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone. His unshakeable firmness was based on the strength of his theoretical convictions and on his being saturated with the gigantic forces of the working class, of the masses, of the people. He knew neither panic nor discouragement, nor confusion. When all around him was shaken, he remained calm and showed the way which led forward again. He was a past-master in the difficult art of retreat, of rapid evolution which not only saves the troops but also creates a situation favourable to another offensive. The peace-treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the transition to the New Economic Policy showed his unsurpassed mastery in retreating in good time and making such a retreat a source of new forces for a new offensive. In such situations there were only a few who stood by his side unshaken. But there was one man on whom he would always and unconditionally rely: Stalin, his comrade and his equal in the struggle. Lenin was always sounder of wind than the enemies of the revolution. His revolutionary patience which he wisely pitted against the hurry of his short-winded and impatient opponents always got the better of them. Lenin knew that a few years made no difference, but he also knew that sometimes days and even hours could make all the difference. Revolutionaries have other standards of time than the calendar. Lenin, the master of revolutionary patience, cried in October, 1917: "The success of the Russian revolution and the World Revolution depends on two or three days of struggle!" We all know how insistent he was at that time, how he spurred the Party on, how he explained to his comrades that the decisions of decades were being compressed into a few days. Lenin had prepared for this moment in a lifetime of unprecedented patience, and when it came he won the battle by his unprecedented rapidity of action. Supreme wisdom coupled with supreme audacity, cautious probing and lightning blows—such was Lenin's revolutionary policy.

In Lenin the type of the revolutionary

mass leader had reached the highest degree of perfection. No man could have greater faith than he in the masses, in their revolutionary instincts and their creative ability. But never did he make the masses his idol and never imputed infallibility to them. He knew that the masses could make mistakes, and that it was necessary to explain such mistakes to them with great patience; that it was necessary to help them to learn from their own experiences, to overcome mistakes, prejudices and outworn opinions, and to transform revolutionary feeling into revolutionary consciousness. He knew that the masses need a leading directing force: he knew that spontaneous mass movements invariably break down and that mass movements can win only if the leading directing force is at their head. This force is the Party as formed by Lenin—the united revolutionary fighting party of the working class consisting of the most mature and class conscious elements of the working class. This Party also needs a leadership, a collective leading body which is formed of the most capable and steadfast men and women whose devotion to the Party is of the greatest. The leader of this leading body would be the most capable, most steadfast individual whose connection with the masses is of the deepest. Such a leader was Lenin! Such a leader is Stalin!

Situations arise again and again in which the strength of the masses and the needs of the moment are most clearly incarnated in one man and in which the clarity, courage and resolution of one man decides the issue. Such a leader was Lenin. Such a leader is Stalin.

A proletarian mass leader will not use formal decisions as an alibi to evade responsibility, but he also knows all the time that he is nothing more than the faithful brain of the masses, their concentrated will and their alert will and consciousness. He never flatters the masses and never allow himself to be intoxicated by them, but he knows that the masses are the soil in which he is rooted and from which he draws his strength. He never regards the adherents of his party as followers, but as

members possessing equal rights in a collective body which is held together not by obedience but by conviction. Such a leader was Lenin. Such a leader is Stalin.

Lenin, profoundly bound up with the masses and saturated with the elementary forces of the people, was at the same time the greatest and boldest thinker mankind has produced since Marx and Engels. He had not only understood Marxism in all its purity and amplitude, had not only defended Marxism against all its falsifiers and distorters, he also developed and extended it. Again and again he stressed that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory! Again and again he underlined the tremendous importance of theory, i.e., of correct revolutionary theory conscientiously checked by experience. He passionately opposed those who saw only the practical aspect of any problem and opposed no less passionately the dogmatic theoreticians, and by so doing he defended not only the letter but the spirit of Marxism. While the opportunists revisionists "revised" fundamental truths of Marxism because they found them inconvenient and hence thought them not "opportune": while Kautsky and other Centrists clung to the letter of Marxism and tried to drive out the spirit with the assistance of the letter, —Lenin widened, enriched and rendered more concrete the teachings of Marx and Engels in the light of new facts and experiences. A creative political thinker, he did not hesitate to amend certain tenets of Marx and Engels in the light of new facts and experiences. Marx and Engels had foreseen but they had not experienced the period of decaying Capitalism, the period of Imperialism. Lenin described Imperialism as moribund Capitalism, as the last phase of capitalist development, as the eve of Socialist revolution. He revealed the parasitic nature of this extreme domination of monopolistic capital, the tremendous sharpening of all contradictions inherent in Capitalism, the tensions driving towards discharge in wars and revolutions. The sharpening of the antagonisms between the ruling class and the masses of

the people—the sharpening of the antagonisms between the masters of colonies and the colonial nations—the sharpening of the antagonisms between the imperialist states furiously struggling for a redistribution of the earth—such are the characteristics of Imperialism. Capitalism has extended its power to all countries in the earth and has become a world system. The whole world system of Capitalism is ripe for revolution. It is no longer the maturity of economic conditions in one or the other single country, but the sum total of the relation of forces in each country which provide the decisive preliminary conditions for revolution. The revolution may first break out and win a victory precisely in countries with a lower economic development, in countries in which a residue of feudal conditions still exist, and in which the bourgeoisie is as yet weak. In countries or a country in which the proletarian revolution has been victorious the working class allied with the mass of the peasantry can build up Socialism while Capitalism still survives in other countries. This thesis of Lenin, brilliantly confirmed by the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, goes beyond the theses put forward by Marx and Engels. As Capitalism development then stood, Marx and Engels had to assume that the proletarian revolution would occur simultaneously in all advanced capitalist countries and that the working class would establish Socialism in all these countries at one and the same time. Lenin rectified this view on the basis of new facts and in 1915 he already stated in an article headed *Concerning the United States of Europe*:—

“As an independent slogan the slogan ‘United States of the World’ would hardly be correct, because in the first place it coincides with Socialism and secondly it might give rise to the erroneous idea that the victory of Socialism in one country was not possible and lead to false conceptions concerning the relationship between such a country and other countries.

The unequal development of the economic and political conditions in the various countries is an immutable law of the capitalist system. It follows from this that the victory of Socialism may originally be won in a few countries and even a single country.”

Lenin also rectified another thesis of Marx and Engels in the light of new experiences. As political development then stood Marx and Engels had to assume that the dictatorship of the proletariat would take the form of a democratic republic and that the working class would establish its dictatorship on a parliamentary basis. But Marx and Engels also pointed out the fact that the Paris Commune created new forms of the rule of the people, in which was embodied, for the first time and imperfectly, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Meanwhile, in the revolution of 1905 the masses themselves evolved new, more democratic organs of the will of the masses: the councils or soviets. Lenin immediately recognised the tremendous political significance of these mass organs which were incomparably more democratic than any parliament. He recognised in the soviets the future pillars of the proletarian dictatorship, the most comprehensive, mighty, direct, democratic and authoritative organisations of the oppressed and exploited people, i.e. of the masses themselves. He regarded soviet power not only as a higher form of democratic institution, but also as the only form capable of ensuring the least painful transition to Socialism possible in the circumstances. In the spirit of Marx and Engels, who regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as the foundation-stone of their doctrine, Lenin went a step further beyond one of their principles and gave the dictatorship of the proletariat firm and durable reality in the shape of soviet power.

Thus while the reformists of all denominations openly renounced the teachings of Marx and Engels or transformed them into a rigid dogma, into a lifeless museum exhibit, Lenin always regarded them as a “guide to action” and maintained them in all their marvellous vitality. But the essence of life is development and a doctrine can live only if it continues to develop. Marxism lives on because it developed into Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin, in developing and continuing Marxism evolved the theory that im-

perialism was decaying, moribund Capitalism, that it was the "eve of the socialist revolution," He strikingly refuted the opportunist "theory of spontaneity," i.e. the theory which condemned the party to lag behind the "spontaneous" movement of working class and stressed the leading role of the proletarian vanguard, of the revolutionary party of the working class. He made it clear that the working-class movement would not lead to Socialism of its own accord; that political class-consciousness does not develop of its own accord, "from inside" out of the economic struggles of the working class but that the workers must be educated to political class-consciousness "outside the economic struggle, outside the sphere of the relation between workers and employers." Lenin developed the theory of the continuous revolution put forward by Marx in his "*Address to the Communist League*" and taught the working class that it was possible and necessary to pass on from the bourgeois-democratic to the proletarian-socialist revolution, that it was a strategic task of decisive importance to make the transition from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution in a correct way. Lenin passionately opposed the opportunists who erected a Chinese wall between democratic and socialist revolution, who maintained that the democratic revolution must first be neatly brought to a conclusion and who put off the socialist revolution to some distant future; but he also opposed no less passionately the "left-wingers" who wanted to skip the democratic revolution and start at once with the socialist revolution. Under the leadership of Lenin the Russian Bolsheviks effected the transition from the democratic to the socialist revolution in a correct way in 1917.

The teaching of Lenin regarding the transition from the democratic to the socialist revolution, his approach to the problem of bourgeois democracy are of the greatest topical interest to-day more than ever. Many opponents of the Communist International are trying to quote the authority of Lenin in their struggle against the policy of the VIIth world

congress. They deliberately suppress in these quotations the constant references of Lenin to the fact that the revolutionary party of the working class can mobilise the masses against the ruling class only by a consistent struggle for general democratic demands. In his pamphlet *What is to be done* Lenin wrote :

"... For he who forgets that 'the communists support every revolutionary movement' that we are obliged for that reason to expound and emphasise general democratic tasks before the whole people without for a moment concealing our socialistic convictions is not a Social Democrat. He who forgets the obligation to be in advance of everybody in bringing up, sharpening and solving every general democratic problem is not a Social Democrat. . . ."

"We must take upon ourselves the task of organising a universal political struggle under the leadership of *our* party in such a manner as to obtain all the support possible of all opposition strata for the struggle and for our party. . . ."

"It cannot be too strongly insisted that this is not enough to constitute Social Democracy. The social democrat's ideal should not be a trade union secretary but a tribune of the people able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it takes place, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects. . . ."

In his article *The United States of Europe* Lenin explained that democratic political slogans can never obscure or tone down the slogan of the socialist revolution, but on the contrary :

"Political transformations in a truly democratic direction and even more political revolutions can never, in any circumstances, obscure or tone down the slogan of socialist revolution. On the contrary they always bring us nearer to the socialist revolution, extend its basis, draw in fresh sections of the middle-class and of the semi-proletarian masses into the socialist struggle. On the other hand political revolutions are inevitable in the course of the socialist revolution which must not be regarded as a single act, but rather as an epoch of stormy political and economic convulsions, of sharpest class struggle, civil war, revolutions and counter-revolutions."

We believe these few quotations to be sufficient to characterise Lenin's approach to the struggle for democratic demands. In our time it is the historical task of the working class to take the lead in the struggle for any and every democratic

demand, to fulfil the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution in the teeth of Fascism and thus to prepare the transition to Socialism which is our goal.

Lenin, in developing and extending Marxism, brought the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat—which Marx himself had regarded as his own best achievement—to the highest degree of perfection. He showed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary in order to break the resistance of the classes whose rule was overthrown by the revolution, in order to bring about the unity of the whole working population with the proletariat as its core for the building of Socialism and in order to arm the revolution against its enemies at home and abroad. He emphatically stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat was incomparably more democratic than the most highly developed bourgeois democracy, for :

“... in capitalist society we have a curtailed, scanty, sham democracy, a democracy for the rich alone, for a minority. The dictatorship of the proletariat, the period of transition to Communism will for the first time in history create a democracy for the people, for the majority and at the same time a power needed to keep down the minority, the exploiters.

“Democracy for the overwhelming majority of the people and the forcible suppression of the oppressors and exploiters of the people, i.e. their exclusion from democracy—such is the modification of democracy required by the transition from Capitalism to Communism.” (State and Revolution).

In fidelity to these principles the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union gave the masses of the people a most extensive and far-reaching democracy. The first constitution of the Soviet Union was already in accordance with these principles but the Stalin constitution represents a more advanced stage of soviet democracy. It is not only a democracy for the vast majority of the people but for the whole people which, after the completed elimination of the capitalists and landowners and after them of the kulaks, i.e. of all exploiting classes, has now achieved political and moral unity. Under the leadership of Stalin this extensive and far-reaching democracy was anchored in the new soviet constitution. This constitution at the same time main-

tains and strengthens the Soviet state which safeguards Socialism against the surrounding capitalist world and all enemies at home or abroad. That the dictatorship of the proletariat is still needed for some length of time, that the class struggle does not cease but is sharpened after the victory of the proletarian revolution was formulated by Lenin in these terms :

“ The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most self-sacrificing and ruthless war of the new class against the mightier enemy, against the bourgeoisie whose resistance has been increased tenfold by its fall. . . The dictatorship of the proletariat is a stubborn, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative struggle against the forces and traditions of the old society.”

This struggle has not ceased and will not cease as long as the Soviet Union is surrounded by capitalist states which stop at literally nothing in order to destroy Socialism. The socialist state, its Commissariat for Home Affairs and its Red Army are indispensable as long as capitalist armies, spies, wreckers and assassins threaten the Soviet Union. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union is not only the strongest weapon of the Soviet peoples but also the strongest weapon of the international working class and of the masses of the people in all capitalist countries, who are threatened with Fascism and alien domination.

Lenin, in developing and extending Marxism examined and answered the peasant question as none had done before him and emphasised the absolute necessity of an alliance between the working class and the masses of the peasantry. As no other man had done before him he showed up the national problem in all its tremendous importance and restored the proper balance between proletarian internationalism on the one hand and participation of the working class in the vital problems of the nation on the other. In all these spheres Lenin found a faithful, consistent and creative companion in Stalin.

Of the greatest importance in this our period of struggle against the fascist warmongers is Lenin's attitude to the war

problem. At the time of the first imperialist world war Lenin waged an irreconcilable struggle against war. He set the working class in all belligerent countries the task of striving for the defeat of the native bourgeoisie and of turning the war into a civil war. From this consistent revolutionary attitude of Lenin in the imperialist war the direct and indirect accomplices of the fascist aggressors are now trying to draw the conclusion that Lenin was an opponent of war in any circumstances and that he had made it the task of each working class in all circumstances to strive for the defeat of its own country. Nothing could be more wrong or deceptive than such a conclusion. In the imperialist war Lenin already described pacifism as "a way of deceiving the working class" and distinguished with great precision between imperialist wars and wars of emancipation, between just and unjust wars. In his debate with Rosa Luxemburg ("Concerning the Junius pamphlet") he pointed out that national wars directed against imperialist powers are not only possible and probable, but inevitable, progressive and revolutionary as well. He made it clear that such national wars are still possible in Europe as elsewhere and that in such wars it is the duty of the working class to give support to the fighters for national liberty. He opposed the dogmatic view that a war is of necessity an imperialist war if as happens in certain circumstances, imperialist powers take part in such a war on the side of the fighters for liberty. Using the American War of Independence for an example he explained that this war was a war of emancipation even though the reactionary French monarchy gave its support to the American fighters for liberty. In his speech at the first All-Russian Congress of the Workers' and Peasants' Councils, in which he demanded that the war be ended, Lenin said :

"That is no easy task. This task should not make us forget that in certain circumstances we shall not be able to avoid a revolutionary war. No revolutionary class can renounce revolutionary war—if it did so it would condemn itself to a ridiculous pacifism. We are no adherents of Tolstoi ! It is impossible for us to renounce such a war. To

do so would mean that we fall a prey to the Tolstoi spirit, to the petty-bourgeois spirit and forget the whole doctrine of Marxism and the experience of every European Revolution."

Again and again Lenin pointed out that war is merely the continuation of politics by other means and that hence what matters is what policy and whose policy it is which is continued by the war. When German Fascism continues by a war its policy of oppression, robbery and murder, then such a war is merely a more sanguinary form of robbery and oppression. When the Spanish People's Front, which gave the people freedom and was therefore attacked by the fascists, defends the land and the people in war, then that war is a just war, a war for liberty. If the Soviet people defends Socialism in a war, that war is the most just, most revolutionary war ever waged. This is what Lenin said about war.

Through his doctrine, through his work, through his policy Lenin became the greatest unifier of the working class and of the mass of the people. He abandoned the purely formal "unity" of the Labour and Socialist International, a unity which collapsed every time it was faced with a decisive issue, in order to bring about a real and genuine unity of the working class which stood up to any storm. What sort of "unity" is this which the Labour and Socialist International claims to guard so jealously ? On the first day of the imperialist war this "unity" was a heap of ruins and the workers of all nations faced each other on the battle fronts in suicidal strife. And how is it to-day ? The more urgent the need for unity among the workers of all countries, the more disunited and confused is the Labour and Socialist International, the more evident is the treachery of Citrine and Spaak, Paul Faure and Stauning and the more incapable of action the Social Democratic parties. Unity, a strong ideological, political and organisational unity exists only in the ranks of the Communist International. True to the teaching and the example of Lenin the Communist International labours undauntedly and indefatigably to unite the working class, to bring about

the anti-fascist united front, to rally the widest masses of the people against the fascist aggressors. Lenin's historical work of unification has matured to highest perfection in the Soviet Union. Here the greatest political and moral unity of the people is an accomplished fact: unity of the working class and the peasants, unity of all nations inhabiting the Soviet country, unity of the Soviet people with its party and its government. Lenin's creation, continued by Stalin is the monolithic party and the monolithic Soviet state, a block of granite which stands inviolable and unshakable.

The sculptor Rodin formed the statue of Balzac out of a massive block of stone from which a great head emerges steeply. Such is Lenin : a proud head emerging

from the granite block of the people, of the Soviet state, of the proletarian dictatorship. The unity of his being, of his personality is reflected in the unity of the party which he created, of the people which he led, of the state which he founded : unity of theory and practice, of thought and action, of will and achievement.

Thus Lenin lives on, striding on in front of us in the shape of his faithful companion Stalin, in the shape of the great party of the Bolsheviks, in the shape of the Socialist Soviet Union, in the shape of his teachings which penetrate the masses and in the shape of the masses who turn his theory into practice in a heroic struggle and who march forward to the Revolution and to Socialism despite all opposing forces.

“With Fire and Sword . . .”

HUMANISM in Germany, the subjugation of the Middle Ages, began when the great humanist Johann Reuchlin came out against the persecution of the Jews by the Inquisition. In the hard struggle which he waged against the Court of Inquisition under the presidency of the notorious Jakob Hogstraten, all people who stood for progress joined with him, and notably Ulrich von Huetten. With this defence of the Jews by the most advanced figures of the early sixteenth century, opened the brilliant campaign against the “obscurantists” in Germany.

The fascist obscurantists who rule in Germany to-day, or to be more precise who wage war upon the German nation, detest all humanist traditions. The hangmen of the Inquisition, the torturers of the Middle Ages who burned men at the stake in the dark age of superstition and savagery, are the ancestors of the German fascists. But the terror of Hitler outdoes in crudity, bestiality and infamy, those bloodhounds of **Mediaeval Germany**. It out-vies the most fanatical geniuses for pogrom under Russian Tsarism. It has worked brutishness up into a system which makes the terror of the Inquisition seem tame. Never yet has Germany been so terribly disgraced, and never yet have Europe, or the world, witnessed any slaughter of innocents carried out with such design, deliberation and sangfroid.

The Jew persecutions have aroused the horror of the German nation. Every German with the least trace of honour in his being abhors the disgrace into which his country has been brought by the systematic extermination of hundreds of thousands of defenceless people, and by the fostering by every means of trainees in murder, who envisage in the torture and massacre of the undefended the fulfilment of a patriotic mission. The

German fascists can sense the antagonism and resistance of the mass of people in their officially decreed savagery. And, therefore, they try to present this savagery as a consistent factor in German history, and to delude the Germans into the idea that to be a German means to let ones basest instincts take control. The official Bulletin of the German Labour Front, of December 1, describes with absolute relish the persecutions of the Jews which took place in Berlin 400 years ago, *i.e.* just at the time when the great German humanists began their struggle against this revolting anti-Semitism. The account opens with a reminder full of promise of what is to follow:

“In the capital of the Reich a few hundred years ago, short work was made of Jewish criminals, in accordance with the Biblical thesis of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.”

Then with a smirk it proceeds to tell how in the year 1510 in Berlin, 37 Jews and one non-Jewish tinker were tortured to death because the Jews were held guilty of “defiling and mangling” a human body stolen by the tinker, and further of “slaughtering Christian children” in order to drain their blood. The tale continues:

“The report of the case states that the executioner took the tinker, placed him *half naked* on a low cart and paraded him at his pleasure *in irons* through the smartest streets of the two towns, Berlin and Cologne, and tore him open with red-hot pincers . . .”

Finally the condemned men were bound on a pyre by iron thongs round their necks, which this exhaustive account says was so artfully built that the flames reached one at a time, so that each had to watch the others burn. The author of the article adds:

“Though the horrible cries of the burning Jews must have grated sharply on the nerves

of the numerous spectators, despite the fact that people were used to most things in those days, we certainly cannot gainsay *the salutary effect of public execution.*”

In the course of the article, amazed posterity is informed that a Jew in 1571 practised magic and poisoned his superiors. The account to which the writer refers, records:

“A riot broke loose in Berlin. The rabble threw itself upon the big Jewish hostel, stormed and wrecked the Synagogue there and looted the Jewish houses.”

The writer adds indignantly that the word “rabble” must “surely be a garbled epithet for a really infuriated section of the people.” Some progress is inevitable: that which 400 years ago appeared to the chronicler as a rabble, has advanced under Hitler to the status of “a really infuriated section of the people.” These “really infuriated sections of the people” in S.S. and Hitler youth uniforms, are exhorted not to underrate the “salutary effect” of public execution and torture. Even if the murdering of defenceless fellow beings “grates on the nerves,” one is after all “used to most things” in Germany, and for educational reasons it is advisable to accustom the German people to sights still worse.

Return to the Middle Ages? No. The fascist persecutions of Jews are incomparably more ghastly than the mediæval pogroms. The fanatical inquisitioners and blind illiterates of the Middle Ages did at least genuinely believe that witches and devils existed, and that Jews indulged in sorcery and ritual murder, whereas the German fascists do not believe the grisly tales they tell about the Jews. They have *invented* a devil, in order to deflect the masses of the people from the fight against Capitalism, to incite a chauvinistic fever, under cover of anti-Semitism to put in hand a gigantic swindle, to sow seeds of discord among the nations, and to foster that sub-human barbarity which they need for their criminal policy. As they cannot depend on the “really infuriated sections of the people,” knowing as they do that the fury of the overwhelming bulk of the German people is directed not against the Jews, but against Fascism, they have “rationalised” the eradication of the Jews, they have made

a series of decrees which, put together, far exceed in barbarity the burning-at-the-stake of the Middle Ages. • And even these unparalleled decrees are not the limit to which mass murderers can attain in the guise of law enactors. The organ of the S.S., “Das Schwarze Corps,” published on November 24, 1938, the monstrous plan of campaign against the Jews. It is here stated:

“Because it is essential, because we no longer listen to the world’s outcry, and because when all’s said no power on earth can stop us, we will proceed to the *final solution* of the Jewish question.”

This “final solution,” in the words of the “Schwarze Corps,” consists in the *eradication of the Jews “with fire and sword.”* It cannot be expected of any German that he continue to live with a Jew, “as with a race of certified murderers and criminals and of mortal enemies of the German nation, under one roof.” Thus the Jews must be chased from houses and residential areas, and herded together in a ghetto. They must be publicly labelled (with a yellow stripe or with bells on their clothes) and must be deprived of their possessions and their work. Through complete impoverishment and unemployment, “they will one and all, in pursuance of the most age-old tendencies which run in their blood, *sink into criminality.*” So the openly proclaimed plan is, *to compel the Jews to acts of madness by reducing them to poverty, wretchedness and starvation;* and then, in the words of the S.S. paper, “the final solution of the Jewish question” will follow:

“But now let no one think that we can look passively on at this development. The German people has not the slightest desire to put up with a hundred thousand criminals in its territory. . . . In the event of such a development we should be faced with the painful necessity of exterminating the Jewish underworld exactly as we endeavour to exterminate all criminals in our ordered State: *with fire and sword.* The outcome would be the actual and final finish of Jewry in Germany, its complete destruction. . . .”

The German Jews, hundreds of thousands of workers, salaried employees, artists, lawyers, craftsmen and shopkeepers, are thus to endure step by step the whole torment of progressive suppression, to the point of physical

annihilation. The friends of Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier glory without concealment in the mass murder which they are planning. In face of this official preparation for mass murder, it is absolutely incredible that all the forces of civilisation do not combine together to put a check on the savages by economic and political sanctions, but that instead of this, democrats and social democrats spend time discussing which country shall offer asylum to the German Jews. It is precisely this controversy that the German fascists wish to play up, with a view in this way to preventing joint action of the democratic powers and to sowing disension in their ranks. It is precisely this controversy that can frustrate the uniting of the democratic powers against fascist savagery and retard the struggle against German Fascism. The point is not so much one of securing asylum for the German Jews, as of expelling the accomplices of German Fascism from Britain, France and other countries so as internationally to isolate the Hitler terror, to expose the rottenness of the German fascists and *compel* them to capitulate before the conscience of the world. This question, and not any other, is even more to the point because the persecution of the Jews is simply a prelude to more far-reaching persecutions. Already the German fascists are supplementing the anti-Jewish campaign by a campaign against the Catholics and the members of the Protestant Confessional Church. "Das Schwarze Corps" has openly proclaimed such persecutions. The organ of Himmler, chief of the S.S. and the Gestapo, asserted as early as October 27, 1938, that the clergy "fall outside the community of the people," and added:

"The safety of the nation demands the elimination of these criminals as a State duty. And if they still dare then to raise a cry about *religious persecutions . . .*"

On November 10, 1938, the same paper fanned the campaign against the Catholic and Protestant clergy, voicing this threat:

"We have nothing further to do with them. They are deserters, and as deserters we must treat them."

With an obstinacy which is significant, the papers of German Fascism assert again and again that behind all opposition to the regime are the Jews, and that the professing Christians are the closest allies of the Jews. *Persecution of the Jews is already beginning to switch over into persecution of the Christians*, and just as in the Middle Ages the burning of Jews went hand in hand with that of heretics, so German Fascism is preparing to eradicate not the Jews alone, but with them all "heretics" to fascist totality. *The Jewish persecutions are no more than a part of the relentless civil war, which the Fascists in power are waging with fire and sword upon the German nation.* The chasm of bloodshed and decay which is opening ahead, is meant to swallow up not only hundreds of thousands of German Jews, but also hundreds of thousands of non-Jewish Germans. The contagion from this chasm is meant to stamp out European culture and civilisation. Decaying Capitalism is meant to merge into a state of savagery.

The fight of all nations against the Fascist butchers of the Jews is not merely a duty of elementary decency, but also a condition for the self-preservation of the nations from Fascism's insatiable savagery.

“ . . . and they will no longer be free . . . ”

IN the speech delivered by Hitler on December 2 to the Sudeten Germans at Reichenberg, an open declaration was made of German Fascism's intention to “rear” the German youth for lifelong slavery. Whilst Hitler surveyed the “achievements” of German Fascism since 1933, he had at the same time to admit that boundless difficulties stand in the way of adapting the German nation to the so-called “people's community” (Volksgemeinschaft). He, who had always boasted that he would eradicate Marxism, had freely to admit that he had been unable to accomplish that aim.

“It is extremely difficult to *instil* into a class-conscious proletarian that the whole of his previous outlook is wrong.” These were Hitler's words at Reichenberg. Fascism, it may be, can “instil into a class-conscious proletarian how he must click his heels together in the army; but one cannot “instil” into a class-conscious proletarian the idea that his outlook on life, which is based upon the studies of Marx and Engels, is “out-moded,” or that it is not destined to win through. Over one sixth of the earth's surface the outlook on life of the class-conscious proletariat is supreme. That is known not to the class-conscious proletarian alone, but to everyone else, too. In the land of Socialism, the theory of the class-conscious proletariat—Marxism-Leninism—has been put into effect. The sincere proletarian who, as Hitler rightly remarks, “is swelled with the pride of his class-consciousness,” is today as convinced as he was before German Fascism had seized power, “that one day State power will come to him through the dictatorship of the proletariat.” When Hitler spoke of his efforts to put into effect his so-called “practical Socialism” in Germany, he

had to make an even more damaging admission, for he said: “To be sure, there are people even to-day who say, I remain a communist, and I remain a class-conscious proletarian.” Yes, there are such people, and their number is infinitely greater than a mere 1.2 or 1.1 per cent. of the German electorate! Terror with extreme brutality, measures of compulsion and repression, spying, concentration camps and executions have none of them availed to cow the class-conscious proletarian of Germany. The whole machinery of education, drilling, deprivation of all freedom of press and assembly, and the brute-force organisations of Fascism, are powerless to rob the sincere, class-conscious proletarians of their outlook on life, or to make of them dupes of fascist slogans. German Fascism knows this well enough. And therefore Hitler says resignedly: “Let them remain as they are. . . . There is yet another factor, namely, the child.”

The children, the youth of the German nation—of them Fascism wants to make slaves not simply economically and politically, but spiritually. It speculates that to-day's younger generation in Germany is one which knows nothing about the openly-waged class-struggle of the proletariat, and it is at pains to keep the doctrine of Marx and Lenin out of the reach of the German youth. As Hitler clearly stated in his Reichenberg speech—“and a generation is growing up, which is reared by us. We weed out these ideas from it even in childhood, that is, we never let them so much as enter.” And then Hitler described how education of the youth in Germany proceeds. Even the children are forced into the organisations of Fascism. Besides the school, which no longer enlightens, but stupifies the young German,

thinking. And every thinking man in Germany, including the youth, knows that when, instead of 80 million tons of coal, 180 millions tons are produced, the 100 tons overproduced do not spread out in the form of "heat to the whole German nation," but that the honourable mineowners are making greater profits at the cost of greater exploitation of the miners, whilst the mass of the people is no longer able to burn enough coal to make its rooms comfortable warm. The German people reaps little benefit from the raising of the production quota, but it could well satisfy its most urgent living requirements, at least in part, with higher wages. The German people also know that the millions of Germans who were unable to pass last summer and autumn with their families, but had to spend months on end in the barracks and on the army drill grounds, were by no means ready for "the last supreme sacrifice," but yielded to a compulsion which they had no means of escaping. The great bulk of young people in Germany realise that the Labour Service is not a form of recreation nor a reasonable or useful occupation, but that in it the youth—as Hitler quite correctly stated—is "drilled" with a view to being dissuaded from independent thinking and saturated with the poison of National Socialism. A great number of young people, and first and foremost the working-class youth, feel that the realisation of a so-called "people's community" in capitalist Germany is impossible, because Fascism is not in a position even to ameliorate class distinctions. Every dispute between capital and labour becomes more glaring than ever under Fascism. On the rights of the German workers and of the German nation, one can speak no more. They have no rights left, only duties. Duties, which the fascists impose on the German nation at the pleasure of the armament kings. This is why Fascism will not succeed in eradicating the old revolutionary traditions of the German nation, just as little as it has succeeded in reversing the convictions of the class-conscious proletarians. Within the German people and the young Germans the

there are the organisations of the "Pimpfe," of the Young People, the Hitler Youth, the S.A. and S.S. And in all these organisations the children of the German people are supposed to be reared into "total National Socialists." When they leave these children's organisations and the school behind them, "then they spend seven months in the Labour Service, where they are drilled all with the one symbol, the German spade." That is the point of the Labour Service—drill with the German spade. The uniforms are already on, the martial music is playing, and the dealing of blows is something that can also be practised with a German spade. Moreover, after the Labour Service the young boys enter the Defence Corps. So that whatever the very well trained young man may yet lack, in order to become a "total National Socialist," he will acquire in the army. And when they have left the Service period behind, "then we take them, that they may not *relapse*, into the S.A. and S.S., and they will never again be free their whole life long . . ." That is the way Fascism has treated the German youth. This point-blank admission of Hitler's at Reichenberg, and also certain other passages in the same speech, were not published in the Nazi press. But those attending the Congress at Reichenberg and all who followed this "address of the Leader" on the radio, heard it: German youth is never again to be free its whole life long. So Fascism wills it, and thus Hitler lays it down. Since only thus can Fascism hope to "instil" its ideology, which is false, contradictory, and refutable at every point, into a part of the German youth.

But even these methods of coaching will not enable German Fascism to banish the ideas of Marx and Lenin from Germany. Large sections of the German youth, and particularly the young working people, feel the class distinction between capital and labour, even though they have never yet read the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. One can prohibit a people from publishing its thoughts in the press and in assembly; but one cannot prohibit it from

love of freedom still lives. And even if Fascism has managed by its hypocritical policy, its deceitful hero-worship, its uniforms, military music and war-play, to draw sections of the German youth under its influence, the fact remains that the most valuable section of the German youth is antagonised and repelled by the injustice, inhumanity and bondage with which German Fascism has built

up its system. This section of young Germans is looking for the path to freedom. The class-conscious proletarians will see to it that the young learn the story of the revolutionary struggle of the German workers, and they will see to it that the traditions of the revolutionary proletariat are upheld by the youth. No, German youth will not be unfree its whole life long.

Peter Forster

ON May 14, 1938, Peter Forster, imprisoned in the concentration camp of Buchenwald, Thuringia, made up his mind to escape; however risky, it was better to make the attempt than to wait for certain death inside the camp. Before reaching this decision, Forster had seen only in the first few months of 1938 the death of 145 of his fellow prisoners. In the space of a few months, in only one out of the many concentration camps in Germany, 145 human beings had been beaten up, shot, brutally driven to "suicide." Among them was Dr. Hans Litten, a lawyer, member of no political party, whom years of agony and torture at the hands of the Nazis since the night of the Reichstag fire had made a cripple.

Peter Forster was a young worker. On March 17, two months before he attempted to make his escape, he had just turned 27. From his earliest boyhood he had been one with his class in its joys and sufferings. Its fight was his fight, the whole meaning of his young life. He wanted to live, and he wanted to fight. He knew what fighting under fascist dictatorship meant. When Fascism endeavoured to crush the German working class by means of the Reichstag fire terror, mass imprisonments and mass murder, Peter Forster was among those picked troops of the working class who do not lose their heads in difficult situations, but keep a clear brain and are able to translate the will to resist into action. Peter Forster was a young comrade who had just left the Socialist youth movement; he had been made treasurer of the local branch of the Social Democratic party in his native town of Amberg, in Bavaria, where he carried on the work with all the fresh enthusiasm of youth. In face of the fascist terror he felt a double responsibility rested on

him to carry out his tasks and duties. In August, 1933, he was arrested by the Gestapo and sentenced to 15 months imprisonment for distributing anti-fascist literature. After his sentence had expired, Peter Forster returned to Amberg and got a job as a building worker. After some time he was again arrested by the fascists. The "reason" given for this second arrest was that he was an irreconcilable enemy of national-socialism. That statement was in itself his sentence: it meant that he was included in that body of hostages which Fascism seizes in order to bring pressure to bear on the anti-fascist opposition by the threat of their death. This was the beginning of new suffering for Peter Forster. In Lichtenburg and later in Buchenwald he was driven and drilled, and continually there was the prospect before him of being tortured to death like his comrades by the Nazi murderers.

Peter Forster and his fellow-prisoners experienced on their own persons the intensification of the Nazi war preparations. They were misused for experiments with substitutes and methods of chemical warfare. Among these men, who in the case of war were to be the first to fall on the "home front" (as Himmler, head of the Gestapo, calls it), the speed-up of war preparations caused the first fatal war casualties even before the outbreak of war.

Forster wanted to escape from this hell. He and his fellow-prisoner Bagatzky succeeded in getting out of the camp, but were discovered by one of the notorious "Death's Head" troopers. In self-defence they struck him down and continued their flight. Hounded like animals, they decided to separate in order to increase their chances. For more than two weeks Forster roamed hungry

through woods and fields, until he at last succeeded in crossing the Czechoslovakian frontier. Here he hoped to find protection and safety. Here he learned of the fate of Bagatzky, who had been caught, tortured and executed.

But now in the Czechoslovakian Republic, founded by men of whom some had themselves been emigrants, Peter Forster had to endure for months the torment of suspense. He was kept under arrest. More than once the authorities were inclined to reject the Nazis' demand for Forster's extradition, and to release him. But in the end they always listened to those "honourable gentlemen" for whom the life of a fighter for freedom was only valuable as a counter to bargain with. Peter Forster was made one of the victims of Munich. The Social Democratic coalition government of the Czechoslovakian Republic had refused him his freedom. The government of what was left of Czechoslovakia after Munich handed him over to his executioners.

Peter Forster, the German anti-fascist, the courageous defender of freedom, the socialist, the tireless fighter against Hitler's rule, was put across the German frontier by the Czech authorities. The same day a fascist court condemned him to death. Within a few hours sentence had been carried out.

Peter Forster's death is a severe blow to the German working class; it hits communists, socialists and all anti-fascists equally hard. For Peter Forster was one of those who devote their strength and their lives to uniting the working class for the task of delivering Germany from Fascism.

For the international working class Peter Forster's fate is a cruel and bitter lesson, which they must not forget. The stroke of the axe that ended Forster's life struck also at them. They should feel not only pain, but shame. Peter Forster had already left German soil, but the hand of the fascist hangman pulled him back, because the clenched fist of the international working class struck no blow in defence of his life. Peter Forster was one of many who have been and are being sent back over the German frontier. Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland have handed back many a German anti-fascist, many an Austrian refugee to the power and vengeance of German Fascism.

Peter Forster's fate should touch the conscience of every decent man and woman. It must rouse them to demand that the most elementary principle of humanity shall at last become law: whoever seeks refuge in another country from persecution by the inhuman rule of German Fascism, may and must be assured of the support and help of all decent people. Above everything else, all working class organisations must take serious warning from the case of Comrade Peter Forster: they must do everything in their power to prevent the gangster law of German Fascism from acquiring international validity through a tacit accordance of "legality" to the arbitrary and illegal extradition demands of the fascist authorities. Workers' organisations owe it to the anti-fascists in Germany and Austria to fulfil these simple duties of proletarian solidarity. They owe it to themselves and to the security of their own countries.

“Neutrality, or . . . !”

COMIC papers used to be fond of depicting highwaymen who menaced their victims with revolvers and demanded “Your money or your life !”

The highwaymen of olden days were gentlemen compared with the “spiritual S.A. leaders” of to-day, polished up as these are to represent sages determining the rights of nations. Yet in one respect their objects are identical : *something* must in every event be handed over by the victim to his assailant. Either his money or his life. Either he pays by “Gleichshaltung” which German Fascism describes as “neutrality,” or he is point-blank branded as an enemy. So that in each case he has something to lose.

The *Frankfurter Zeitung* describes this process as the “harmonising of Europe.” He who is attacked or menaced has not merely to pay up, but has to strike a friendly attitude as he does so, and has to live in “harmony” with him who does the squeezing.

The Scandinavian states, particularly Sweden and Denmark, are now subject to the “harmonising” efforts of German Fascism. In its feverish haste to dominate the Baltic, German Fascism is striving for more speedy results. Goebbels’ press is publishing alluring accounts and whole pages of pictures of the Swedish mining districts, in order to prepare the ground inside Germany for a more intensive campaign for the subjugation of Sweden. The German news-reader, whose “patriotism” hitherto has been fired chiefly with the aid of stories of the “troubles of his German brothers” abroad, will now be keyed up and acquire an appetite for Swedish ores. Every day the German news-reader and the listener to Goebbels’ radio has a tit-bit from Sweden put before him : the

journalists have to extort reports from their finger-tips, which speak of a rich growth of anti-Semitism ; they put on record the publication in Swedish papers of news items which are sent out by Goebbels’ head office ; they give careful notice to every activity of the fascists in Sweden, who have started to use misleading titles like “Socialist Gathering” and “Swedish Socialists.” In short, they are at pains to produce in the German public the impression that it will actually soon be necessary for the policeman of Europe to defend justice even in Sweden, so as to maintain order.

In Berlin, where there is deep concern to determine what other nations “lack” in order to become ripe for subjugation, they have discovered that the Scandinavian brain is unhappily incapable of distinguishing between “true and false humanism” (*National Zeitung*, November 27th, 1938).

Let us reflect a moment. Did we not hear quite recently, before the Dictate of Munich, that the Czechs failed to appreciate wherein lay their true national mission ?

Do we not likewise recollect that the Spaniards had to be protected from the danger that they might become untrue to their “nature” ?

Have we not still ringing in our ears Berlin’s admonition to the states of South-eastern Europe, that these states should forbear to court any too far-reaching tendency towards independence, because they would fare far better if they conducted themselves within the “German economic orbit” ?

Was not a cancelled football match between Germany and Holland a few weeks ago made the occasion for German propaganda, with finger upraised in reproof, to indicate to the Dutch that they

should ponder the fact that their sympathy for the Jews and Catholics being insulted and persecuted in Germany, might have "devastating consequences" for their trade with Germany?

And so here we are in the midst of the "shortcomings" which the spokesman of this German race of supermen observe in the neighbouring states of the remainder of Europe, and from the observation of which they deduce on their own behalf the right to "harmonise" Europe, that it may hum in concert pleasing to Berlin.

The reasoning applied to Sweden and Denmark by the German fascist schoolmasters goes like this: the Scandinavians cannot distinguish between "true and false humanism"; for that reason they are exposed to the "danger" of being enlisted against Germany by "irresponsible elements"; and therefore only the control of the press and of public opinion can be of any use. And since money is always ready to hand for fascist propaganda abroad, even though goods imported from abroad are not paid for, Goebbels can start National Socialist Daily papers through his dummies in Denmark. In the name of "neutrality" and of "clean politics" (!!), the German press-pistol, pointed at the heart of the Scandinavians, demands that the trade in "emigrants' papers" and "emigrants' books" shall be stopped, and that the Scandinavian papers shall refrain from publishing "letters from Germany" or "other articles." Nay, more: Even "cultural lectures and functions," "dramatic productions, concerts, yes, and even song festivals" are, it appears, to the German fascist censor incompatible with "neutrality," as he envisages it (see *National Zeitung*).

So it comes to this, that the alternative "Neutrality or enmity" means neither more nor less than those thus addressed must unconditionally manage and control everything so as not to disturb the "harmony" directed from Berlin. It will not help for zealous statesmen to rush to guarantee their "neutrality." German Fascism requires quite a special "neutrality"; the unconditional subservience of "neutralised" vassals.

"Jewish and Marxist-governed democracies" have "so far never been neutral," declares the "spiritual S.A. leader" Bockhoff in the *Berliner Boersenzeitung*, referring to all states and nations which are powerful enough to want to rule themselves and decide their own internal affairs. Their "independence" from all international ties, i.e. their uncoupling from all treaty ties and obligations, their complete isolation, is for the German fascist an "essential, unalterable object."

From which it follows that those who concur in the "neutrality" demands of German Fascism not only gain nothing, but by such a step deliver themselves up. Sweden recently experienced an attempt by German firms to introduce the German rule of race into Sweden (according to the principle: We will buy your goods, pay for them at best with worthless compensation marks, but will supply you first of all with anti-Semitism and Gestapo!) Denmark was reprimanded as "selfish" in mid-December, 1938 by Goering's *National Zeitung*, because someone in Denmark reasonably suggested that she should procure a declaration from the other Scandinavian countries, guaranteeing her frontier with Germany. That was a purely German-Danish affair, thundered Goering's organ. Well, now the Danes can wait until further demands are directed at them.

Unconditional subjection to the "policy of neutrality" as demanded by German Fascism, or open enmity—that is the alternative with which German Fascism faces its neighbours. "Neutrality" towards the fascist tyrants means to forswear one's national independence, means to capitulate before the menace of foreign rule. The Scandinavian countries can only avert this danger by determined and united resistance. The struggle against fascist influences, against the spies and accomplices of German Fascism, against every policy of capitulation, the close collaboration of the Scandinavian states, the support of all the democratic forces in Europe and not least of the Soviet Union—herein lies the stronghold of that independence which is menaced by Hitler's Germany.

“Towards the Baltic”

IN Lithuania the German fascists are now behaving as they did in the Sudeten territory shortly before the annexation. On December 4th, 1938 appeared for the first time their newspaper, *Memeler Dampfboot*, together with a supplement which contained extracts from Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and “basic achievements of National Socialist World philosophy.” Similar contributions are to be published regularly. Alfred Rosenberg, the Baltic spy is now directly trying to reconcile Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia with the ideology of German Fascism. Neumann, its representative in Memel, is openly pushing forward preparations to separate the Memel territory from Lithuania.

Formerly many an insular citizen of Western Europe deluded himself with the comforting thought that the drive of German Imperialism “towards the East” (*Drang nach Osten*) was of no danger to Western Europe and that it therefore was actually a welcome diversion of Germany's efforts to expand. This “argument” played an essential part in the reasons given by Chamberlain and Daladier in their countries for their policy of capitulation and pacts with the Hitler regime. Now, however, the entire fallaciousness and hollowness of this construction is coming to light. The steps taken by Germany in the East are occurring simultaneously with Italy's advance against France together with new efforts made by the united forces of German and Italian Fascism towards the subjugation of Spain. It is now shown that German Imperialism's policy in the East is merely a component part of that policy whose aim is described as a “New Order in Europe.” German Imperialism does not think of allowing itself to be just “shoved” towards Eastern Europe.

Rather does it consider mastery over the South East European countries to be first and foremost a stepping stone or basis, on which German Imperialism, by virtue of its growth in might and territory in South East Europe can finally and completely crowd France out of the European sphere of influence.

It concerns not only Memel but considerably more. Memel is only the starting point, the present focal point of German Fascism's offensive against the three neighbouring Baltic states.

German Fascism demands “positive neutrality” from the three Baltic states. Understood in this is their dependence and subordination to German patronage. Goering's *National Zeitung* leaves no room for doubt concerning the attitude that Berlin demands from the three states, namely that German Fascism will not be satisfied by a mere declaration on the part of the three states to the effect that they are totally opposed to the U.S.S.R. It demands also that they isolate themselves entirely from Poland and give up all ideas of collaboration with Poland. Accordingly, for better or for worse, Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia are to be made directly dependent upon Berlin. The demand for the “positive neutrality” of the three states towards Germany is therefore the first step, to be followed by complete dependence upon and subordination to German Fascism. In this case “positive neutrality” signifies moreover, granting to German Fascism a free hand to carry out its agitation in the three states.

The rapid tempo at which Rosenberg's people are working in Lithuania may serve to illustrate the extent of the fascist work of disintegration, pushed forward at great expense and by the application of numerous “specialists,” if Fascism

once succeeded in obtaining a free right of way.

On December 8th, 1938, Neumann, who is Rosenberg's deputy in Memel, declared: "Even if according to the letter, we are Lithuanian citizens, inwardly we have no further connection with Lithuania. Memel territory is German by culture."

In its leading article of December 10th, 1938, the *Essen Nationalzeitung* openly threatened Lithuania's regime with "the fate of Schuschnigg and Benesch." On December 11th the same paper wrote that no great insight was needed, "after the experiences of 1938, to entertain the least doubt as to whether it were still possible in Memel to come to an agreement between the two nationalities even with the best of goodwill on the part of all concerned." On December 13th the *Frankfurter Zeitung* referring to the change in the international constellation, declared that the "political construction and constitution" of Memel had lasted long enough "to prove its absurdity." On December 13th the *National Zeitung* reported joyfully that the "Memel Directorate" (the board of management inspired from Berlin), through a regulation pertaining to internal state service, had ordered "that the Lithuanian state police should be regarded as civilians and correspondingly so treated. This summary of a few days suffices to show that there is no lack of provocative threats or direct interference aiming mutually at the outbreak of open conflict.

The agitation of German Fascism claims that in Memel it is a question of "liberating German compatriots." But even official German literature estimates that only 50.9 per cent of the inhabitants in Memel territory speak the German language. Because in this case the recently beloved "ethnographical" principle threatens to be inadequate. German Fascism appeals on a claim that the Baltic countries are in the main "German territory by culture." In this connection Germany's "claims to justice" go back to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, to the raids of pillaging and robbery undertaken by German knighthood. In German literature it is stated point blank

that the Baltic countries have never been colonised or cultivated by Germans. The new claims to domination on the part of German Imperialism are simply based on a supposition that the peoples of the three states are "incapable of cultural development," and that they need German tutelage for further progress. On these grounds German Fascism especially likes to meddle in the affairs of other countries. For example on December 2nd, 1938, the semi-official *Deutsche diplomatisch-politische Korrespondenz* in justifying German intervention in Spain, explained that on the Iberian Peninsula, the German government "was striving to eliminate foreign influences that are essentially repugnant to the character of the Spanish People." Just as the regime in Berlin defines those who may be admitted in the world as "German," the Hitler regime presumes to investigate what the "character" of a nation consists of, and to dictate to this nation how it must live and develop.

If however the mantle of "German National" and "culture bearing" phrases, under cover of which they come forward as "Bearers of a European mission," is torn from the Rosenberg Knights of the Swastika then is revealed the brutal footpad, the highway robber.

In 1915 the extreme "politicians of conquest" in Germany wrote and circulated under the name "Professorial Petition" (because it was signed by 325 university professors among others) a memorandum concerning the war aims of German Imperialism. This memorandum has become well known. It refers in the following manner to the Baltic states.

"Furthermore we do not hesitate to point emphatically to the old land of the Russian Baltic provinces, cultivated for 700 years by Germans. Its fertile and thinly populated territory offers a rich future for colonisation, and its population of Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians can become the assured nucleus of migratory workers that we so urgently need."

Germany's present fascist regime stands firmly by these aims at annexation. Rosenberg has merely to prove that the methods used by the agents

of Germany in those days were too faint hearted. The peoples of the Baltic states are themselves sufficiently acquainted with the moral code of the Baltic barons and German "knights," to appreciate that under the domination of German Fascism they would actually be nothing but hounded and underpaid serfs, "migratory workers," driven from one Junker to another, from one job of road-making to the next.

German Fascism is thus striving to undermine and dominate the Baltic states, to enslave its inhabitants, to erect strategic bases and sally-posts. Moreover, because it believes and hopes that the Western European nations will be too short sighted to recognise that they themselves are involved and endangered by the Swastika legions, the fascist press authoritatively says : "The affairs of Eastern Europe are in good hands !"

German Fascism Undermining Switzerland

HERR VON BIBRA was until 1935 councillor of the German embassy in Prague. Such, at least, was his official title; unofficially he was Hitler's specially appointed agent for the task of "bringing the Sudeten Germans back home to the Reich." In this capacity he had nominated Henlein as the Fuehrer of the Sudeten Germans, and it was in this capacity also that his ears were soundly boxed, in 1934, upon the streets of Prague by a Czech woman. Finally, Herr von Bibra was constrained to quit Prague, as the leading part he played in the organisation of treasonable activities could no longer be concealed.

Herr von Bibra moved straight from Prague to Berne. But there has since been no change in his activities. He is now first councillor of the German embassy in Berne, and the only change made in his specially appointed, unofficial duties is the substitution of the term "Swiss Germans" for "Sudeten Germans." One might have hoped that the Swiss government would manifest more vigilance than the capitulatory government of Hodza, and would keep strict tabs on the councillor of the German embassy. However, the fate of the Czechoslovakian Republic appears not to have made any impression upon the Swiss government, and Herr von Bibra, officially and openly, and with the government's express sanction, is "Fuehrer of the German National-Socialists in Switzerland" as well as embassy councillor. Thus the range of the "unofficial" appears substantially to have shrunk, and conditions for Herr von Bibra's sinister activities appear to be even more favourable than in Prague.

The activities of the "Fuehrer of the German National-Socialists in Switzerland" are extraordinarily varied. By means of coercion and blackmail Ger-

mans and Austrians living in Switzerland are to be forced into serving the Fascist plans of aggression. So much is generally known, and is almost official, so to speak. At any rate, any attempt to stem these activities would be looked upon as violation of Swiss neutrality, not only by Herr von Bibra and his employer, Hitler, but also by the Swiss Government. As for that branch of Herr von Bibra's activities which is concerned with Swiss citizens, organisations and newspapers—this is considered as the "unofficial" aspect of his mission.

Under pressure of public opinion—and also after certain cantons, particularly that of St. Gall, had started to proceed on their own account against the Swiss Nazi agents—the homes were searched, throughout Switzerland, of well-known members of Swiss Nazi organisations, and even some arrests were made. The public gathered from these proceedings only that sufficient damaging evidence was discovered to prove the close connection of these organisations with "foreign centres." Beyond this, the Swiss authorities were silent.

Nevertheless, a certain amount of further information filtered through. For example, not long ago "Die Nation," the organ of the "Richtlinien" movement, published a report from its Lucerne correspondent stating that instructions, emanating from the German authorities, had been found on German engineers employed in certain Swiss factories in which these engineers were ordered, in the event of an outbreak of war, not to return to Germany. Their task was to remain in Lucerne, and, in the event of German air attacks, to indicate the most important industrial centres of the town.

The Lucerne correspondent then continued:

"It is said, here in Lucerne, that the result of the investigations is so damaging that the authorities do not dare to deport all these spies as there are too many of them. Diplomatic conflicts are feared, and therefore other means of getting rid of them are being sought."

This despatch from Lucerne represents only part of the truth. The German Government would certainly not rest content with giving its subordinates in Switzerland instructions only in the eventuality of an outbreak of war. Wrecking work, sabotage and espionage, even during this period of so-called peace, is going on at full speed; and practically not a single step in this direction is taken without the most specific instructions from Berlin. It is not for nothing that Herr von Bibra is "Fuehrer of German National-Socialists in Switzerland."

The Government remains silent, but at the same time is planning a diversion—an offensive against the Communists.

Indignation at the criminal activities of German fascists in Switzerland is growing day by day, and can no longer be allayed by fine words regarding neutrality and neighbourly relations with the fascist predatory states. Therefore the Government—with the support of the Fascist and semi-Fascist press—is seeking to divert this indignation by directing it against the Communists. An unsavoury campaign of misrepresentation is to be the pretext for the passing of anti-Communist legislation, as no grounds whatever can be found in the sincerely democratic and anti-Fascist Communist Party itself. Such methods, of course, are not new—they are the old and tried methods of repression.

The Fascist peril, the danger of "co-ordination," ("Gleichhaltung") of the partition of Switzerland among the Fascist aggressors, has become a very present one, particularly since Munich; and the Swiss people realises this and has sounded the alarm. It has recently been shown that neither German nor Italian Fascism can boast of any support in Switzerland to talk about—yet the process of fascisation is making definite pro-

gress! This is only possible because the forces of democratic resistance are profoundly divided and without a leader.

If any proof be needed of the above statement, the referendum of November 27, 1938, on the Finance Bill, provides it. The situation was as follows. Ever since 1933, the existence of an emergency clause—which has here fulfilled the same function as Bruening's emergency decrees did in Germany—has enabled the sponsors of all financial bills to prevent them from being the subject of a referendum as is provided in the constitution, in order to avoid their certain rejection by the people.

All working-class organisations, the Swiss trade unions and Social-Democratic Party and the Swiss Communist Party are carrying on a powerful campaign against the policy of the emergency clause. In the course of this struggle the "Richtlinien" movement was born to which adhere all the trade unions, the Social-Democratic Party, the Young Peasants, some cantonal democratic parties, and other groups, including the young Catholic group: "Entscheidung."

All the above organisations, parties and groups unitedly demand the termination of the emergency clause policy, adequate funds for the provision of employment, the operation of the old-age pensions provisions, and the strengthening of national defence through increased taxation of capital.

The Finance Bill which was submitted to the referendum last November provided neither for increased taxation of capital, nor for the adequate provision of funds for employment, nor for putting into operation old-age pensions. Most of the revenue originally destined for these purposes was now to be allocated to national defence. The new Finance Bill also asked for a prolongation by another three years of the validity of all previous financial provisions—which were introduced by means of the emergency clause and are strongly opposed by the "Richtlinien" movement. Yet the trade unions and Social-Democratic Party asked the voters to vote "Yes"! This is the consequence, on the one hand, of certain paltry and vague concessions

by the government, and, on the other, of the deliberately disruptive policy of the notorious Ilg, secretary of the metal workers' union.

This is that same Ilg who concluded an agreement with the employers in the metal industry by which the workers renounce the right to strike. The same Ilg who wrote in his paper, the *Metallarbeiterzeitung* (the "Metal Workers' Journal") that one should learn "folk community from the German Fascists, and who held up the Nazi "Kraft durch Freude" ("Strength through Joy") organisation as an example both for Swiss employers and workers.

Thus it transpired that partners in the "Richtlinien" movement were in opposition to each other in the struggle for and against the Finance Bill. The Young Peasants, the federal Democrats under the leadership of Dr. Gadients (the strongest party in the Canton of Grisons), and also the Social-Democrats and trade unions of Geneva, voted "No" as against the "Yes" of the Swiss Social-Democracy and trade unions. Thus there arose a sharp antagonism here, where really no antagonism should exist; for the Swiss Social-Democratic Party also supports demands for taxation of capital, for the modification of the wage reductions ordered by emergency clause, for the provision of work and for old-age pensions. Instead of a united struggle for these demands, there arose in part a bitter struggle among themselves. The policy of division triumphed, and German Fascism—or, as Ilg prefers to term it, German "folk community"—may boast of yet another success.

Thus the democratic forces in Switzerland present a picture of profound division which makes it comparatively easy for German Fascism to push Switzerland farther along the path of her own downfall. Nevertheless, at the same time the desire and determination to resist is also growing. Undoubtedly the Swiss people is prepared to defend with arms its country and its freedom, even against superior forces. This applies as much to the German-speaking Swiss as to the French-speaking, to the Italian-speaking as to those speaking Romanz. The in-

solent instructions which German Fascism issues to the Swiss, the orders from Berlin that Switzerland, in the name of "neutrality," must suppress expression of opinion and limit democratic rights, have opened the eyes of numerous Swiss citizens to the real intentions of Hitler Germany.

The immediate danger is not that of military aggression. Like Italy, Germany has every reason to fear a war that might be transformed overnight into a world war which would bring in its train the inevitable defeat of the Fascist powers. No, the greatest immediate danger for Switzerland lies in surrender to Fascism. The peril lies in the undermining and disintegration of those factors which are most essential to the successful defence of Swiss democracy. There is, of course, still time to arrest this perilous process. The will to anti-Fascist unity is strong and increases from day to day. What is lacking is its concentration and organisation. Democratic anti-fascist unity naturally cannot be achieved on the basis of inter-party co-operation all the way from Musy, over Motta, to Ilg, but only in a struggle against these agents of Fascism.

And it is upon these agents and allies that German Fascism principally relies. The *Berliner Börsenzeitung* has candidly stated that Germany believes that a decline in Swiss democracy, and the renunciation of Marxism by the Swiss working-class movement, with a turning towards National-Socialism, is imminent. In other words, German Fascism looks upon people like Motta in the middle class and Ilg in the working class as the executors of its intentions.

There exist, in all sections of the population of Switzerland, and in all parties, tendencies and forces which are in favour of a determined struggle against the attempt to fascisize the country. At the same time, however, there also exist, in almost all organisations and parties, protagonists of capitulation, the masked or open agents of Fascism, who have so far been able to paralyse the anti-fascist forces, to intensify existing antagonisms, to provoke new divisions, and to hinder all attempts at unity.

This applies particularly to the organisations of the Swiss working class. The Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions—which, in view of their numerical strength and social composition, were pre-eminently qualified to take the lead in the process of rallying almost the entire Swiss population against Fascism—are almost completely paralysed, as a result of international antagonisms and the ruling tendency within them towards surrender and division.

The amazing and depressing spectacle may now be witnessed in Switzerland of peasant, democratic and Catholic bodies carrying on a struggle against Fascism which is clearer and more consistent than that of the great organisations of the Swiss working class.

This deplorable weakness cannot be overcome by patching up irreconcilable antagonisms. It can be overcome only by means of a merciless struggle against the capitulators, against the agents of Fascism in the ranks of the Swiss organised working class. It will not be by the Social-Democratic Party surrendering to Ilg and his allies, but by the

forced surrender of this same Ilg and his friends to the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions, to the mass of their members and functionaries, that the way will be made clear for the defence of Swiss independence and democracy against Fascism.

The unification of all anti-Fascist forces within the great organisations of the working class, the cleansing of these organisations of hostile agents, a pitiless struggle against the capitulators and against every attempt to cripple the anti-fascist forces—such is the task upon whose fulfilment will depend whether Switzerland is or is not to become the prey of the fascist bandits. It is only in a struggle for these ends, and in a struggle against a government which, under cover of an alleged neutrality, has written complete surrender into its programme, that democratic Switzerland can be successfully defended. In an alliance with Motta, in an alliance with fascists, we cannot fight Fascism. Communist-baiting was never the beginning of a successful struggle to defend Democracy, but, without exception, was everywhere a step towards Fascism.

“Anschluss” in South America

IN Chile, at the southernmost point of South America live about 10,000 German immigrants and descendants of immigrants, whose ancestors left Germany several generations ago. Under the influence of German fascist agents, backed up by the pressure which is brought to bear on their relatives still living in Germany and on business connections, a fascist movement developed there, which, claiming to preserve German customs and manners, aims at the “uniformitisation” (Gleichshaltung) of everything that can in any way be connected with former German immigrants. Organisations and associations of all kinds are compelled to submit to this “Gleichshaltung.” Individuals and guilds are expected to take an “Oath of Fidelity to Hitler.” Maga, the bourgeois-radical deputy in Parliament, explained, that in this territory there reigns an atmosphere in which a citizen of Chile feels himself to be a foreigner.

There we have, far from Germany, an impressive illustration of the National Socialist principle that “The right of the People” is linked with the “Right of the State.” “The right of the People,” which is defended by German Fascism as a principle by which to regulate relations between states, is the “right” assumed by German Fascism, to place at its disposal those of former German nationality or their descendants, and to force them to be active in other states on behalf of the fascist regime’s imperial interests.

Meanwhile in Chile the next step has also been taken. After Fritz Thyssen, the German arms magnate and financier of the Nazi Party, had in 1937 visited that part of Patagonia belonging to the Argentine, in order to prepare the plans for the German air line station in that

strategically important territory, which had already during the world war 1914—1918 served the German Navy as a base for operations against the British Navy, the fascist organisers in Chilean territory developed a movement to unite the neighbouring part of Patagonia with the territory sought by the Nazis.

It is tempting to see only the grotesqueness of these efforts. Yet the brutal earnestness, in which the German fascists everywhere pursue their aims might well be underrated if progressive mankind were merely content to pour justified mockery on the booted and spurred highway robbers.

The “Anschluss” demand by German fascists in the case of Patagonia, is illuminating in many respects. It shows how the methods used in Sudetenland, also come to be applied in territories which cannot in any way be considered as neighbours of the German Reich; it proves, that the fascist régime of Germany is striving to introduce into other states as strategically important points, foreign bodies, whose function it is to undermine and dissolve state order under the banner of the so-called “Right of the People.” It proves that behind the “Right of self-determination” and the “Right of the People,” which German Fascism leads into the field, stand very definite strategical and imperialistic motives.

At the same moment that Italian Fascism stretches out its hand to the Suez Canal, German Fascism is intensively engaged in planning and constructing bases in the region of the Panama Canal. The action brought against the German spy Schakow has recently shown how keenly German Fascism is interested in the Panama Canal. In the state of Equador a base for the control and mas-

tery of the Panama Canal, is being established since a German military specialist "won over" the minister Avilés and General Chiriboga with the help of a rich reward in money. In Equador and Peru, German agents have managed to acquire extensive stretches of land by means of which the streams of the Amazon and Marañon rivers can be dominated. By this means a connection has been established with those territories in the Brazilian states of Amazona and Para, where 1.3 million hectares of land is in Japanese hands. Therein lies the attempt to dismember a whole continent and to create their own communications between the two oceans by means of a corridor subjugated to German and Japanese Imperialisms. On the Panama Canal itself, still more extensive under mining work is being carried on. The German Bank in Columbia and the influence exercised by German capital on the Magdelene River Shipping Company, are working in harmony towards bringing the entire river under the patronage of German finance, and in this way to acquire a base next door to the Panama Canal for the operations of German Fascism. Between the states of Costa Rica and Panama, between Nicaragua and Honduras, German agents and wire-pullers are provoking differences and strife, in support of which they willingly supply arms. With the help of convulsions and the creation of fascist-infected territories, the plan of German Fascism is to convert the Panama Canal territory into a field for the development of German Imperialist bases, where difficulties can be prepared for the U.S.A.

With the same ruthlessness, German Fascism is building air lines and air bases in the Latin American countries under the cloak of the "civil" aviation enterprises of "Lufthansa" and the "Condor Syndicate." Many important communications from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and between the most important points of the Latin American states lie in the German hands.

Thus one cog-wheel of this machine grips the other. The fuel, however, which can always be added, especially if the resistance of the Latin American

peoples to their inclusion and subjugation under the domination of German Fascism clogs and hinders the running of this machine, is supplied by the intrigues of the so-called "Germans Abroad" and "German People's Groups." They are the focus of Gestapo activity and military espionage. They stand behind those "mutual home-bred" fascist organisations founded with German money and guided by German instructors, whose "Putsches" and outrages they prepare and support. They are a state within the state, acting as a centre of infection for the spreading of anti-Semitic racial hatred. As a starting point for countless internal difficulties and conflicts, they weaken and break up the power of resistance of the Latin American states to attacks and extortion from outside.

In 1937 at the "Foreign Session" of the N.S.D.A.P. (Nazi Party), the German fascist Hans Henning von Kossel, reported on the activity of fascist German groups in Brazil. He drew special attention to the significance of the network of German schools, staffed by teachers drilled to Fascism in Germany or by German instructors. By means of threats, outlawing and boycott, the fascist drivers try to induce the sons of colonists whose ancestors emigrated from Germany, to submit to "Labour Service" and "Military Service" in Germany. All associations that are not under the central control and in which the German language is used, are subject to continued threats and attacks in order to force them under Fascist guidance and also their members to take the oath of fidelity to Hitler.

In the Argentine, State Governor Misiones asserted that the so-called German colonies in this state recognise no other government than that of Hitler. In the schools a regime has been introduced by fascist teachers, many of which have been specially trained in Germany. Under this regime, the children of German speaking democrats are forced to stay away from school because they are constantly threatened and involved in serious conflict. A report published in August 1938 in the "Berliner Tageblatt" by a certain W. Lütge who officiates as

leader of Nazi propaganda in the Argentine, shows that a minority of German speaking people in fascist organisations terrorises the majority and strives to undermine with fascist principles all non-political, social and cultural guilds.

In Mexico it is known that the German Nazi organisations have quite officially imported the German fascist code of “Racial Laws.” German immigrants and descendants of German immigrants are forbidden to marry Mexicans who have “Indian blood.” In the land of a sovereign state, German Fascism is thus beginning to pass the barbaric German bye-laws of “race instruction” and to apply them practically.

The picture which has been sketched may be completed by adding that side by side with the immediate ambassadors of the various German “Propaganda”—and spy groups (those for example of the “German Workers’ Association,” the “Society of Germans Abroad,” the “Foreign Political Office” of Rosenberg, the “Fichtebund,” the “Ibero-American Institute,” etc.), certain German capitalists, being those most interested, are the arch-initiators of these plots. Through their offices and representatives run also many threads connected to the “home-bred” fascists, for example to the Integralists in Brazil, the “Gold Shirts” in Mexico among others. The monthly

support given to the Integralists in Brazil by German capitalists amounted for some time to 60,000 dollars. The contractors Hasenklever, Hücke, Hermann Stoltz and Dannemann act as though they were noble benefactors. The Transatlantic German Bank earmarked at one go 400,000 dollars in order to ensure the election of a Brazilian fascist. The money donors work in close unity with certain North American financiers, who are the props of reaction against Roosevelt in the U.S.A., who would like also to obstruct democratic development in Cuba and who are particularly interested in keeping the Latin American states dependent and weak.

Whoever takes these facts into consideration, will no longer find the bid for the “Anschluss” which the German fascists made in Chile merely grotesque, but will understand that great dislocations are being prepared in the course of which it is a question of repulsing the attempts of German Fascism to convert, with the help of its Italian and Japanese allies, the Latin American States into a parade ground and into a base of operations for German plans towards world domination. The danger does not lie only or even foremost in the attack from outside. It exists principally in the centres of infection, that German Fascism has known how to form.

The Struggle for Democracy in Cuba

GREAT changes have recently taken place in the political life of Cuba. At the beginning of 1938, the Government, whose real head is Colonel Baptista, was a military dictatorship. Now it has taken genuine steps towards recognising the democratic rights of the people.

Not only are demonstrations in favour of Mexico and Spain now allowed, but during 1938 the Government changed its own attitude towards the Spanish Republic, and, for instance, released a Spanish Republican ship and crew which had been held under arrest for more than a year. On September 30, Baptista told the American agency, the Associated Press, "Cuba is for democracy and against the totalitarian states." He added that the Cuban army, 25,000 strong, would support the democratic United States in the event of their fighting a war against Fascism. Montalvo, a typical specimen of the Spanish fascist merchants of Cuba, has been thrown out of the Government.

Colonel Baptista promised to carry out almost all the democratic and social demands of the popular demonstration of September 25. Pepin Rivero, leader of the reactionaries, and editor of the newspaper of the big Spanish merchants, had a decoration bestowed on him by Hitler not long ago. His paper has attacked Colonel Baptista for his attitude towards President Cardenas of Mexico and towards the recognition of the people's democratic rights. Colonel Baptista has replied to these attacks by maintaining his anti-fascist position. Ignoring the anger of the reactionaries, Baptista has openly repeated his promise to summon a Constituent Assembly in 1939, and has taken the first steps towards realising it. The preparation of the voting list has begun throughout the country, and a drafting commission has been established,

to draw up laws for the election of the Constituent Assembly.

Finally, the Government has demonstrated its new position by its attitude towards the Communist Party and the other revolutionary organisations. For some time the Government has allowed Communist speeches to be made openly. Early in September, Colonel Baptista recognised the Communist Party of Cuba as a legal political party, and said, "The Communists form a part of public opinion, and our aim is that no section of the people shall be excluded from the construction of Cuba's new system of Government."

The Communist Party of Cuba, which has been compelled to work underground during the whole of the 13 years of its existence, has organised demonstrations in which thousands have taken part. It has celebrated openly its thirteenth anniversary. It has been granted an hour on the radio for propaganda, and on November 7 it celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of the October revolution with a speech over the radio. Recently the Communist Party sent an open letter, signed by Blas Roca, to President Vargas of Brazil, demanding the release of Louis Carlos Prestes.

Cezar Villa, Communist leader of the Cuban workers, who was driven into exile by the police in 1936, has returned legally to his native land, and received a public welcome from thousands of workers. Comrade Joachim Ordoqui, a high official of the Communist Party, who was also in exile, has returned to his home unmolested. He and Comrade Blas Roca, the General Secretary of the Party, for whom spies were hunting furiously only a few months ago, were received by Colonel Baptista, who assured them of his determination to call the Constituent Assembly during 1939. When Blas Roca

refuted the charges of the reactionary press that Batista had manoeuvred against the Communists, Batista sent him a friendly telegram, reaffirming his aims.

Several causes have brought about this change in Cuba. The most important of these was the movement of the workers and of the people for their economic demands, for democracy, and for the unification of the democratic and progressive forces of the country. 30,000, 60,000, and 80,000 people took part in demonstrations in support of Mexico, of republican Spain, and of China. A mass demonstration of transport and other workers took place on September 25 in Havana in support of a programme of 15 economic, political and social demands. A great wave of feeling swept over the country in favour of the unity of the working class and the unity of democrats, in favour of revolutionary unity and of one united revolutionary Party. Early in 1938, a great Congress of Workers was held, with the Government's permission, in Havana. A union for the Havana district was formed. A series of important conferences in the various localities and industries followed. Finally, a central committee was established to organise a national Congress of Workers in January 1939. This congress is to form the single national centre of the Cuban working class, and will unite 900,000 workers of town and countryside, and also the black-coated workers. Till now only 200,000 of these were organised, according to the official statistics.

On the basis of this movement for unity amongst the workers, the unification of the revolutionary Parties is also advancing. In the middle of 1937, a revolutionary block was formed consisting of the following parties: the National Agrarian Party, the Cuban Agraristic Party, the Cuban Revolutionary Party, and the Revolutionary Union. This block united the progressive forces of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the Left intellectuals, and the powerful national revolutionary masses of the people and of the workers. At present, efforts are being made to extend and

strengthen this block, and to form a single Progressive Party. At the last full session of the Revolutionary Union (a National-Revolutionary Party) it was decided to join up with the Cuban Revolutionary Party (the Party of the progressive bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements) and so prepare the way for the formation of a united Progressive Party. The Cuban Youth, organised in several special youth organisations and in the various parties, is moving steadily towards unification. One organisation, "Jovenes del Pueblo" (Youth of the People), has affiliated to the "Hermandad de los Jovenes Cubanos," (Fellowship of Cuban Youth). More than 30 per cent. of Cubans are negroes. The Cuban Negroes' Union has declared itself in favour of the people's united movement for democracy, whilst continuing its struggle for equality of the negroes with the rest of the population.

Another factor which helped to change Batista's policy was the Government's economic difficulties.

A third factor, which certainly played a decisive part, was the correct line of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has worked hard to overcome the sectarian mistakes of the past. It has fought vigorously and successfully against Putschist tendencies which existed amongst the petty bourgeoisie, and which were being cleverly exploited by Fascist agents, especially by the Trotskyists.

The Communist Party led important popular demonstrations in favour of democracy, of Spain, of the unity of the working class. It urged the masses constantly not to resort to isolated outbreaks of violence, but to take part in legal demonstrations of their will. As a result of this policy, fascist agents have been given no opportunities to provoke disorders which the reactionaries could have used against the people.

At its tenth plenum, the Communist Party analysed the political situation in the country. It came to the conclusion that Batista was no longer the centre of the reactionary forces, and that the

party's chief attack must be directed against the open fascists, Pepin Rivero, Montalvo, and Casanova. The Communists emphasised that they did not, however, imply that Colonel Baptista was therefore to be recognised as a democrat and supported. Colonel Baptista had only taken a few steps towards the recognition of the democratic demands of the people. The party's tactics must be to support the Government's democratic measures, to detach it from the reactionary forces inside the country and from international Fascism, and at the same time to press for a democratic constitution, which would assure democracy, and better living conditions and economic security for the people.

Other factors which helped to alter the Government's policy were certainly the influence of Roosevelt's policy, the progressive policy of President Cardenas of Mexico, and, especially, the struggles of the Spanish and Chinese peoples.

Baptista's social origin may also have played a part. He comes from the peasantry, and was a clerk and a subaltern when he led the revolution of 1933. Although he later became rich, and in spite of the reactionary measures which he took until this last change, he never won the confidence of the aristocracy and of the bourgeoisie.

The Cuban reactionaries have begun to attack Colonel Baptista, as yet only in hidden ways. They are trying to unite their forces under the cover of defending the ideals of the 1933 revolution from demagoguery and Communism. Senator Casanova, a leading reactionary, has joined a Nazi Party, which has been modelled on the German Nazi Party. Together with their Trotskyist agents whose acts of provocation include attacking a priest and throwing bombs in a cinema, the reactionaries are trying in every way possible to sabotage Baptista's preparations for the Constituent Assembly.

Under pressure from these reactionary forces, most of which are still inside the Government, Colonel Baptista's attitude has weakened dangerously. The Government has banned meetings planned in support of Spain. Trade unions exist, but are still illegal. The paper of the Cuban Revolutionary Party has been forbidden. In a few provinces, army officers still behave with great brutality towards the people and the revolutionary organisations. Finally, the Government has allowed the establishment of two fascist organisations, which are preparing a coup d'état against Baptista and his new policy. The leaders of Cuban reaction are already taking steps to secure the material aid of American bankers for this venture.

Cuba's Communists and democrats are on their guard. They have discovered the sinister-sanguinary designs of the fascists and reactionaries, and the deeds of their agents, the Trotskyists. They are fighting constantly and with success for the unification of the working class. At the same time, they are urging the forces of the Left towards the essential step of creating an all-embracing progressive Party. The Communists and the Parties of the Left support all the Government's progressive measures, but never refrain from attacking any measure which is not in the interests of the Cuban people.

The Communists and all true Cuban democrats are carrying on a disciplined and legal struggle under the slogans: "For a happy and democratic Cuba. For a constitution which assures democracy, and improved conditions and economic security for the people." They are fighting for the summoning in 1939 of the Constituent Assembly which will check the manoeuvres of the fascists, and unite the people against its enemies: at home and abroad.

Pirow, South Africa, and German Fascism

OSWALD PIROW, Minister of

Defence and also of Commerce for the Union of South Africa, went on a journey to Europe immediately after the surrender at Munich about which so much has been written. Pirow chose a curious route, which led him through Portugal, through that part of Spain held by the fascist interventionists, through Britain, Germany, Italy, Holland and Belgium. The explanations and excuses which were given in public for this tour were so obviously invented to mislead and delude public opinion that they are not worth dwelling upon. The reception accorded to Pirow in Berlin and Rome betrays, more clearly than any communiqué, whose interests this tour was intended primarily to serve, and the hopes that were placed upon Pirow by the German fascists in particular.

Pirow was hailed in the German press as "one of the first foreign politicians" who "even in the year 1933" had found his way to Hitler. As an important guarantee of his servility regarding the demands of German imperialism the German press pointed to his "German origin."

For the benefit of the public, the organs of German Fascism placed the following subjects upon the order of the day, as being the ones to be dealt with on the occasion of Pirow's presence in Germany:

1. Economic problems, connected with armament questions in the Union of South Africa, the solution of which the German war industry took upon its shoulders.

2. The treatment of "Germans" in South West Africa.

3. "Racial questions" in a twofold sense; first of all, a "final settlement of

the relation of Black to White" must be undertaken, and further, Hitler's Reich desired to see anti-Semitic measures taken in South Africa.

This list of requirements reveals a very definite and most deep-seated interest on the part of German Fascism in the political and economic conduct of the Union of South Africa, a land which at present occupies no official position of subservience to Germany but is, on the contrary, a not unimportant part of the British Empire.

The "modern" methods of bourgeois democracy at present in use in Britain and South Africa, and particularly favoured since the Munich conference, allow reactionary statesmen to slur over, by means of vacuous "statements," questions which are vitally important for the immediate future of everyone who is directly affected by certain secret understandings. Neither Chamberlain nor Pirow have any intention of disclosing the nature of the underhand machinations which formed the business of Pirow's conversations, to the public or to their electorates. Thus it is all the more necessary to make the facts clear.

The subjects of negotiation, given more or less in the form of an ultimatum by the German press upon Pirow's arrival in Berlin, can only be grasped in full significance when viewed as the outcome of a long drawn-out period of German fascist activity in South Africa. The fascist press did not exaggerate when, in its welcoming articles on Pirow's visit it said that developments in South Africa were being watched with growing interest by German Fascism. In this instance, contrary to its custom, Goebbels' pen expressed itself overmodestly, since Hitler's Reich acts not as an attentive observer of developments

in South Africa, but as a power which has its own finger in the South African pie.

German Fascism believes that it has now prepared the ground in South Africa well enough to obtain control of the key positions, by means of stronger pressure and by the "spontaneous influence" of the connections which it has taken pains to nurse. The raw materials of South Africa, South West Africa and Tanganyika whet the appetite of German imperialism just as keenly as does the strategic position of those regions. Both are meant to serve as a springboard from which it hopes to reach further objectives. Anyone who thinks its imperialist avidity can be subdued by throwing it a few juicy morsels should remember that the South African territories make up only a part of German Fascism's colonial demands, and that the very reason why those territories are put first at this moment is that they are key points because of their strategic position and would form bases for other plans of aggression. The "economic problems" which Pirow was to discuss are in reality strategic, military problems, insofar as German Fascism looks to acquire through them the naval and air bases which would enable it to harass the important communications of other powers with India, the Far East and Australia. And finally, this offensive of German Fascism in the Southern and South-Western parts of Africa must be accounted as the "complement" of the efforts being made by Italian Fascism to seize the hegemony of the Mediterranean basin.

The preparing of the ground in South Africa and its adjoining area of South West Africa was accomplished in the usual way. First, Hitler's Reich and its numerous foreign organisations tried to sow the seeds of disruption within these countries through the agency of German settlers, by means of misusing German trading houses and faking "scientific research expeditions." In the Union of South Africa there live about 57,000 German immigrants and others, who are claimed as "Germans," in South West

Africa there are some 14,000 and in Tanganyika some 2,700.

In recent years thousands of Germans have been settled by Germany in all these areas. Between 1933 and 1936 about 6,000 Germans immigrated into the Union of South Africa. In South West Africa the number of German settlers to-day is double that before the war. And of Tanganyika, a correspondent of the South African paper, the *Star*, writes that it has been subjected to a proper invasion of Germans. In Moshi, for instance, there were no German settlers in 1925, but now, 500-600 Germans live there. The situation is similar in Arusha, in Oldiana. German tradesmen who used to have two employees now have six or seven, without this being necessitated by reasons of business. Many native chauffeurs and other employees have been replaced by Germans, apparently for the sole purpose of raising the German population by hook or by crook.

Everywhere among the immigrants, organisations have been built up on the pattern of the German fascist organisations. The Union of South Africa, South West Africa and Tanganyika, have each been consolidated into national bodies, which in turn are subdivided into District, City, and Local Groups. The spies of the Nazis concentrate on the work of influencing the South African papers, the authorities, scientific bodies and universities. Here they collect supporters for the Nazis, develop their fascist propaganda work, and organise "excursions" of dramatic touring companies and "tourists" in these areas. They relay radio programmes from Germany to every corner of South Africa; they set up illegal broadcasting stations in South Africa. Everywhere they have their auxiliary organisations: "Strength through Joy," "Winter Relief," Pioneer organisations, school organisations, summer camps for training, among others, S.A. and S.S. men, through which they try to get control over the cultural life of the country, to foster anti-Semitism and to preach fascist racial hatred.

This organisational work is supplemented by other efforts. For example, the

Capetown Guardian reports that the Germans on the Bissagos Islands, which lie 150 miles off the West Coast of Africa, have built naval and air bases, for secret submarines; that Soga, Ruban, Buban, Bubanque and Camhabaque have been converted into complete naval bases; whilst the *New York Times* records that recently a German aeroplane crashed in Gambia carrying a crew of five and with them ten technicians of the Bavarian Engineering Works, whilst doing "test flights" under tropical conditions, precisely in this region which can threaten the sea routes to South Africa and South America. Among the victims was a pilot named Blankenburg who had flown the Atlantic 107 times before. *Reynolds News* reports that the Italians, in violation of the Anglo-Italian Treaty of 1925, permitted a Germany colony to be established in Jubaland (East Africa), the German population of which the Third Reich proposes to bring up to a strength of 5,000 during the next year.

The great and extremely acute danger to the people of South Africa, arising from this activity of the Nazis in South Africa and its immediate vicinity, is enhanced because the spies of German fascism have found accomplices, who come forward for instance in the "Malan Movement" ostensibly as leaders of an independent "national" movement, but who are really pulling the waggon-load of German imperialism's interests.

The Malan Movement in the Union of South Africa is sponsored by the Nationalist Party, at the head of which is the reactionary, pro-fascist leader Malan. It gets its members chiefly among the Afrikaans (Boers), especially those living in rural areas. It appeals for the support of the 500,000 so-called "poor Whites," i.e., to the ruined or impoverished farmers, labourers and farm personnel, who are hard hit. At the last elections the Nationalist Party received about 260,000 votes out of a total of about 800,000. The reactionary, pro-fascist leaders of the Nationalist Party, among them Malan, have repeatedly made pronouncements favourable to Hitler, Mussolini and Franco.

It is an open secret that the leaders of the Nationalist Party have connections with the Nazi spies in South Africa and even with the Nazis in Germany, who support them by every manner of means. The Malan Party also collaborates with the fascist organisations in South Africa, the "Greyshirts." The Nationalist Party is run in a spirit of hatred of Communism. Every effort is made to prohibit the unity of the nation for securing the independence of the State, the formation of a United Front in South Africa, and to split the Trade Union movement afresh by launching racial unions.

The leaders of the Nationalist Party make special efforts to kindle racial hatred among the Afrikaans against the Africans (Natives), and thus to nip in the bud the friendship between Natives and Europeans. They stand for the sharpest possible repression of the Natives, and in this respect fall in completely with the policy of German Fascism.

By its foreign policy and its reactionary internal line the Government of the Union of South Africa, in which Pirow sits as head of two Ministries, backs up the German fascists and their Nationalist allies. Without wishing to draw facile conclusions from a comparison of the agitation of the German fascists before the outbreak of the war of intervention in Spain, with agitation in one's own country, it remains a fact that the South African Government belongs to the backers of Franco and in general follows faithfully behind Chamberlain. Besides the shame which this brings upon their own country, they earn the derision of German Fascism, which of late showed enormous delight when the "Boer" movement, which it had launched, organised a keen campaign against the English language in South Africa. At the same time as this was happening, the spokesman of Hitler's Reich published demands addressed to Minister Pirow for a wider use of German and for a far-reaching saturation of the entire country with the ideological exports of Hitler Germany—racial hatred and anti-Semitism. In this respect the reactionary forces within the

Government of Herzog go a long way in their internal policy toward meeting the "expectations" of German Fascism. In 1936 the Government did away with the last remnants of the right to a direct vote, which had been retained by a section of the Natives. It is now preparing the so-called Urban Areas Act, which aims at driving all the "undesirable" elements of the Natives out of the towns and providing the rich farmers with cheap labour. It is planning legislation to forbid marriages between Natives and Europeans. It adopted the Aliens Bill giving it stricter control of immigration, whereas it puts up patiently with the invasion of German Fascism on a large scale. It tightened up the "Industrial Conciliation Act" until to-day this has become a weapon for prohibiting strikes, since by it the sentences for striking are extended and a strike is so defined as to make it practically impossible for any individual or group to conduct a struggle without coming into conflict with the Act.

It is clear that a reactionary policy like this, which hampers the activity of the great bulk of the people, restricts democratic rights and liberties and bolsters up the warmongers, is not designed to put a stop to the advance of German Fascism.

As a result of all this, the Union of South Africa is the region of the British Empire which is most laid open to Nazi aggression, in which the danger of a fascist uprising is greatest.

The general mass of working people and the oppressed peoples in the Union of South Africa, South West Africa and Tanganyika are avowedly indignant about the intrigues of the fascists. When the horrible anti-Jewish persecutions and pogroms began in Germany, a great mass movement of protest arose in the Union of South Africa. In Johannesburg, Capetown and Port Elizabeth there were mass meetings in which the most varied sections of the population took part. The democratic Press sharply opposed the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. On October 2, 1938, a conference of the Transvaal Organisation of the Labour Party met in Johannesburg,

which branded the betrayal of Czechoslovakia as a betrayal of peace and democracy all over the world, and raised the demand for co-operation with the working-class movement in every country in order to fight effectively in defence of democracy.

It is these widespread anti-fascist feelings which prompted the Capetown organisation of the "Unity Party" to condemn the persecution of the Jews in Germany, which actuated Havenga of the Unity Party to spend £2,000 for the children of Spain, and which induced the Minister Hofmeyer to resign because the reactionary Fourrier was appointed a Minister although his candidature had been invalidated by the elections. The very widest circles of the South African population are opponents of Fascism.

The native and oppressed peoples of South Africa are no less opposed to Nazi activity in South Africa and the return of colonies to Germany. They well remember the brutality of the German imperialists, who reduced the once flourishing Herero Tribes of 300,000 strong to less than one-third this number during a few years in the Herero wars, who drove men, women and children into the Kalahari Desert where they suffered terribly from thirst, and stole the Herero territory and livestock. In German East Africa the German imperialists forced the Natives to work for them 240 days in the year. Between 1891 and 1903 alone, sixteen punitive expeditions were organised against the Natives, and in the unspeakable slaughter of 1906 more than 150,000 were murdered. They understand that a return of the Nazis to the colonies would mean a still ghastlier repetition of these outrages.

So it is understandable that the Natives watch the proceedings of the Europeans with the closest attention. "Umtetelli va Bantu" reports that Hitler's campaign for the return of colonies has caused disturbances among the Natives. Big disturbances took place of late among the Natives in Eshowe in Zululand. They cried: "The German soldiers are coming! What will they do to us?" In Tangan-

yika one might see Natives coming out in full war attire from the mountains, because they had heard that somewhere in the world (in connection with the betrayal of Czechoslovakia) events were being enacted which affected them, too. Even to-day one can still see Natives who go to work on the plantations ready armed with swords and spears, in order to be always equipped to struggle for their interests.

Although, as the facts show, a lot of time has been wasted and plenty of opportunities given to German Fascism to gain a hold, among the great mass of people in South Africa and the regions connected with it the conditions exist for surmounting these pressing dangers. Pirow and his like are certainly the most unsuitable people one could think of for this purpose. Pirow, who conducted his European tour in a secretive twilight of

whisperings after the manner of Munich, constitutes a very great menace to the further progress of the Union of South Africa.

The conclusions which the working-class movement of South Africa has drawn from the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, make it incumbent upon it first and foremost to combine and apply all its own forces, and above all to heal the split in the Trade Unions. Only the working-class movement, in alliance with the oppressed races can provide a basis for the widest development of the struggle against the threatened subjection of South and South West Africa to German imperialism. If it proceeds with the accomplishment of this task, then it will fulfil in its own cause a mission in which it will have on its side the sympathy and support of anti-fascists and progressive forces the world over.

The Fighting in Palestine

THE bloody clashes in Palestine become more and more violent. The country is in a state of war. Barbed wire separates Palestine from Syria and Transjordan. Communications between many towns and villages are discontinued. In Jerusalem, Haifa and Jaffa street fights, often lasting for days, continue to flare up. The fighting has gone far beyond the framework of mere local disturbances between the domiciled population and the English colonial troops. The hand of German Fascism is in the game. The fights are being dramatically parcelled out by the propaganda of Goebbels, whilst German agents are active on the spot as "advisers" and "instructors."

In September, 1938, 100 Arabs took part in the organisation of the Nuremberg anniversary of the Nazi Party. In order that it would play the part of protector to pan-Islam, German Fascism put these people up as representatives of the Arabian countries. It allows no opportunity to slip of emphasising that the struggles of the Arabs have aroused the support of Germany and that Germany's sympathies are on the side of the Arabs. The agents of German Fascism are everywhere forming links destined to make possible a wide pan-Arabian and pan-Islamic movement. Characteristic of this is a declaration by Mohammedans in India, which was circulated by the German press and German news agencies, and which constitutes a link in the chain of pan-Islamic efforts under German patronage.

With this kind of activity, German Fascism is pursuing its own aims. The Arabs are mere pawns in its game. This is well in line with the general attitude of Fascism which supports one side in the great wars for freedom that are be-

ing fought out at this moment by the peoples of Spain and China. The same German press, which hypocritically protests in the name of "humanity" against the destruction of Arab villages in Palestine, extols the devastation that is being prepared in Spain by German and Italian aviators and soldiers. The same German press, in whose columns the least utterance from the reactionary Islam side is exaggerated beyond all measure and converted into an affair of universal importance, preserves a systematic and completely dead silence about what is being said and done in India, in the Malay Archipelago and in other Eastern countries on behalf of the Chinese struggle for freedom against the Japanese intruders.

The fascist propaganda headquarters in Berlin is using its most suitable forces for undermining activity among the Arabs and Mohammedans. For a year Schwarz van Berb, chief editor of the *Angriff*, has been travelling in Egypt, Palestine and the neighbouring countries; Sieburg, news reporter of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, has been in France and has reconnoitred in Tunis, Algiers and Syria. According to communications received from the press in Syria, the German newspaper correspondents "working" in Syria, Irak, Egypt and Palestine recently held a conference with a view to concentrating the entire activity of these correspondents in the Arabian countries. At the conference, the propaganda methods to be used by German fascists in Arabian countries were discussed. The chief of the Propaganda Ministry, Goebbels, pays out monthly £3,000 towards the upkeep of correspondents in Egypt, and this machinery is simultaneously engaged in espionage.

The German and Italian fascist agents

in Palestine, who are exploiting to the utmost the antagonism between Jews and Arabs, produced artificially by British imperialism, are striving to intensify this national hate between the two. They seek their lieutenants among the native sheiks and feudal chiefs; but principally among those Arabs who were formerly agents of British imperialism.

Marx Grün delivered in Rome a lecture, in which he made the following statement about the Palestine question among other matters:

"With the help of the Arabs, Italy can easily destroy the Mossulo-Haifa petroleum pipeline and thereby deprive the English Mediterranean Fleet of its fuel."

That is the practical explanation of the sentences in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* dated November, 29, 1938, stating

"that Germany's great partner, fascist Italy, is destined to become a leading power in the Mediterranean, and that the English claim to world power via the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean, was limited by the natural rights of a strong Italy."

The German and Italian fascist agents are also engaged in the smuggling of arms. The arms transport goes through Syria, Irak, Egypt and Palestine, and supplies the insurgent Arab movement in whose leadership Italian and German officers are active. According to a report of *Reuter's Agency*, arms to the value of £20,000 were smuggled from Germany and Italy alone into Palestine, in five months of 1938. It is obvious that these figures by no means represent the actual volume of arms traffic. The English Colonial Minister Macdonald, answering a question in the House of Commons, stated that the bombs exploding in Palestine were not of German origin. This "refutation" does not alter the essential truth of the matter, for German and Italian fascist agents can also send English bombs to Palestine. Photos published in various newspapers of guns and light machine guns used by the Arab insurgents, nevertheless prove clearly that the insurgent's weapons are of German origin.

The responsibility for the bloodshed in Palestine is borne by the pro-fascist government of Chamberlain, which by its policy of provoking and stirring up

national dissension in Palestine, and by its concessions to Mussolini and Hitler, incites more strongly than ever the aggressive desires of those two men and grants them great freedom of trade.

The agents of British imperialism in the ranks of the Jewish bourgeoisie who support the national oppression of the Arabians bear also their share of responsibility.

The native Jewish population in Palestine lived for centuries in brotherliness and friendship with the Arabs. The workers and peasants among the Jewish emigrants and the entire working class Jewish population can and wish to live in peace with the native Arabs. If the Jewish workers can compel the reactionary leaders of the "Chistadrut" Trade Union to finish with their policy of disunion and create a united Workers' Movement, this unity would deal British Imperialism and German and Italian Fascism a serious blow. Such unity is a guarantee of brotherliness and friendship between the Jewish and Arab workers. It alone can lead to the restoration of peace in Palestine and to the withdrawal of German and Italian fascist influence.

The responsibility for the present bloodshed in Palestine also falls upon those reactionary elements among the Arabs, who constantly betray the interests of their own country. At the head of the insurrection now stands the Mussulman priesthood in Palestine—the Mufti Eli Chusein—a bought agent of German Fascism, whom the fascists claim to be a fighter for the interests of the Arab people.

Eli Chusein and his mysterious men are not only not representatives, but are wreckers and traitors to the true national movement of the Arabian people, to the just cause of the Arabs. Mufti Eli Chusein and his clique do not shrink from organising plots and provocation against the real revolutionary leaders of the Arab people. With such corrupt methods and with such provocation they mask themselves before the Arab people. These traitors are to the forefront in inciting national dissension between Arabs and Jews. They do not confine their agitation to Palestine but

carry it on in all Arab countries. Recently a clash occurred also in Irak between Jews and Arabs.

No true supporter of democracy and freedom can dispute the right of the Arabian people to national self-determination. And it is the duty of democrats, particularly in Great Britain, to fight the policy of the Chamberlain Government in Palestine, to force British imperialism to make an end to this policy and give the Arabian people complete democratic rights in its country. But at the same time the Arabian people must see clearly that it is its bounden duty to cleanse the Arabian national movement of all agents of German as well as Italian Fascism, and to prove by deeds that the fascist conquerors, the worst oppressors of weak peoples, have no place in Arabia.

No man of honour can remain indifferent to the catastrophic situation in which the Jews residing in capitalist countries find themselves. German Fascism is organising Jewish pogroms. In broad daylight the fascists are driving the Jews out, stripping them of their possessions, torturing them and throwing them into concentration camps. The Jews fleeing from the bestial actions of Fascism are seeking a refuge in various countries. Many Jews who believe in the promises made by British Imperialism that a "Jewish National State Home" was founded in Palestine, are just now streaming into that country. Palestine cannot accommodate all emigrants. It would result in chasing the Bedouins and the Fellaheens from their own land. But the working class Jews who have emigrated to Palestine are already finding out the kind of "National Home" that British Imperialism has prepared for them.

The chief culprit in the bloodshed in Palestine is German and Italian Fascism, which is using to the full, espionage, provocation and trickery in order to unleash a new world war.

Peace and unity in the fight for the independence of Palestine are possible and necessary to the working class Jews and Arabs. This fight must not only be directed against British Imperialism with its agents in the Zionist bourgeoisie and

against the reactionary Arab sheiks and feudal chiefs, but in the first instance against the organisers of provocation and pogroms — the German and Italian fascists.

In their plans of aggression, German and Italian Fascism are going far beyond the new carving up of Europe. They want to have the last say in the Mediterranean and Red Sea territory. Their gaze is fastened upon colonies and also upon those countries which are under the influence of British Imperialism. Since the Munich arrangement, Hitler and Mussolini have begun to speak still more openly and cynically about them. The old plan of German Imperialism, to possess a direct line of communication from the North Sea to the Black Sea, to Bagdad and Mesopotamia, is being energetically pursued by Fascism. To this end they have inaugurated the air line Berlin - Bagdad - Teheran - Kabul. Chamberlain, who wants to divert the thieving glances of Mussolini and Hitler from the English colonies, has made over Abyssinia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia for German and Italian Fascism to tear to pieces. But Chamberlain's capitulation to Hitler and Mussolini has not reduced the appetite of these aggressors. The British Government concluded a "Gentleman's Agreement" with Mussolini by which it desires to establish a balance of power in the Mediterranean. How the balance of power is actually constituted, if a free passage is given to the "Rome-Berlin Axis," is described by the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, dated November 29, in the words:

"France finally . . . must realise that the new power relations in the Mediterranean can no more be overthrown by alliances than those in Eastern Europe. In short, the status quo existing previously in Europe has yielded to something totally different, and this must be recognised as irrevocable."

The course of events in Palestine, and in the East generally, illustrates the fascist theories of "Balance of Power" and of "Peaceful Settlements." German Fascism and its Italian allies intend to establish themselves in these territories and to make them a base in their fight for the imperialist domination of the world.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Path of the Bolsheviks

THE CONCLUSION OF THE "SHORT HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION."*

WHAT are the chief conclusions to be drawn from the historical path traversed by the Bolshevik Party?

What does the history of the C.P.S.U.(B.) teach us?

(1) The history of the Party teaches us, first of all, that the victory of the proletarian revolution, the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is impossible without a revolutionary party of the proletariat, a party free from opportunism, irreconcilable towards compromisers and capitulators, and revolutionary in its attitude towards the bourgeoisie and its state power.

The history of the Party teaches us that to leave the proletariat without such a party means to leave it without revolutionary leadership; and to leave it without revolutionary leadership means to ruin the cause of the proletarian revolution.

The history of the Party teaches us that the ordinary Social-Democratic Party of the West-European type, brought up under conditions of civil peace, trailing in the wake of the opportunists, dreaming of "social reforms," and dreading social revolution, cannot be such a party.

The history of the Party teaches us that only a party of the new type, a Marxist-Leninist party, a party of social revolution, a party capable of preparing the proletariat for decisive battles against the bourgeoisie and of organising the victory of the proletarian revolution, can be such a party.

The Bolshevik Party in the U.S.S.R. is such a party.

"In the pre-revolutionary period," Comrade Stalin says, "in the period of more or less peaceful development, when the parties of the Second International were the predominant force in the working-class movement and parliamentary forms of struggle were regarded as the principal forms, the party neither had nor could have had that great and decisive importance which it acquired afterwards, under conditions of open revolutionary battle. Defending the Second International against attacks made upon it, Kautsky says that the parties of the Second International are instruments of peace and not of war, and that for this very reason they were powerless to take any important steps during the war, during the period of revolutionary action by the proletariat. That is quite true. But what does it mean? It means that the parties of the Second International are unfit for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, that they are not militant parties of the proletariat, leading the workers to power, but election machines adapted for parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggle. This, in fact, explains why, in the days when the opportunists of the Second International were in the ascendancy, it was not the party but its parliamentary group that was the chief political organisation of the proletariat. It is well known that the party at that time was really an appendage and subsidiary of the parliamentary group. It goes without saying that under such circumstances and with such a party at the helm there could be no question of preparing the proletariat for revolution.

"But matters have changed radically with the dawn of the new period. The new period is one of open class collisions, of revolutionary action by the proletariat, of proletarian revolution, a period when forces are being directly mustered for the overthrow of imperialism and the seizure of power by the proletariat. In this period the proletariat is confronted with new tasks, the tasks of reorganising all party work on new, revolutionary lines; of educating the workers in the spirit of revolutionary struggle for power; of preparing and moving up reserves; of

*We print here the last chapter of the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, which will shortly appear in English.

establishing an alliance with the proletarians of neighbouring countries; of establishing firm ties with the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, etc., etc. To think that these new tasks can be performed by the old Social-Democratic parties, brought up as they were in the peaceful conditions of parliamentarism, is to doom oneself to hopeless despair and inevitable defeat. If, with such tasks to shoulder, the proletariat remained under the leadership of the old parties it would be completely unarmed and defenceless. It goes without saying that the proletariat could not consent to such a state of affairs.

"Hence the necessity for a new party, a militant party, a revolutionary party, one bold enough to lead the proletarians in the struggle for power, sufficiently experienced to find its bearings amidst the complex conditions of a revolutionary situation, and sufficiently flexible to steer clear of all submerged rocks in the path of its goal.

"Without such a party it is useless even to think of overthrowing imperialism and achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"This new party is the party of Leninism." (J. Stalin, *Leninism*, Eng. ed.)

(2) The history of the Party further teaches us that a party of the working class cannot perform the role of leader of its class, cannot perform the role of organiser and leader of the proletarian revolution, unless it has mastered the advanced theory of the working-class movement, the Marxist-Leninist theory.

The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future.

Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working-class forward.

On the other hand, a party which has not mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory is compelled to grope its way, loses confidence in its actions and is unable to lead the working-class forward.

It may seem that all that is required for mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory is to diligently learn by heart isolated conclusions and propositions from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, learn

to quote them at opportune times and rest at that, in the hope that the conclusions and propositions thus memorised will suit each and every situation and occasion. But such an approach to the Marxist-Leninist theory is altogether wrong. The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pedants and dogmatists. The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working-class movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of the Communist society. And as a science it does not and cannot stand still, but develops and perfects itself. Clearly, in its development it is bound to become enriched by new experience and new knowledge, and some of its propositions and conclusions are bound to change in the course of time, are bound to be replaced by new conclusions and propositions corresponding to the new historical conditions.

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

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

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

The Marxist-Leninist theory is not a dogma but a guide to action.

Before the Second Russian Revolution (February, 1917), the Marxists of all

countries assumed that the parliamentary democratic republic was the most suitable form of political organisation of society in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism. It is true that in the seventies Marx stated that the most suitable form for the dictatorship of proletariat was a political organisation of the type of the Paris Commune, and not the parliamentary republic. But, unfortunately, Marx did not develop this proposition any further in his writings and it was committed to oblivion. Moreover, Engel's authoritative statement in his criticism of the draft of the Erfurt Program in 1891, namely, that "the democratic republic . . . is . . . the specific form for the dictatorship of the proletariat" left no doubt that the Marxists continued to regard the democratic republic as the political form for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Engels' proposition later became a guiding principle for all Marxists, including Lenin. However, the Russian Revolution of 1905, and especially the Revolution of February, 1917, advanced a new form of political organisation of society—the 'Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. As a result of a study of the experience of the two Russian revolutions, Lenin, on the basis of the theory of Marxism, arrived at the conclusion that the best political form for the dictatorship of the proletariat was not a parliamentary democratic republic, but a republic of Soviets. Proceeding from this, Lenin, in April, 1917, during the period of transition from the bourgeois to the Socialist revolution, issued the slogan of a republic of Soviets as the best political form for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The opportunists of all countries clung to the parliamentary republic and accused Lenin of departing from Marxism and destroying democracy. But it was Lenin, of course, who was the real Marxist who has mastered the theory of Marxism, and not the opportunists, for Lenin was advancing the Marxist theory by enriching it with new experience, whereas the opportunists were dragging it back and transforming one of its propositions into a dogma.

What would have happened to the Party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin had been overawed by the letter of Marxism and had not had the courage to replace one of the old propositions of Marxism, formulated by Engels, by the new proposition regarding the republic of Soviets, a proposition that corresponded to the new historical conditions? The Party would have grouped in the dark, the Soviets would have been disorganised, we should not have had a Soviet power, and the Marxist theory would have suffered a severe setback. The proletariat would have lost, and the enemies of the proletariat would have won.

As a result of a study of pre-imperialist capitalism Engels and Marx arrived at the conclusion that the Socialist revolution could not be victorious in one country, taken singly, that it could be victorious only by a simultaneous stroke in all, or the majority of the civilised countries. That was in the middle of the nineteenth century. This conclusion later became a guiding principle for all Marxists. However, by the beginning of the twentieth century, pre-imperialist capitalism had grown into imperialist capitalism, ascendant capitalism had turned into moribund capitalism. As a result of a study of imperialist capitalism, Lenin, on the basis of the Marxist theory, arrived at the conclusion that the old formula of Engels and Marx no longer corresponded to the new historical conditions, and that the victory of the Socialist revolution was quite possible in one country, taken singly. The opportunists of all countries clung to the old formula of Engels and Marx and accused Lenin of departing from Marxism. But it was Lenin, of course, who was the real Marxist who had mastered the theory of Marxism, and not the opportunists, for Lenin was advancing the Marxist theory by enriching it with new experience, whereas the opportunists were dragging it back, mummifying it.

What would have happened to the Party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin had been overawed by the letter of Marxism and had not had the courage

of theoretical conviction to discard one of the old conclusions of Marxism and to replace it by a new conclusion affirming that the victory of Socialism in one country, taken singly, was possible, a conclusion which corresponded to the new historical conditions? The party would have groped in the dark, the proletarian revolution would have been deprived of leadership, and the Marxist theory would have begun to decay. The proletariat would have lost, and the enemies of the proletariat would have won.

Opportunism does not always mean a direct denial of the Marxist theory or of any of its propositions and conclusions. Opportunism is sometimes expressed in the attempt to cling to certain of the propositions of Marxism that have already become antiquated and to convert them into a dogma, so as to retard the further development of Marxism, and, consequently, to retard the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

It may be said without fear of exaggeration that since the death of Engels, the master theoretician Lenin, and after Lenin, Stalin and the other disciples of Lenin, have been the only Marxists who have advanced the Marxist theory and who have enriched it with new experience in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat.

And just because Lenin and the Leninists have advanced the Marxist theory, Leninism is a further development of Marxism; it is Marxism in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat, Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Marxism of the epoch of the victory of Socialism on one-sixth of the earth's surface.

The Bolshevik Party could not have won in October, 1917, if its foremost men had not mastered the theory of Marxism, if they had not learned to regard this theory as a guide to action, if they had not learned to advance the Marxist theory by enriching it with the new experience of the class struggle of the proletariat.

Criticising the German Marxists in America who had undertaken to lead the American working-class movement, Engels wrote:

"The Germans have not understood how to use their theory as a lever which could set the American masses in motion; they do not understand the theory themselves for the most part and treat it in a doctrinaire and dogmatic way, as something which has got to be learned off by heart and which will then supply all needs without more ado. To them it is a dogma and not a guide to action. (Letter to Sorge, November 29, 1886.)

Criticising Kamenev and some of the old Bolsheviks who in April, 1917, clung to the old formula of a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry at a time when the revolutionary movement had gone on ahead and was demanding a transition to the Socialist revolution, Lenin wrote:

"Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action, Marx and Engels always used to say, rightly ridiculing the learning and repetition by rote of 'formulas' which at best are only capable of outlining general tasks that are necessarily liable to be modified by the concrete economic and political conditions of each separate phase of the historical process. . . . It is essential to realise the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognisance of real life of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday. . . ." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XX, pp. 100-101.)

(3) The history of the Party further teaches us that unless the petty-bourgeois parties which are active within the ranks of the working-class and which push the backward sections of the working-class into the arms of the bourgeoisie, thus splitting the unity of the working-class, are smashed, the victory of the proletarian revolution is impossible.

The history of our Party is the history of the struggle against the petty-bourgeois parties — the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Anarchists and nationalists—and of the utter defeat of these parties. If these parties had not been vanquished and driven out of the ranks of the working-class, the unity of the working-class could not have been achieved; and if the working-class had not been united, it would have been impossible to achieve the victory of the proletarian revolution.

If these parties, which at first stood for the preservation of capitalism, and later, after the October Revolution, for the restoration of capitalism, had not been utterly defeated, it would have been impossible to preserve the dictatorship of the proletariat, to defeat the foreign armed intervention, and to build up Socialism.

It cannot be regarded as an accident that all the petty-bourgeois parties, which styled themselves "revolutionary" and "socialist" parties in order to deceive the people—the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Anarchists and nationalists became counter-revolutionary parties even before the October Socialist Revolution, and later turned into agents of foreign bourgeois espionage services, into a gang of spies, wreckers, diversionists, assassins and traitors to the country.

"The unity of the proletariat in the epoch of social revolution," Lenin says, "can be achieved only by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism, and only by a relentless struggle against all other parties." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XXVI, p. 50.)

(4) The history of the Party further teaches us that unless the Party of the working-class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst, it cannot preserve unity and discipline within its ranks, it cannot perform its role of organiser and leader of the proletarian revolution, nor its role as the builder of the new, Socialist society.

The history of the development of the internal life of our Party is the history of the struggle against the opportunist groups within the Party—the "Economists," Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites and nationalist deviators—and of the utter defeat of these groups.

The history of our Party teaches us that all these groups of capitulators were in point of fact agents of Menshevism within our Party, the lees and dregs of Menshevism, the continuers of Menshevism. Like the Mensheviks, they acted as vehicles of bourgeois influence among the working-class and in the Party. The struggle for the liquidation of these

groups within the Party was therefore a continuation of the struggle for the liquidation of Menshevism.

If we had not defeated the "Economists" and the Mensheviks, we could not have built the Party and led the working-class to the proletarian revolution.

If we had not defeated the Trotskyites and Bukharinites, we could not have brought about the conditions that are essential for the building of Socialism.

If we had not defeated the nationalist deviators of all shades and colours, we could not have educated the people in the spirit of internationalism, we could not have safeguarded the banner of the great amity of the nations of the U.S.S.R., and we could not have built up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It may seem to some that the Bolsheviks devoted far too much time to this struggle against the opportunist elements within the Party, that they over-rated their importance. But that is altogether wrong. Opportunism in our midst is like an ulcer in a healthy organism, and must not be tolerated. The Party is the leading detachment of the working-class, its advanced fortress, its general staff. Sceptics, opportunists, capitulators and traitors cannot be tolerated on the directing staff of the working-class. If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators and traitors on its own staff, within its own fortress, the working-class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly, such a struggle can only end in defeat. The easiest way to capture a fortress is from within. To attain victory, the Party of the working-class, its directing staff, its advanced fortress, must first be purged of capitulators, deserters, scabs and traitors.

It cannot be regarded as an accident that the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and nationalists deviators who fought Lenin and the Party ended just as the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties did, namely, by becoming agents of fascist espionage services, by turning spies, wreckers, assassins, diversionists and traitors to the country.

"With reformists, Mensheviks, in our ranks," Lenin said, "it is impossible to achieve victory in the proletarian revolution, it is impossible to retain it. That is obvious in principle, and it has been strikingly confirmed by the experience both of Russia and Hungary. . . . In Russia, difficult situations have arisen many times, when the Soviet regime would most certainly have been overthrown had Mensheviks, reformists and petty-bourgeois democrats remained in our Party . . ." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XXV, pp. 462-63.)

"Our Party," Comrade Stalin says, "succeeded in creating internal unity and unexampled cohesion of its ranks primarily because it was able in good time to purge itself of the opportunist pollution, because it was able to rid its ranks of the Liquidators, the Mensheviks. Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists and social-chauvinists, social-patriots and social-pacifists. The Party becomes strong by purging itself of opportunist elements." (Stalin, *Leninism*, Eng. ed.)

(5) The history of the Party further teaches us that a party cannot perform its role as leader of the working class if, carried away by success, it begins to grow conceited, ceases to observe the defects in its work, and fears to acknowledge its mistakes and frankly and honestly to correct them in good time.

A party is invincible if it does not fear criticism and self-criticism, if it does not gloss over the mistakes and defects in its work, if it teaches and educates its cadres by drawing the lessons from the mistakes in Party work, and if it knows how to correct its mistakes in time.

A party perishes if it conceals its mistakes, if it glosses over sore problems, if it cover up its shortcomings by pretending that all is well, if it is intolerant of criticism and self-criticism, if it gives way to self-complacency and vainglory and if it rests on its laurels.

"The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes," Lenin says, "is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfils its obligations towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed. Vol. XXV, p. 200.)

And further:

"All revolutionary parties which have hitherto perished, did so because they grew conceited, failed to see where their strength lay, and feared to speak of their weaknesses. But we shall not perish, for we do not fear to speak of our weaknesses and will learn to overcome them." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XXVII, pp. 260-61.)

(6) Lastly, the history of the Party teaches us that unless it has wide connections with the masses, unless it constantly strengthens these connections, unless it knows how to hearken to the voice of the masses and understand their urgent needs, unless it is prepared not only to teach the masses, but to learn from the masses, a party of the working-class cannot be a real mass party capable of leading the working-class millions and all the labouring people.

A party is invincible if it is able, as Lenin says:

"to link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and to a certain extent if you like, to merge with the broadest masses of the toilers—primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian toiling masses." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XXV, p. 174.)

A party perishes if it shuts itself up in its narrow party shell, if it severs itself from the masses, if it allows itself to be covered with bureaucratic rust.

"We may take it as the rule," Comrade Stalin says, "that as long as the Bolsheviks maintain connection with the broad masses of the people they will be invincible. And, on the contrary, as soon as the Bolsheviks sever themselves from the masses and lose their connection with them, as soon as they become covered with bureaucratic rust, they will lose all their strength and become a mere cipher.

"In the mythology of the ancient Greeks there was a celebrated hero, Antæus, who, so the legend goes, was the son of Poseidon, god of the seas, and Gæa, goddess of the earth. Antæus was very much attached to the mother who had given birth to him, suckled him and reared him. There was not a hero whom this Antæus did not vanquish. He was regarded as an invincible hero. Wherein lay his strength? It lay in the fact that every time he was hard pressed in a fight with an adversary he would touch the earth, the mother who had given birth to him and suckled him, and that gave him new strength. Yet he had a vulnerable spot—the danger of being detached from the earth in some way or other. His enemies

were aware of this weakness and watched for him. One day an enemy appeared who took advantage of this vulnerable spot and vanquished Antæus. This was Hercules. How did Hercules vanquish Antæus? He lifted him from the earth, kept him suspended in the air, prevented him from touching the earth, and throttled him.

"I think that the Bolsheviki remind us of the hero of Greek mythology, Antæus. They, like Antæus, are strong because they maintain connection with their mother, the masses,

who gave birth to them, suckled them and reared them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible.

"That is the cue to the invincibility of Bolsheviki leadership." (J. Stalin, *Defects in Party Work*.)

Such are the chief lessons to be drawn from the historical path traversed by the Bolsheviki Party.

The Colonial Demands of German Fascism

BY K. FUNK

THE pros and cons of the colonial demands of Hitler's Reich have been of late much discussed and debated. In this respect the campaign of German Fascism has, as intended by the wire-pullers, been taken a step forwards. It has succeeded in making Germany's colonial demands a subject for discussions in the course of which Hitler has had the opportunity to get some idea as to the places where he can most easily and quickly direct his attack and make a break through.

The *Times*, whose function as pace-setters for the claims of German fascism upon Czechoslovakia is still fresh in our memory, declared its attitude to the German colonial demands on November 16, 1938, in a manner which, following on the events in Europe, was worth more attention than it actually received. This reactionary paper felt itself obliged, at the very moment when the British public as a whole was in uproar over the disgraceful Jewish pogroms in Germany, to come out whole-heartedly *in favour* of the cession of colonial territories to Germany. This paper, with editors who are perfectly acquainted with the practices of German colonial "pioneers," such as Hanging Peters, and with an editorial library from which the official British records of German colonial policy have certainly not been cleared away yet-awhile, tried to swim against the current of British public opinion, by certifying in advance that Hitler's Reich would treat the colonial peoples with more moderation than the German Jews. Seeing the present significance of the proprietary group of the *Times* for the pursuance of the line of the imperialist

reactionaries in Britain, the accommodating tone of the paper toward the colonial claims of German Fascism must be taken as showing the disposition of the reactionary leaders of British policy, to grant concessions to Hitler's Reich even in this regard. The "fairness" which distinguishes politicians of the Chamberlain brand gives good reason to think that the British reactionaries will shortly try to arrange a "colonial appeasement" or a "rearrangement of colonial relations" on the Munich pattern, at the expense of third powers. Consequently, responsible people in Belgium, Holland and Portugal are already uneasy because, correctly, they feel that negotiations for their colonial possessions are going on behind their backs. But the course of relations between France and Italy, and the relevant remarks of British politicians and newspapers on the attitude of the British Government to the Italo-French dispute, show that the colonial claims which are put up in this case primarily by Italian Fascism (but with the confessed collaboration and coincidence of interests of German Fascism) to a "Great Power" of France's standing, do not only concern and endanger small countries.

Although the demands which German Fascism proposes to make regarding colonies have not yet been specifically listed, one can see that the time is near when these demands will become the focus of international attention. Fascist propaganda has perfected the groundwork for this to a striking degree, inside Germany and abroad. "Sooner or later the boiler must burst!" said Goebbels in February, 1936. Since then, Ger-

many's internal and foreign political evolution has generated such great pressure that the menace of the "burst" is no longer beyond our horizon. Munich, thanks to the conduct of the British and French reactionaries, has cleared away many obstacles from the path of German Fascism. The attacks of Italian Fascism, again thanks to the influence of reactionary groups on the policy of Britain and France, serve as auxiliary propellers to German Fascism, of which it gladly makes use in order to gain some more ground itself. Goebbels' press was at pains to make clear the connection between the Italian claims upon France and Germany's colonial aspirations. That, too, was done in a way which deliberately left some room for doubt as to which areas Germany's colonial designs encompass, but managed to imply that the scope of the German demands is very extensive. From various utterances of the semi-official *Deutsche Diplomatisch-politische Korrespondenz*, however, it would seem clear that the "return of the former German colonies" is one, but only one, of the many colonial demands of German Fascism. The *Berliner Boersenzeitung* took the occasion of a speech by the Belgian Premier, Spaak, to remark that the German colonial problem does not resolve itself into a "return," but is a comprehensive problem. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* has stated, without mincing words, that the enhanced continental standing of Germany could entail no renunciation of its overseas and colonial "legitimate claims." Schwarz van Berk, the Editor-in-chief of the *Angriff*, who was sent on a world tour, summed up his first year's touring impressions of Egypt, Palestine, India, Australia and other countries, after directly referring to the Chinese nation's struggle for liberty and the National Liberation movements in the colonial countries, in the following words:—

"At this hour in world history, Germany comes forward. Shall she be spontaneously accepted into the ranks of the world powers, or shall her strength be lacking when everything is at stake which the white man has built up on a world scale?"

Anyone can see from random samples

of fascist newspaper articles, that the colonial ambitions and demands of German Fascism are extremely far-flung and manifold. They can only be correctly understood and considered if taken in conjunction with, not in contrast to, the "reorganisation" and "transformation" plans of German Fascism for Europe. It would lead to fatal misconceptions and false conclusions, should it be thought that German Fascism seriously intends, simply for reasons of prestige or from "justified" motives, to insist on the "return of the colonies which were formerly in Germany's possession," whilst for the rest contenting itself with the hegemony of the Continent of Europe. The facts are as George Dimitroff has written:—

"The fact should be clearly appreciated that the question has already passed beyond the bounds of the arbitrary revision of the Versailles treaty by the fascist States.

"What is at issue is a new repartition of the globe. What is at issue is not only the redistribution of the existing colonial possessions. Fascism is placing on the order of the day the question of the repartition of Europe itself, the colonisation of a number of European states and the imperialist enslavement of a number of European peoples." (United Front of the International Proletariat and the Nations against Fascism—*Communist International*, No. 12, 1938.)

THE COLONIAL DEMANDS AS ONE SECTION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE REPARTITION OF THE GLOBE

It is the "approved" tactics of German Fascism, to start by spreading its demands of a foreign political nature systematically within the homeland, in such a way as to set certain sections of the population moving, in fact, to imbue them with fanaticism. The colonial demands have for long been incorporated in the school curriculum. There exists in Germany a large amount of colonial literature. Colonial exhibitions are always being shown in the cities. Certain professional and population groups which have a particular interest in the export trade have been fed or deluded over an extended period, with the argument that their interests can best be served by the acquisition of colonial territories for Germany. It little worries

the propagandists of Fascism that the "argument" by which, for instance, Rudolph Boehmer tries to show that German colonial possessions would offer wonderful opportunities for the large-scale emigration of German peasants and settlers, is directly contradicted by the statistics and calculations of another, very official, colonial expert—Paul Rohrbach—where we find that a colonial area of the size of Bavaria (about 27,000 square miles with six million inhabitants) could only support some 58,000 settlers. The propagandists for German colonial demands take care not to reveal to the mass of Germans that the colonising plans of Hitler's Reich would immediately, and for a prolonged period, burden the bulk of Germany's population with new strictures, which the Reich would impose in order to finance the building of communications, industries and—not least—fortifications. Apart from the glowing colours in which German propaganda for home consumption paints the future, it works chiefly through "patriotic" appeal like the demands for "equality of privileges," "recognition as a great power," "precedence in view of the racial mission of the German Nation," etc. The immediate object of this campaign is to fulfil certain conditions which will ensure a response inside the home country to the offensive being planned on the colonial question.

Let us now try to see in what measure Hitler's Reich has so far pushed forward along the road toward colonial conquests. The campaign for the "return of the former German colonial possessions" has already aroused wide international repercussions. In particular, since Munich it passes for a sign of special "realist political" cunning in bourgeois circles, if one whispers it about that one holds a special trump card, which one will play if Hitler persists in disturbing the world with his demands: the return of the former German colonies, which are now governed as "mandates" by Britain, France, Belgium, Japan, Australia, the Union of South Africa and New Zealand. Admittedly the advocates of such a step are

thinking rather of a partial and temporary concession, from which their own country perhaps would be exempted. But there are as well consistent advocates of the "great-hearted" and "honourable" attitude to Hitler's Reich, who believe that German Fascism will calm itself with the mandated areas delivered up to it, and be dissuaded from making further demands. Combating these illusions, one cannot point out too strongly that whereas it is true that Hitler's Reich puts the "return" in the foreground, that is for precisely the same tactical reasons as have prompted, one by one, the reunion with the Saar, the introduction of conscription, the fortification of the Rhineland, the building of a large fleet, the annexation of Austria, and that of the Sudeten districts. For better understanding the methods of fascist foreign policy it is necessary to note the parallelism, voiced again and again by the spokesmen of Hitler's Reich, between the road to autocracy in Germany and the road to world domination which they are treading. The appeal to "legality" played, in its time, a considerable role in Germany. Whither the tracks led, which were hidden for so long in the tunnel of "legality," we now know. And revelations of the further implications of the demand for a "return," founded on an imperialist "legal right," are close at hand.

In reality, Hitler's Reich is neither waiting for the voluntary "return" of the future, nor will it content itself with such. This much can be deduced with certainty from the comprehensive steps which German Fascism has already taken in dead secrecy, with a view to being in control at a given moment of every key position, which can enable it to bring increased pressure to bear upon those enemies or opponents who may seem inclined to give ground. In the former German colonies there is a network of fascist locals and spy-groups. In places, the numbers of German employees of commercial units and of "scientists" are actually greater than at the time when Germany was the official owner of the colonies. In South Africa and Tanganyika, where for strategic

reasons it appears important to the fascists to have influence and to penetrate, the German fascists, apart from their direct representatives, maintain confederates and flunkys inside certain Boer, also in British, organisations. French Morocco is riddled with the cells of German Fascism and connected by dozens of threads with fascist Spanish Morocco. Just as the Balearic Islands have become air-bases in the Mediterranean for the fascist intervention in Spain, from which, in addition, the lines of communication between France and North Africa can be cut, so also along the coast of Africa there are various islands in the hands of German or of Italian Fascism, converted into raiding bases for attack upon the property of other powers. Let the observant student but consider the efforts of Hitler's Reich on behalf of the "return" of the former German colonies in conjunction with the intrigues of Italian Fascism in the Mediterranean, the work of disruption in French Morocco, and the struggle for influence on the one hand in Egypt, on the other in South Africa—and he will get an interesting picture of the whole of Africa in effect gripped between two prongs, and further, studded at different points by centres of fascist sedition. Both fascist powers take particular care to influence the Mohammedan movement, which in the African territories and also in other parts is harnessed to the chariot of the imperialist designs of the Rome-Berlin Axis.

These facts lend very pronounced colour to the function of Africa, repeatedly defined of late by German Fascism, as "an economic reserve area." German Fascism and its Italian allies look forward, following the well-favoured hazard of Munich, to such a degree of leniency and support from the ultra-reactionary cliques of Britain and France, that they expect within measurable time to see Africa being a "reserve area" in the grasp of German and Italian Fascism, its key points being exploited meanwhile for harrassing and cutting, at their own sweet will, the lines of communication to the colonial possessions of other powers in other parts

of the world. For the colonial designs of German Fascism do not stop short at Africa; they extend also to South America, to the Orient and Asia, and for each of these regions Fascism has a special programme, and operates with carefully adapted methods. But in general the colonial claims and the colonial activities of German Fascism constitute in every case a direct menace to peace and the current status quo, and are directed toward the goal of fundamentally upsetting the equilibrium of the world in pursuance of the hegemony of German imperialism. In this connection, special interest attaches to the comprehensive plans of German Fascism in Asia, to the realisation of which Japan, and a grandly-conceived "pan-Islamic" movement, are to contribute. Hitler's Reich operates on the principle of bargaining simultaneously with the most reactionary cliques of the imperialist powers, and through cells among the oppressed colonial peoples. It attempts to sway movements of national liberation through its spies, and to exploit them up to a certain point for its preparatory work in furthering Germany's imperialist ambitions. But in no case is German Fascism a true ally or a genuine supporter of oppressed colonial nations, not even when it hypocritically takes up their case, as in Palestine. Rather, German Fascism affords us an example of colonial policy in the age of imperialism, which singles it out as the most reactionary and dangerous of the imperialist powers. The colonial claim and colonial theories of German Fascism are a menace to the world, not merely because they multiply the prospects of imperialist wars, but in addition on account of their specific character and special consequences for the colonial peoples themselves.

THE "SPECIFIC CHARACTER" OF THE GERMAN COLONIAL DEMANDS

In German fascist publications, the point has again and again been made recently, that the opening up of Africa must be considered to be an European "co-operative undertaking." Schwarz

van Berk, who has already been cited, is among those who have spoken of common interests of the "Whites" with respect to colonies. For an understanding of the function of German Fascism in colonial politics it is important to get clear about what is meant by "co-operative work" and "common interests of the Whites," the more so since in some sections of the British Labour Party the idea of "co-operative work" is sprouting (in conjunction with a "just" distribution of the sources of raw materials).

The expert writers of German Fascism on colonies stress their view that German Fascism sees the colonial exploitation and suppression of entire peoples, states and continents as an unalterable and unchallengeable privilege of every "ruling race" which, in the fascist racial creed, is born to dominate the world. For the influencing and penetration of colonial countries by German Fascism, the fascist theory of race plays a part comparable to that of anti-Semitism in the undermining and disruption of European states.

The fascist theoretician on colonial questions, Paul Rohrbach, clearly expressed the conception of German Fascism when he described the Negro as "racially inferior" to the "Whites," and from this drew the conclusion that the Negro belongs permanently under the "guardianship of the Whites," who alone is fitted "to bring about the great African restoration and generally to organise the fund of physical strength and the capacity to learn, which is possessed by the Negro, for the purpose of promoting culture." (Rohrbach, "Deutschlands Koloniale Forderungen.")

"Generally promoting culture" here means nothing else than systematically exploiting the mineral resources, the agricultural yield and the labour forces in the colonial countries for the profit of the tyrant. The phrase about a "cultural mission" of the colonial tyrant for the "elevation" of the colonial peoples, carries no weight, and in fact it is now seldom used in its old sense in the fascist utterances on colonies. Fascism talks about the "unalterability" and "per-

manence" of colonial oppression as if it were something to be taken for granted. German Fascism openly sneers at attempts to teach Negroes and other colonial peoples reading, writing and general knowledge. One must discipline the colonial peoples and train them to the point where their labour power becomes exploitable to the maximum, but the art of this training is precisely to ensure "fixed consciousness of subordination to the superior character, the superior fairness and capability of the White man." Rohrbach.)

At present German Fascism is using every channel to disseminate as widely as possible this, its conception of colonial policy. To do that, it does not even require the "return" of the former German colonies. In South Africa, Mexico and other countries these theories are methodically propagated by German spies and the accomplices of German Fascism. For the colonial peoples and for the peoples of dependent states this spreading fascist ideology of race means the imposition of additional fetters, and an attempt to extend and aggravate their bondage. For the peoples of imperialist countries the adoption of the fascist theory of race amounts to a source of new, unlimited conflicts, splits, and finally the hegemony of German Fascism over ourselves also, being the most unscrupulous and cunning force in these affairs.

If, therefore, German Fascism now talks in terms of "European co-operative undertakings" on the colonial field, it is but pursuing its intent to get its principles, i.e., the principles of the most ultra-reactionary imperialist power generally recognised, so that they may then come into play as explosive matter.

Entirely compatible with this fascist ideology of race is the tactic of German Fascism of encouraging movements of colonial peoples, temporarily and only in selected, convenient areas, under the banner of struggle against "national oppression," with a view forthwith to putting other European or American competitors out of the running, and afterwards to building up its hegemony all the more securely. The slogan of the "interests of the Whites" has obviously

been taken up by German Fascism for opportunist purposes, in the hope that it will facilitate the groundwork of its various campaigns in the sphere of colonial policy, by obliging certain reactionary groups in Britain, France and America to adopt for the time being an attitude of benevolence to German Fascism.

But the colonial peoples themselves may expect from German Fascism not only a repetition of the notorious German punitive expeditions and the wholesale extermination of local populations, but the establishment of a rule which would stand without compare for brutality and imperialist ruthlessness. In Germany itself, Hitler's Reich has turned citizens into yes-men who are of less account than the "faithful lieges" of olden days. What indescribable bestiality Fascism practices in Germany upon its "White" yes-men in the concentration camp! How unscrupulously it grinds them down in the arms factories and in the building of arterial roads and fortifications! How it presses the members of the states annexed by it or lapsed into dependence on it, further and further into the mire! And how would it behave in places where it could work its will as an unbridled imperialist tyrant! It is not merely a matter of beating and murdering. It is a matter of the fact that German Fascism would interrupt the cultural advance of whole peoples on a grand scale, or—as it prefers to put it—in general, and turn them in the opposite direction. And as to the means for terrorising the colonial peoples, that aforesaid so-called theoretician of German Fascism on colonies, Paul Rohrbach, in his book published in 1937 expresses his regret that the German colonial force had no military aircraft in 1904 to help them exterminate the Hereros, and he has given an assurance that the modern weapons of the German army provide instruments of an altogether different order for holding down and punishing colonial peoples, from the ones that were in use then. With some candour, Rohrbach explains the aims of German colonial policy in Africa, which, with minor variations, are valid for the

other colonial areas too and in the end will be applied to such countries as may be independent yesterday or to-day, but are marked down for colonisation by German Fascism:

"Africa has for a long time been the colonial part of the Earth and will remain so. It differs in many ways from the remaining overseas spheres of influence of European economy. First, its population is still numerically undeveloped. Secondly, while the African races are admittedly better able to withstand the ill effects of climate and environment than the Whites are, in their racial and spiritual make-up they lag behind us not merely temporarily, but permanently, and are therefore destined to be led by us. Thirdly, as far as man can foretell, there will never exist upon African soil any large-scale industry based upon the enterprise of the natives themselves."

Here is a relatively candid self-declaration of the reactionary, parasitic imperialist colonial policy which haunts the mind of German Fascism, and which is also ripe in imagination for the non-African areas, yes, and for the annexed European territories (except that there, for example, existent industries are ruined and liquidated to suit the profit book of German monopoly capital).

A FIRM, UNIFIED ATTITUDE ON THE PART OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS TOWARD THE GERMAN COLONIAL DEMANDS IS NECESSARY

As far as is possible within a limited scope and a brief account, we have been trying to show that the colonial demands and theories of German Fascism, when compared with the colonial methods of imperialist states to date, are far and away the most reactionary. It is the duty of the international working-class movement to assess these demands and intrigues not only from the viewpoint that the origins and possibilities of imperialist wars of conquest are multiplied by them, but also from the viewpoint that here is the most reactionary and most pronounced imperialist power, trying to interrupt the whole future evolution of human society and to force it along the road to ruin, to subjugation

to the inhuman system of robbery with violence of German Fascism.

For this reason the international working-class and the Marxist working-class organisations cannot look indifferently upon the German colonial demands and the intrigues of German Fascism in colonial and dependent countries. It does not suffice to throw out general declarations against imperialist colonial policy as such, as sections of the British and French socialists do, and to finish by acknowledging with a shrug of the shoulders the relative "justice" of the German colonial claim "so long as colonial policy and colonial domination exist at all." In the final resort this seemingly "radical" view is just as much a bourgeois imperialist one as that taken by those "socialists" who simply mimic the colonial policies of their respective bourgeoisie.

Within a measurable space of time the colonial question posed by German Fascism may have grown to such a degree that it forces itself upon the attention of all politically active forces. In that event a vague "opposition to colonial policy as such" will be of no more avail than a simple copy of the standpoint of the relevant bourgeois government. Even now the effects of German fascist activity in the colonial regions is noticeable, German Fascism is coming onward, more or less veiled, as a power, and already complicates the analysis which must be made by the oppressed colonial peoples in furtherance of their national independence and liberty.

In the cause of the progress of the struggle for liberation of the international working class, a viewpoint can and must be found on which it is possible to build the widest combination of all progressive forces, above all of the working class, the oppressed colonial peoples fighting for their independence, and the progressive forces of the petty bourgeoisie in capitalist countries. This

viewpoint can only be (it accords with the interests of each of the above-named groups): opposition to the colonial demands of German Fascism and resistance to the intrigues of German Fascism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries; and the demand for the extension of the democratic rights and liberties for the colonial peoples. On such a viewpoint alone can sufficient strength be mustered in order to dispute successfully the trend to capitulation and the preparatory haggling of the reaction in Britain and France, which would like to buy itself a breathing space at the price of colonial concessions to Germany. Rigid opposition to the German colonial demands is the sole condition for averting a new era, steeped in fascist racial ideology, of colonial policy more merciless and imperialist than is presented even by its forerunner, German Fascism. Such rigid opposition also coincides with the interests of the majority of the German people themselves, who from the achievement of the fascist colonial ambitions might expect, not the relief, but the decided aggravation of their dire straits (new dues and taxes, forced labour, wage-cuts resulting from the cheaper labour power which the fascist regime and the monopoly capitalists would control). The attitude here briefly outlined would thus be calculated to bring to a head the decisive forces whose interests are affected, forces by which German Fascism can be prevented from receiving, through the acquisition of colonies and its reactionary abuse and falsification of movements of national independence (such as the Arabian one at present), an accession of power—which in the end it would employ solely to enslave humanity and to trample underfoot the German people itself. It is possible, and it is necessary, that above all the workers' organisations of the world should begin to build a firm, united, clear attitude of opposition to the demands of German Fascism.

The Experience of History calls for the Unity of the Working Class

BY F. FUERNBERG

THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAINFELD PARTY CONGRESS

IT is fifty years since the Party Congress which established the unity of the Austrian workers' movement was held in Hainfeld. Fifty years have passed of hard struggle, great successes, mighty victories, and also of many a severe defeat for the Austrian working class. If the Austrian workers' movement was young at that time, was scarcely out of its infancy, still not a broad mass movement, it has, during the past fifty years, grown in strength both from the ideological and organisational point of view; it has travelled a long way, and is to-day in sight, within reach, of the goal towards which it set out. It is in sight of this goal despite the barbaric domination of Fascism, which has gagged the workers, for the working class and its revolutionary party are able to discern the true dialectical laws of the development of mankind. The Marxist-Leninist theory helps it to know those laws and to perceive behind the bloody curtain of fascist domination the revolutionary changes of the future, the dawn of liberation.

The Austrian workers' movement dates much farther back than fifty years. As early as the revolutionary years 1848/49 the new young rising force made itself felt which was later to set its stamp on the whole further course of events. The workers' movement in Austria developed with particular vigour after the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 which ended with the defeat of the Hapsburg monarchy. The forces of reaction, compelled after the defeat to make concessions, very soon endeavoured to crush the rising

workers' movement. A period of persecution and repressive decrees followed, a state of emergency was declared, and every effort was made to solve the social question by methods of brutal suppression.

The repressive measures of the ruling class proved successful for a time, although they served to stimulate the far more vigorous and powerful development of the workers' movement which followed on this period of openly brutal repression. At first, however, the ruling class succeeded not only in shattering and suppressing the workers' organisations, but also in introducing spies into them and splitting them. The repressive measures of the Imperial Government aroused tremendous indignation among the workers, and, profiting by this, *agents provocateurs* succeeded in organising assassinations and terroristic acts, and in driving honest workers in the direction of anarchism. The Austrian workers' movement was divided into "moderates" and "radicals." If the "radicals" were infected with the germ of anarchism and rejected the struggle for democratic rights and the day-to-day interests of the workers, the "moderates," on the other hand, saw salvation only in the democratic franchise and were opposed to any form of illegal, nay of revolutionary, struggle whatever. The workers' organisations were consumed by internal dissensions, and the two factions were driven further and further apart.

The development of capitalism proceeded. The number of workers increased at a tempestuous pace. In all the capitalist countries of Europe the working class reared its head. The German work-

ing class had established its unity, and despite the Anti-Socialist Law continued to develop. The preponderance of the workers in society increased; social forces required that the workers should enter the lists united, and the workers' movement of other countries pointed the way. The hour was approaching when unity was to be essential.

The necessity for unity does not imply that unity as yet exists. In order to bring unity actually into being hard, steady work was needed. For this a Marxist line was necessary, from which the struggle against bourgeois influences in the workers' movement could be carried on and, concretely, the struggle against anarchism and liberalism. There were people to be found in the workers' movement who were willing and able to carry out this work, to carry on this struggle. They were to be found both in the ranks of the "radicals" and the "moderates."

These men got together, and began to work out a "declaration of principles" and to lay the foundations of a united party. In this connection a progressive rôle was played by Viktor Adler, who at that time still adhered to the revolutionary standpoint. He still declared that the new party was a revolutionary party, and that "its objective was bound up with a complete change in the basis of the contemporary social order." (Viktor Adler, *The Rise of Social Democracy*, p. 56.) The reformist trends which even at that time were discernible in Viktor Adler and which later developed to such an extent that he became a leader of the reformists were entirely thrust into the background by his revolutionary and progressive attitude. Of no less significance, in this connection, was the direct influence exerted by Friedrich Engels on Viktor Adler and the Austrian workers' movement. Engels fought resolutely for the unity of the Austrian workers' movement and regarded this unity as essential for its development.

The ground was prepared for unity over a period of some years. The state of emergency declared by the Government very considerably reduced the possibility of any kind of political activity.

The reactionary Austrian Government threatened to take even severer measures against socialists and to pass a special law against them in Austria. Unity had not merely to be the result of clarity within the workers' movement, but also to go hand in hand with the struggle against the Government for the political rights and liberties of the working class. Only unity attained in the course of the struggle has a firm and unshakable basis and is able to withstand fresh blows and attacks. And such unity, forged by the rank and file and consolidated by the leaders, came into being in Austria.

The great mass meetings held in Vienna on May 9, 1866 and April 3, 1887 were milestones on the road to unity. If the first meeting in Vienna was no more than a demonstration of protest against the Anti-Socialist Law projected by the Imperial Government, the second meeting laid the foundations for a declaration of principles on the part of the new united Austrian workers' movement.

The first meeting gave evidence of "the consciousness that the victory of the proletariat is the inevitable outcome of the course of history." (Ibid, p. 8.)

The second meeting, however, accepted the basic principle that "the capitalist social order is marching to its . . . downfall," and developed the programme of the revolutionary Marxist workers' party of the time, laying the main emphasis on the achievement of democracy with the object of facilitating the transition from a capitalist to a socialist social order. (pp. 13-14.)

Thus the basis for unity in the struggle was achieved. The Unity Congress had become possible, and an appeal convening it for New Year's Eve in Hainfeld was published by the socialist newspapers. The final paragraph of this appeal echoed the rising spirit of unity:

"Let us forget our old dissensions, and may nothing fill our hearts but the firm resolve to form an inseparable fighting band of brothers, which will never rest until our sacred cause is victorious and our great objective achieved: *the emancipation of the working class*. Let us not look backward but forward! We know that we shall have only our own force, the working class itself, to thank for our liberation, and only if it stands united." (Bruegel, *History of Austrian Social-Democracy*, Vol. III, p. 396.)

One hundred and ten delegates assembled at the Congress in Hainfeld, seventy of whom were entitled to vote and among whom were representatives from all parts of the old Austria. Austrians from Vienna and the alpine provinces sat side by side with Czechs, Poles and Slovenes. The Congress was a Unity Congress in a national sense as well. The Socialist Party, which this Congress founded, was a truly international party; it was based on the Marxist theory that the working classes of the individual nations must stand together in a single fighting front and not let themselves be led into regarding alliance with the bourgeoisie of their own nation as fundamental. It was only later that the reformist development of Austrian Social-Democracy and the defection of the Czech and Polish Socialists to the camp of nationalism led to the fateful split of the Austrian workers' movement into national parties.

The Hainfeld Congress set the seal on unity. The declaration of principles was accepted with only three dissentient votes and the resolution calling for unity was passed unanimously. The basis was laid for the coming great advance of the Austrian workers' movement.

The Hainfeld Congress, it must be admitted, was not entirely guiltless of mistakes and omissions. It pointed out the line for the struggle for political rights and liberties, but gave no clear idea as to how these rights should be utilised to enable the workers to seize power or of the organisational tasks confronting the party. It committed the error of designating all non-socialist groups and parties bluntly as a "reactionary mass" and entirely failed to realise that the proletariat must march united in its struggle. It did not even place the national question, which was a burning one in the old Austria, on its agenda. Despite these errors and omissions its tremendous historical importance remains a fact. This significance lay in the establishment of proletarian unity on a Marxist basis.

And therein, lies the significance for the present day of the Hainfeld Congress. To-day the Austrian working class lives

and struggles under a regime of utter slavery, of bloody suppression by German Fascism. In so far as lack of workers' rights is concerned, the period of fifty years ago was, in comparison with to-day, one teeming with opportunities for the working class. The terror exercised by the Government fifty years ago is not to be compared with the barbarity of the Nazis. There is a hundred times greater need for the unity of the workers to-day than fifty years ago.

The unity of fifty years ago did not come of itself. Still less will it do so to-day. Still more than at that time is the achievement of unity bound up with the struggle against the enemies of the workers, with the daily struggle against Fascism, with the struggle against the enemies of unity within the workers' own ranks.

The division in the working class to-day is the result of the treachery of the leaders of Social-Democracy, which began in the year 1914 and continued during the whole post-war period.

The hard school of defeat, the loss of all political rights and liberties, and the bloody suppression of the workers' movement by Fascism has caused the conviction to grow in the minds of the Austrian workers that it is of paramount importance to overcome the split within their ranks. The overcoming of this split, the restoration of unity, can, however, only be accomplished, just as fifty years ago, on the basis of the Marxist revolutionary theory of class struggle. The Austrian working class has realised that complete unity can be reached only through the establishment of the united front.

"The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to begin, is to form a united front, to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country all over the world." (Dimitroff, "United Front," p. 30-31, Lawrence and Wishart.)

Unity of action, thanks to the effort of the Communist Party and the socialist workers, has been established in Austria. But it is far from being close and strong enough. Intrigues are being carried on against it by certain reactionary leaders amongst the Social-Democrats and by sham revolutionaries amongst the "revo-

lutionary socialists." There is, moreover, no lack of police spies and agents provocateurs—Trotskyists—who carry on a rabid campaign against unity. Only in the struggle against all these enemies of unity, who are only furthering the interests of the class enemy, can the split in the workers' ranks be overcome and the desire of the workers be realised which the Chairman of the Hainfeld Congress expressed in the following words:

"I found that they all felt the necessity . . . of setting the seal at this Congress on the spirit of unity which has long throbbled in every breast and to part from one another as brothers." (Minutes of the Hainfeld Party Congress, p. 109.)

The revolutionary Austrian workers, the whole Austrian working class, have long felt their hearts pulsate with the spirit of unity and desire to set the seal on that unity.

If the Austrian working class to-day, at a time when it is working under the conditions of the strictest illegality, looks back on the first Party Congress of fifty years ago, it does so in the determination to emulate the example of the pioneers of the socialist movement in Austria in closing the ranks of the working class, in achieving the unity of the workers' movement in Austria and the closest fraternal alliance with the workers of other nationalities, particularly with the German, Czech, Italian, Hungarian, Croat and Slovene workers. But above all the Austrian working class feels itself united with the workers of the Soviet Union. The forefathers of the socialist workers' movement stated in their programme at Hainfeld with regard to their aims:

"Seeing however . . . that so long as land and soil, tools and factories are the property of single individuals, such a just distribution of the products of labour is impossible, we desire that these should become the exclusive property of society. In the society of to-day they are the monopoly of the possessing classes, and hence the dependent state of the working class is the cause of all misery and wretchedness. Hence, for the achievement of equality of conditions for all members of society, the abolition of wage labour is absolutely essential, the abolition of any form whatever of exploitation of man by man, the abolition of every form of social and political inequality in society." (Brügel, History of Austrian Social Democracy, p. 389.)

The workers of the Soviet Union have realised this aim. They have abolished the exploitation of man by man. They have built up Socialism, which assures the welfare of the whole people. On the basis of the unshakable unity of the working class and its Bolshevik Party they have established the moral and political unity of the whole people. The Soviet Union is the fortress in the struggle against Fascism, but it is also the living, incontrovertible and unshakable proof of the fact that, despite the defeats suffered by the working class in the West, the last hour of the capitalist social order has struck.

Fifty years ago the Hainfeld programme stated:

"And from all the misery, all the accumulated wretchedness to which our conditions doom the vast majority of mankind, one single fact, which makes this life worth living, stands out in glowing relief: the fact that in our country, just as in other countries, thousands of men, despite the scourge, despite the cudgel and the knout, stand firmly shoulder to shoulder, keeping their eyes always on the goal, determined to tread the path leading to it, dauntless and united." (Brügel, History of Austrian Social Democracy, p. 397.)

To-day the Soviet Union, which is the spearhead of the struggle for progress and humanity, the struggle for Socialism, lifts its head triumphantly above the wretchedness and misery of the peoples of the capitalist countries.

The Hainfeld Congress had a prodigious effect on the Austrian workers' movement. United, its ranks closed, the movement marched forward and within six months achieved a decisive victory in the mighty May demonstration held on May 1, 1890, in Vienna. Engels was able to say with justification:

"Friend and foe are in agreement that of all the countries of Europe Austria, and of all the towns of Austria, Vienna, celebrated the holiday of the proletariat the most brilliantly and worthily, and that the Austrian, and in particular the Viennese, workers have thus achieved an entirely new place in the movement." (Quoted from Viktor Adler, Essays, Speeches and Letters, Volume I, pp. 8, 9.)

It was thus that the persecution of the workers' movement by the reactionaries was rendered ineffective, it was thus.

that unity placed the development of the socialist movement on a broader basis. The appeal convoking the Hainfeld Congress stated with justification:

"Thus the history of the Austrian workers' party is the same as the history of the proletariat of all countries: *a hundred times beaten, but never conquered.*" (Brügel, History of Austrian Social Democracy, p. 394.)

The Austrian workers' movement is not conquered even to-day. The more rapidly it creates complete unity within its ranks, the more rapidly will it rise up again, the sooner will it gain fresh victories. And this time, too, after a period of bloody suppression, these victories will be mightier and more far-reaching than before.

The Austrian working class is conscious of its historical task. It sets great store by the revolutionary traditions of its year-long struggle and draws the lessons from the past. It places itself more and more resolutely at the head of the whole people in the struggle for the overthrow of the fascist rule and for the attainment of the independence of Austria. The Austrian workers apply the lessons of Hainfeld to the present day and say, with Comrade Dimitroff:

"At the present exceptionally responsible moment one must not limit oneself to the mere propagation of working-class unity.

"To-day already unity must be established in practice, sweeping aside all obstacles in its path." (*Communist International*, No. 12, 1938, p. 9.)

The Nature of Soviet Patriotism

BY A. CLAIRE

HIDDEN in the dense forests of Soviet Karelia close to the Finnish border stands a little hut. One summer evening in 1938 five strangers came to this hut. They asked the owner, Jegor Kopylov, an old collective farmer, for a night's shelter. The hospitable old man did not refuse their request, gave the strangers a meal and made them a bed of fresh hay in his hut. Before going to bed he entertained them by stories about the locality. At daybreak the strangers left the hut. They had not noticed the old woman who was in the hut when they arrived and who now made them a curtsey and without exchanging as much as a word with the owner, left the hut. Only with his eyes had the owner indicated to her the direction in which the nearest post of frontier guards lay. It was eight miles to the frontier post, old Matriona Seminova was 65 years old, she walked all the way. The guests departed and when the mounted frontier guards galloped up to the hut, the old man led them along the fresh trail of the strangers. They were found to be spies of a foreign power.

In Moscow, in Kiev, in Vladivostok, in Archangel people now form queues in front of the cinemas. The halls are filled beyond capacity. On the screen appears the "battle of the ice" the battle of Lake Peipus, fought in 1242 between the knights of the German Order and the army of Alexander Nevski, elected prince of the old city of Novgorod. The war technique of the German conquistadors is excellent. The battle array is perfect, the ranks closed. They are not easy to beat. But they are beaten by the Russian people defending their soil against a foreign invasion. The producer, Sergei Eisenstein put into the mouth of Alexander Nevski

the actual words of the old Russian chronicle: Giving the captive German common soldiers their liberty Alexander Nevski said:

"Go hence and tell all men in the foreign countries that Russia lives. They may come to us as guests without fear. But he who comes to us sword in hand will perish by the sword. That is and remains the law of the Russian earth." (The cinema trembles with the applause.)

The Japanese have held up a Soviet ship although it had not infringed any article of the international agreements. There was a young woman in the ship, a stewardess. The Japanese deprived her of food and drink and tortured her, demanding that she make statements about state secrets. She refused, said not a word.

Major Kusnetsov, Captain Bulkin and Captain Rybkin, Soviet airmen told of their fights against the fascists in the Red Army newspaper of November 17, 1938. The Soviet airmen wrote:

"We won, not only because of our good technique, what won was our determination, our Bolshevik fighting spirit which no obstacles or dangers can break. . . ."

What inspired the collective farmer, Jegor Kopylov, the 65-year-old Matriona Seminova, the producer Sergei Eisenstein, the young stewardess on the Soviet ship, the military pilots of the U.S.S.R.? What feeling, stronger than the instinct of self-preservation, stronger than the fear of death, moved all these people, the likes of whom are counted not by hundreds of thousands but by millions in the Soviet Union.

That feeling was love of their country. They are Soviet patriots.

The word "patriot" rouses unpleasant

memories in us at first. It reeks of the blood spilt in the war 1914-18. It recalls to our mind chauvinism, that beastly nationalism which pursues its way through war, deceit and violence. But if another word is added to it, the word "Soviet" then it has quite a different sound. "Soviet patriot"—and blood and filth vanish and we see in front of us a Soviet citizen, a citizen of the Socialist state and an enthusiastic internationalist. Love of their own country and internationalism are inseparably united in the men and women of the Soviet land.

A short time ago Papanin, one of the heroes of the Polar ice-floe received a letter from V. Samoilov, a young student in the city of Kuibyshev. He wrote:

"I cannot listen calmly to the wireless when it announces news about the war in China and Spain and the guerillas in Abyssinia. It is my comrades, my brothers who are fighting the foreign invaders there. I ardently wish that they should soon be victorious. But that is merely a wish and not yet a struggle for the liberation of mankind. We, the youth of the Soviet Union, have not experienced the fearful past of Russia, but we are appalled by the present conditions of the working class in the capitalist countries. Shall we really remain inactive now? I am full of hatred for Fascism and do not know what to do with my powers."

Papanin replied to this young comrade in the Soviet press. His reply was both firm and mild. He told the tale how the four courageous men on the drifting ice-floe listened in to the wireless news from the battle fronts in China and Spain.

"It might have seemed that we in the distant Polar Sea could not contribute anything to the struggle against Fascism as we were a thousand miles from the world of men. But we did not feel impotent; we knew that we were doing our duty to the country of Socialism and that by so doing we were working in the interests of the international working class. The tiny black tent on the drifting ice-flow was attached by a thousand threads to the fronts on which the battle raged against Fascism."

Thus does the generation of Papanin, the generation of the October revolution and of the civil war educate the Soviet youth in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism. In the Soviet Union there are no unimportant things, no work that is unimportant.

Everything that is being done in the Soviet Union is of importance to all mankind. Every collective farmer who brings in the rich harvest of his fields, every Metro worker who builds the underground palaces of steel and marble, every miner who gives the country fresh tons of black diamonds, every village schoolmaster and every Soviet author—they are all working for their Socialist mother-country, i.e., for all mankind as well, for the present and future welfare of humanity.

Soviet patriotism is a harmonic chord of ideas and feelings. But in order to feel it one must be completely filled with the consciousness of the greatness of the cause. One of the most valuable achievements, one of the most real victories of Socialism consists in the fact that the men and women of the Soviets in their masses, as a *people* have become conscious of the historical significance attaching to the great work they have achieved.

Let us recall the words of the "Communist Manifesto":

"The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word."

These prophetic words have come true in the Soviet Union. The working class of the Soviet Union having won political power, has risen to be the national class, has constituted itself as the nation.

* * *

The consciousness of Socialist interests and aims cannot arise spontaneously—it has to be instilled into the working class. Marx and Lenin have imparted this to us. That the working class of Russia has become conscious of its patriotism is due to its teachers, its vanguard, the Bolshevik party, Lenin and Stalin.

The Bolsheviks have well understood the nature of national feeling and its tremendous power. They, who imbibed the teachings of Marx not as a dogma but as a guide to action, purified this national feeling, flaming with a dark and elementary force, by adding to it Socialist consciousness. In the years of chauvinist

intoxication during the first world war of 1914-1918 Lenin replied to the slanders of his enemies:

"Is the feeling of national pride foreign to us great-Russian class-conscious proletarians? Certainly not! We love our language and our country. It pains us more than anyone else to see and feel the deeds of violence, the oppression, the yoke to which the henchmen of the Tsar, the landowners and capitalists subject our beautiful country. We are filled with a feeling of national pride because the great-Russian nation has *also* brought forth a revolutionary class, has *also* proved that it is capable of showing mankind great examples of the struggle for freedom and Socialism, not only of fierce pogroms, of rows of gallows-trees, of torture-chambers, of great famines and of servile grovelling at the feet of the priests, the Tsar, the landowners and the capitalists. We are full of a feeling of national pride and precisely for that reason we hate especially our own slavish past and . . . our slavish present. . . ."

This is the reply of Lenin to the slanders who shouted that the working class of Russia was betraying their country, that they had no love for their country because they wanted tsarism to be defeated in the imperialist war. But what inspired the workers of Russia with national pride was the fact that the bitter words of one of the first Russian democrats (Chernyshevski):

"A contemptible nation, a nation of slaves—
—from top to bottom all slaves"—

were no longer true, that the working class of Russia carried on the great struggle for freedom and Socialism amidst the horrors of imperialist war. The true patriotism of the working class of Russia consisted in the fact that they wanted to overthrow, through the defeat of their slave-driving country, that very slavery itself. At that time only the working class of Russia, supported by the sympathies of millions of peasants, represented the true interests of the nation. Through the struggle for the termination of the imperialist war they rendered service to the cause of the whole international working class. The true interests of the nation coincided with the interests of the workers of all countries. Here lie the mighty sources which nourish Soviet patriotism.

Those who fight for Republican Spain against the Fascist interventionists are

defenders of their Spanish home. Those who fight for an independent democratic China against the Japanese invaders are defenders of their Chinese home. Those who fight against Hitler are defenders of their German home. Thorez was fully justified in saying that "the word patriot now regains its true, its original meaning; this word in reality described the sansculottes of 1792" who fought against the reactionary armies of intervention. Those who fight against Daladier for the defensive capacity of France are defenders of their French home. The working class is now coming to be the carrier of the true interests of the nation in the struggle against fascism.

* * *

The Bolsheviks taught the Soviet people to love their country. Lenin said of the working class after the victory of October:

"After October, 1917, we are for the defence of the fatherland."

In 1918 Lenin called the Soviet people to arms to defend the country against the imperialists of Western Europe and the Russian White Guards. The working class of the Soviet Union which had raised itself to political power, had by so doing established a fatherland for themselves, not a slave-driving, unhappy country of a dozen oppressed nationalities, but an independent, democratic, socialist fatherland shining in the brilliance of victory.

The Soviet people includes many nationalities. To forge this Soviet people of many nationalities into a single entity meant that the Soviet Union was made the home not only of the Russian people, which for centuries had been the dominant nationality, but also of the people of the Ukraine, of White Russia, of the Caucasus, Central Asia, the North—for every single nationality and tribe, be it great or small. The proclamation of national equality by the government was only the beginning.

It is a great mistake to describe this establishment of the Socialist fatherland as if it had been an uninterrupted series of triumphs—a method adopted by certain friends of the Soviet Union. Even

though they may do so with the best of intentions, the friends of the Soviet Union, by so doing, harm not only the Soviet Union but themselves as well. For all of us should learn the lesson not only of the victories but also of the temporary reverses and retreats of the first socialist State and its party.

In reality the road was an arduous and heroic one. It passed through the fire of the civil war, through the painful experience of the peasant masses in Ukraine, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Russia, Kazakhstan, whose bodies were trodden underfoot by the iron heel of the punitive expeditions of the foreign interventionists and the Russian landowners. It passed through serious mistakes, through the relapse of certain individuals and groups into chauvinism, through fits of nationalism and distrust of those who, in the eyes of the nationalities oppressed in tsarist Russia, still appeared as the representatives of the former ruling nation. The road to the birth of a fraternal family of nations within the Soviet Union passed through the tremendous sacrifices and difficulties of the first years of industrialisation. Not only by the proclamation of national equality but by years of intense struggle and Socialist action on the part of the Bolshevik party and the common people did this consciousness and feeling of a common Soviet fatherland come into being.

At first the task was to defend that fatherland against open armed intervention and to create a united Red Army consisting of all nations and nationalities inhabiting the country. Later the task was to heal the wounds made by the imperialist war and the war of intervention. Later again the task was to fight for and achieve the economic independence of the country.

The Bolsheviks explained to the Soviet people why foreign conquerors had defeated the gigantic empire of the tsars for centuries: the Mongol Khans, the Turkish Beys, the Swedish feudal lords, the Polish and Lithuanian nobles, the Japanese barons.

"They had all defeated Russia because of her backwardness, her military backwardness, her cultural backwardness, her backwardness

in state organisation, her backwardness in industry, her backwardness in agriculture." (Stalin.)

This backwardness had to be ended! It was the only way to save the Soviet fatherland, won by so heroic a struggle. This was an appeal to Soviet patriotism.

In writing or speaking about the years of the first Five Year Plan we write and speak of many things: of the magnificence of the plan itself, of the miracles of Bolshevik tempo, of the surmounting of difficulties which appeared insurmountable, of the new men and women born in the fire of this creative activity. But we frequently fail to conceive the whole depth of the mighty popular movement incorporated in the gigantic works of the first Five Year Plan. And yet it was precisely in this popular movement that Soviet patriotism took shape. The new men and women who laid the foundations of the independence of their country were Soviet patriots who were defending their country from the terrible danger of a capitalist encirclement.

Many a fire-eater is inclined to turn up his nose at everything that preceded the conquest of power by the working class. They paint the past of the Soviet nations, their struggles, their wars, their statesmen and generals, their whole history previous to the October revolution in the darkest of colours. But Leninism teaches us a different conception of history. Neither Lenin nor Stalin ever taught their people or their party this kind of historical "science." To put forward such a conception of history is to make Marxism and Leninism jejune, is a falsification of Marxism-Leninism. The fire-eaters are flanked by the chattering who are surprised at nothing and who—like Herr Dühring before them—know everything and understand everything. This sort of person sees some sort of "reversion to the historical past" among the Bolsheviks.

Needless to say there is no such "reversion" among the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks only put on its feet what had been standing on its head. Leninism is foreign to any repudiation of the true historical traditions, the national traditions of a people, the Bolsheviks recognise only the real, not the falsified history of a people. The undeniable his-

torical fact that the French revolution of 1789 was a bourgeois revolution must not lead us to conclude that the French revolutionaries of 1789 were no true patriots and that the French people ought not to take pride in these great patriotic traditions, in this brilliant past of France. The undeniable historical fact that Russia was a feudal monarchy for several centuries must not lead us to conclude that the nations in the Soviet Union ought not to pride themselves on their historical struggles for national independence. It was in fact the Russian *people* which in the famous "ice-battle" fought on the ice of Lake Peipus in 1242 inflicted a crushing defeat on the German "cur-knights" who wanted to enslave the Russian people. It was in fact the Ukrainian *people* which in 1613 drove out the Polish interventionists, the Polish nobility and gentry who also stretched out their claws towards the property of the people. In 1709 the Russian army, led by Peter I., defeated the Swedish conquerors who invaded Russia with the assistance of the traitors they found among the hetmans of the Ukraine. In 1812 it was the Russian *people* which rose to defend the country from the invading armies of Napoleon. All this is popular tradition in which the people take pride, which they have sung in song and legend and passed on from generation to generation. The Bolsheviks have put truth back into history and only they, in presenting history in the light of truth, have shown the historical impartiality which befits the ideologists of the working class.

The historical fact that Kutusov and Bagration, Alexander Nevski and Peter I., Suvrov and Bogdan Khmelnitski belonged to and represented the class which in their time ruled Russia must not lead us to conclude that the Soviet nations ought not to regard them as great generals and patriots.

When two years ago in the Moscow Kamerny theatre the attempt was made to burlesque the heroes of the Russian legend, public opinion throughout the country rose up against it. The Soviet Government and the Party condemned this unworthy attempt as a mockery of

popular traditions, as a lack of comprehension of the fact that the people, in its sagas, in the shape of the paladins of story, was praising the men who had fought for the independence and integrity of Russian soil. The author of this play and the producers of the theatre did not represent a Marxist conception of history but a vulgar conception of Marxism, a haughtily contemptuous lack of comprehension of the true meaning of the popular epics and of the national traditions.

Stalin, Kirov and Zhdanov put up an opposition to this falsification of history, to this representation of historical facts in the light of the present day instead of in the light of their own historical period. The leaders of the Bolshevik party supplied the Soviet historians with the foundations on which the history of the nations of the Soviet Union had been distorted and falsified by all too zealous pseudo-"historians," had to be rewritten.

Without this respect for the true history of the nations of the Soviet Union, without this comprehension of their national traditions it would have been impossible to bring about the fraternal alliance of more than 60 nations which now pervades the daily life of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

When the centenary of Pushkin was celebrated in the Soviet Union, it was a festival of culture and fraternity for all Soviet peoples. When the 750th anniversary of the Georgian poet Shota Rustaveli and of his work of genius "The Knight in the Tiger's Skin" was celebrated, it was a festival of culture for all Soviet peoples. The whole Soviet Union with its many nations is preparing in 1939 for the 125th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko whose poems have become the songs of the Ukrainian people.

The Soviet patriot, be he Georgian or Ukrainian, Turk or White-Russian, Russian or Jew has only one country—the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

* * *

When the Soviet Union gave itself a new constitution, thousands of letters arrived in Moscow day after day from all

countries of the world, letters from workers, letters from peasants, from intellectuals, from middle-class people, letters from friends and letters from enemies. An old worker, who did not belong to any party and had taken part in the 1914 war, wrote to Stalin:

"Be not chary of means—arm! The more guns, rifles, machine-guns and tanks for the Red Army the better. Build torpedo boats and submarines. Cover the sky with aeroplanes. Protect yourselves—by so doing you protect us as well. . . ."

That was two years ago. At that time there was as yet no war in China, the battle of Lake Khasan was as yet unfought and there was no Munich agreement. Fascist intervention in Spain was not yet discernible as the beginning of the second imperialist war. Austria was still Austria and Czechoslovakia had not been dismembered yet. War had not yet taken the threatening shape it has to-day and was not yet knocking at the gates of every country. But two years have since gone by. And from day to day the feeling of the mass of the people of all countries was turning more and more into the consciousness that the Soviet Union was the bulwark and the hope, the fatherland of all workers.

The consciousness of historical facts developed in the Soviet Union faster than in capitalist class society. What millions of human beings in all countries of the world learn only at the price of painful experience and cruel defeats, is being made accessible to the Soviet citizens in the Soviet Union by the foresight of the leaders of Socialist society. This foresight is the sense and the art of Bolshevik leadership. And the more the capitalist powers increase their active hostility to the U.S.S.R., the more imminent and real is the danger of a counter-revolutionary imperialist war against the Soviet Union, the more profound is the consciousness of the Soviet people that the Soviet state must be strong. He who thinks over the internal connection between events in the Soviet Union will see that the sequence and mutual interrelation of these events is based on an objective consciously pursued with a strong hand and understood by the whole nation—the consolidation

of the strength and power of the Soviet state.

This road is not strewn with roses and the work is not done with velvet gloves. How many "friendly" warnings were addressed to the Soviet Union when the Soviet state exposed to the gaze of the whole world the revolting plot of the Trotskyist and other agents of Fascism within the Soviet borders. How many "advisers" came forward to persuade the Soviet government that it would be wiser to conceal these things like a "secret disease"; that the trials would injure the international position of the U.S.S.R. and that the purging of the Soviet Union would make a bad impression on the masses in the so-called "democratic" countries. But the Soviet Union acted with firmness and dignity and destroyed the plague-spots of the enemy within its frontiers, intensified the struggle against the war-mongers and against the traitors to their country, turning it into action in favour of universal peace and for the true interests of all nations. In defending itself against the agents of the "secret" war, the Soviet state is defending all the nations of the world against war and Fascism and shows itself to be the true fatherland of all workers. Soviet patriotism is true internationalism.

Only a strong Soviet state is able to frustrate an incipient war with a single blow as the Soviet Union did in the fighting on Lake Khasan in August 1938. "Cover the sky with aeroplanes!" How many men and women in all countries of the earth repeated these words of the unknown worker when the Red Army, defending the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. struck a blow at the axis of war! The Soviet patriots wearing the uniform of the Red Army are defending to-day as they will defend to-morrow the international interests of the workers of all countries, whether they defeat the attacking enemy on the frontier line of the Soviet Union or in the hinterland of enemy territory.

The true democracy incorporated in the Soviet Union is based on the unity of the people and its perfect understanding of what is needed. A Soviet patriot needs not only excellent tanks and aeroplanes.

He needs other weapons as well—he must understand all problems attaching to the struggle for Communism.

The enemies succeeded in deceiving certain credulous and superficial individuals who, misled by high-sounding phrases, began to preach the so-called “withering away” of the Socialist state in connection with the transition to Communism. The Bolsheviks exposed this theory, showing the reality concealed behind the pompous façade of pseudo-Marxist phraseology. To allow the Socialist state to “wither away” in the Soviet Union would be tantamount to giving up the Red Army; it would mean the abolition of the organs of the state which protect the Soviet people from the subversive activities of spies and agents of the fascist and capitalist secret services. Need one say more? Is it not obvious that faced as it is with the war preparations of Fascism, surrounded by a hostile capitalist world, the “withering away” of the Socialist state would simply mean the surrender to the enemy without a struggle, the abandonment of Socialism and of the international working class? This “theory” put forward in the guise of “science” amounts to exactly the same as the policy set afoot in secret by the vile traitors and agents of fascist espionage Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Rykov, Tukhachevsky and Yagoda.

Certain people too clever by half found an opportunity to exercise their wit in connection with the fact that the Bolsheviks were busy on the history of their own party while the Czechoslovak tragedy was being enacted. But as a matter of fact the Bolsheviks, with this little book have put a strong weapon into

the hands of all Soviet patriots. The book refutes the weak-kneed conception of certain pacifists, that the Bolsheviks want peace at any price. It re-establishes the true doctrine of Lenin and Stalin regarding war; pacifism is a way of deceiving the working class; there are just and unjust wars. The war waged in 1918-1920 by the Soviet patriots against the foreign invaders and Russian White Guards was a just war. The Soviet nation regards the war of the Spanish and Chinese peoples against fascist invaders as a just war and therefore the Soviet nations support Spain and China in their just war. The Soviet people believed that a war waged by Czechoslovakia against fascist Germany for the independence and sovereignty of Czechoslovakia would have been a just war and therefore the Soviet state was prepared to take part in this just war. The Soviet patriots know that a war of the Soviet nation against Fascism would be the most legitimate and just war ever fought in the history of mankind. It would be a war in the interests of the whole human race.

* * *

Soviet patriotism has written on its banners the slogan: “Proletarians of all lands unite!” To be a Soviet patriot means to defend wholeheartedly the state which is a stronghold of Socialism; it means being a fighter for the peace and freedom of all nations, for the development of the human race towards Socialism, against Fascism, Capitalism and war. Soviet patriotism is the active internationalism of a people which has already achieved Socialism in its own country.

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