ERNST FISCHER

For or Against the United Front?

PRICE 10 CENTS

Materials of the

SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

•

THE UNITED FRONT AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM
Three speeches by Georgi Dimitroff—cloth 75¢; paper 15¢
Abridged edition—5¢

•

WORKING CLASS UNITY—BULWARK AGAINST FASCISM
Report by Georgi Dimitroff—10¢

•

FREEDOM, PEACE AND BREAD
Report by Wilhelm Pieck with Speech in Reply to Discussion—10¢

•

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE
Report by M. Ercoli with Speech in Reply to Discussion—10¢

•

THE RISE OF SOCIALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION
Report by D. Z. Manuilsky—10¢

•

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE C.I.
Including Closing Speech of Georgi Dimitroff—10¢

•

ENGELS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM
Speech by D. Z. Manuilsky on the 40th Anniversary of the Death of Engels—10¢

•

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN FRANCE
Speeches by Marcel Cachin, Maurice Thorez and Andre Marty—10¢

•

YOUTH AND FASCISM
Speech by O. Kuusinen—5¢

•

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE COLONIAL COUNTRIES
Speech by Wang Ming—10¢

•

NEW STEPS IN THE UNITED FRONT
Report by Earl Browder on the Seventh Congress made at Madison Square Garden—5¢

•

THE WORK OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS
Speech by D. Z. Manuilsky at a meeting of active members of the Moscow organization of the C.P.S.U.—10¢

FOR OR AGAINST THE UNITED FRONT?

By Ernst Fischer

Former editor of the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung", Organ of the Socialist Party of Austria

Workers Library Publishers

NEW YORK

PUBLISHED BY WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.
P. O. BOX 148, STA D, NEW YORK CITY
OCTOBER, 1936
209

For Or Against the United Front?

ON MARCH 1, 1936, the leading journal of clerical fascism in Austria, the *Reichspost*, published one of the usual articles against the Soviet Union. In itself, that would not be noteworthy. The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, the increasing prosperity of the Soviet people and the growing power of the Soviet state are beginning to cause fascism in every country profound uneasiness. The masses of the people in every country are growing more and more sympathetic towards the great socialist workers' and peasants' state, which towers lofty and impregnable above an ocean of crisis, misery and unemployment. In a world of folly, crime and despair, the Soviet Union is not only building socialism, a system without exploitation, a system of order, liberty, and vitality, but is daily bringing fresh forces, skill and tireless energy to the defense of the constantly threatened peace of nations. In every country the masses and the best and finest minds are becoming more and more convinced that only Soviet power can save mankind from ruin, and life and culture from destruction. The Soviet Union and communism are commanding ever greater respect and will command still more; in every country the Front of Life is rallying against the Front of Death.

It is no wonder that the forces of death, war, and capitalist darkness stop at nothing in their attempts to undermine the growing respect in which the Soviet Union is held, and to stay the growth of Communism. It is no wonder that for this purpose they let loose the foul and bloody underworld of lies, murder and villainy; that they take anyone and everyone into their service, every adventurer, every blackguard and social outcast who is ready to help them in their fight against the

Soviet Union. It is no wonder that all the little cliques and big organizations which hate Bolshevism for various reasons are united against it in spite of their conflicting interests. They understand that it concerns them all. It concerns the world of capitalism. It concerns problems that are shaking five continents. Whoever joins this fight against the Soviet Union becomes, whether he will or no, an accomplice of the counter-revolution, takes his place in the front of White death against Red life. Whoever desires to prevent war and destroy fascism must support the Soviet Union without reservation, regardless of whether this or that in the Soviet state altogether meets with his wishes or ideas. Petty, personal desires must go by the board when the fate of mankind is at stake.

Fascism knows why it is concentrating all its ideological and organizational forces against the Soviet Union and Bolshevism —it knows that its opponents would be impotent if the Soviet Union and Bolshevism were defeated. It has become much more difficult to carry on campaigns of slander. No one believes the old fables about starvation in the Soviet Union any longer. The petty-bourgeois fear of "Communist regimentation" is constantly decreasing. The legends of a "terrorist dictatorship of a small group over the Russian working masses" are being discredited more and more.

Conditions have changed and the lies too must be changed. Lies have short legs, says a German proverb. Shod with seven-league boots, Bolshevism strides from success to success; with their short legs the lies can no longer overtake reality and a new host of lies is called into service to pursue the giant a little further. The article in the *Reichspost* gives the lead. Yesterday the cry was starvation, today they discover that prosperity is endangering socialism. Yesterday they were bewailing "dismal equalitarianism", today they discover that there is not enough equality and therefore too little socialism in the Soviet Union. Yesterday they vilified the dictatorship, today they find, as in the *Berliner Tageblatt* of February 8, 1936,

that democratization means pushing the "class-conscious proletarian and genuinely communist forces" into the background, a "weakening of the working class". In short, we cannot satisfy our enemies, nor have we the slightest intention of ever doing so.

Thus from the article in the *Reichspost* we learn that in the Soviet Union life is too good, too happy, and that this is a betrayal of socialism. Instead of "dismal equalitarianism" we find variety, a sinful complexity of wages and standards of living. We are given to understand that a "new class" has arisen, the class of the "jubilant and triumphant", which—it needs the actual words to make it thoroughly enjoyable—"sets the tone in Moscow today, rushes about the town in motor cars, monopolizes the best seats at the theaters, constitutes the most respected habitués of the most expensive restaurants and food stores". In a word, a new Babylon. The pious disappointment of the *Reichspost* is understandable.

In Christian-fascist Austria it is the nobility that sets the tone, the counts and barons, the bank presidents and big landowners. They rush about the town in motor cars, they monopolize the best seats in the theaters, they fill the expensive restaurants and food stores. This is the Christian-fascist order of society. Queues of unemployed in front of the labor exchanges, and rows of expensive motor cars in front of the opera house. In Moscow, however, it is the "jubilant and triumphant" who set the tone: the Stakhanovites, the best turners, fitters, mechanics, dairymaids, cattle-breeders, the best factory managers and the best writers. It is they who are the "jubilant and triumphant"; it is they who are decorated with orders, and feted at banquets, they who sit in the boxes at the opera, they who wear beautiful furs and eat in the finest restaurants.

But there are worse horrors in Moscow. The *Reichspost* states with disgust that there are no fewer than "seventy thousand servants" in Moscow. Actually there are tens of thousands of families in Moscow which employ help in the

house ("servants" as they are called in the aristocratic jargon of the *Reichspost*), tens of thousands of working class families in which husband and wife earn enough to be able to leave the housekeeping to a "servant", tens of thousands of factory directors, writers, engineers, and so on, whose wives do not do their own cooking but work in a factory or office and run their homes with outside help.

But still more horrible—the *Reichspost* crams it into one significant sentence—"The man who earns little is considered a fool". It is to this abyss that socialism has led mankind—every worker has the chance to become skilled through special courses, evening schools, etc., to work as a Stakhanovite, to rise to the position of engineer, or director, to increase his income by increasing his output, and to say to his fellow worker who is behind, "become skilled and then you'll earn more, you'll belong to the jubilant and triumphant too". The *Reichspost* finds this scandalous, but the unemployed proletarians and intellectuals, the industrial workers slaving for a starvation wage, the young technicians, young engineers, office workers and writers who often can no longer find work even as street sweepers might well think otherwise and long for a country where there is no unemployment, where work is the criterion, and not the whim of chance or "pull".

But the *Reichspost* has still a trump to play; its special correspondent recounts the following anecdote for the incurably weak-minded:

> "Everything is done in fine style by these 'responsible' Communists at their innumerable banquets, one of which was attended by the correspondent. The number of empty wine bottles was past counting. All these Communist directors swear by Stalin, who has made 'gentlemen' of them again. 'In the old days,' said one, 'I was embarrassed when I used to arrive at my factory and wanted to ask the comrade porter to help me off with my fur coat. Now—everything's fine!' And then in the maudlin strain, 'But is this socialism? The porter now comes runing a mile further, just to take off my galoshes. That's what our socialism

looks like. Sock the fellow in the jaw who says we were socialist! I tell you, sock him in the jaw!' "

This anecdote is typical of the level of the *Reichspost*, which only a short time ago reported that in Russia children were slaughtered for food. But who is the special correspondent that purveys this kind of story? The article in the *Reichspost* is not a home product of fascism but simply an extract from an article which appeared in the *Socialist Messenger*. You ask, whose messenger is it that brought the readers of the *Reichspost* such glad news? It is the messenger of the Mensheviks, the Russian Social-Democrats. The *Socialist Messenger* is the newspaper of the Mensheviks, led by Dan, Abramovich, and Garvy, who belong to the Second International and sometimes even proclaim themselves to be "Lefts".

The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union inspires the anti-fascist masses in their fight against the fascist oppressors. It gives the workers of every country courage and confidence; it enables them to counterpose to fascism not only the dream of a socialist future but socialist reality. It serves the cause of the workers in every country and confounds the forces of the counter-revolution. But here and there a "message" is whispered among the proletarian ranks, to the fighters: "Don't let yourselves be fooled. Socialism has not been victorious. In the Soviet Union it is not socialism, not the working class that is victorious; in the Soviet Union a new class of the jubilant and triumphant rules, filling itself with drink and proclaiming its drunken wisdom to the world: 'All this has nothing to do with socialism! Sock the fellow in the jaw who says we were Socialists!' " Does this false message strengthen the fighting power of the working class? No one will make such a statement. Does this message strengthen the position of the class enemy? The fascist *Reichspost* has answered this question. It has taken the *Socialist Messenger* lovingly to its heart; it makes use of it as an ally in its fight against the Soviet Union, against the working class. The *Socialist Messenger* may perhaps hypo-

critically reply that this was not its intention. No one will believe it. But even if it were so, the intentions of the *Socialist Messenger* are a matter of indifference to fascism. It is the services of the *Socialist Messenger* that are all-important. It has become the servant of fascism. That is its function in the class struggle.

WHO ARE THE MENSHEVIKS?

Who are the Mensheviks? What role do they play in the Second International? What is their function in the class struggle?

"Why these questions?" someone may demand of us. "The Mensheviks were defeated by world history; they set themselves in the way of Bolshevism and were swept away by the Revolution. They are a small section of the Russian emigrés, soured, embittered, pathetic. On the edge of great streams there are often small bodies of dead backwaters, in which decaying pieces of wood float round in circles, unable to find their way back into the main stream; but you are out in the open stream, let them float round in circles, the unfortunates, those left behind by the main stream of life!"

Now the Mensheviks, it is true, are only a small section, without any prospects, without a future; but they are on the Executive of the Second International. They write in the newspapers and journals of the Second International, and they supply Soviet enemies with "material" against the Soviet Union, and the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy with "arguments" against the united front. And this at a time when it is more important than ever before that the forces of the working class be welded together. It is more important than ever that there be a steadfast and militant united front against war and fascism. It is more important than ever that before the decisive battle the proletarian ranks be purged of unsound elements which decrease their fighting spirit and

undermine their faith in victory, and that the steel structure of the workers' front have no breach or fissure.

What are we to say, however, when in a situation like this men in the proletarian camp run intellectually amuck and write theses about war, prophesying that:

> "In Germany the masses—excluding, of course, the revolutionary van of the proletariat—will bring all the forces of their discipline and self-sacrificing spirit to support Hitler's war for the 'salvation of Germany'."

And, on the other hand:

> "War . . . will reveal in all its tragic extent the weakness and unreliability of the technical, economic and social regime of Russia."

It was not a Hitler fascist who read this from the hand of fate, but the Menshevik Abramovich, who produced such a thesis on war. What is there to say about the Menshevik Garvy, who writes in the *Socialist Messenger* of January, 1936:

> "Only substantial changes in the political regime of the Soviet Union . . . can lay the necessary foundation for the united front in the West."

And what, finally, is there to say when these people no longer speak for themselves alone, but are backed by the Second International, when in pamphlets, pronouncements and manifestoes their names appear linked not only with the leaders of reactionary Social-Democracy but also with leaders of the Social-Democratic Left bloc. True, the Mensheviks have no following, no organization worth the name, no serious political prospects, but they are not only trying by means of illegal groups to undermine Bolshevism in the Soviet Union, they are also becoming the mouthpiece of the Second International on more questions than one, and represent therefore in the eyes of many workers a part of the international labor movement. In close alliance with the reactionary Social-Democratic lead-

ers, they are working successfully enough in the parties of the Social-Democratic Left bloc, as, for instance, in the ranks of the French Socialists, for the purpose of mobilizing forces against the united front. It is therefore necessary to know more about the Mensheviks, during this period when all the forces of the working class are being sifted and rallied.

UP TO FEBRUARY, 1917

The Mensheviks broke away from the Russian Social-Democratic Party in 1903. At that time they were in the minority; Mensheviks means "those of the minority"—Bolsheviks, "those of the majority".

The cause of this split was not understood at that time by many of the Western Social-Democrats; it concerned the problem of organization, a problem of the utmost significance as regards policy and principle, a problem concerning the type of party. Whereas Lenin demanded that Party membership should be bound up with revolutionary work in some organization, the Mensheviks demanded that anyone who was in agreement with the principles of the Party program should be considered a Party member. Today the followers of illegal parties will understand better than anyone else the profound significance of this disagreement: it concerned the type of party. It concerned the question of what role the Party is called on to play in the class struggle. The Mensheviks wanted to make the Party an agglomeration of various elements, united only by a party program binding them to no further commitments. To Lenin the Party was the leader of the working class, an organization of the most class-conscious, tried and tempered revolutionary sections of the proletariat, completely united in thought, will and action; Lenin knew that only a party of this new type could lead the working class, and in critical situations effect what was historically essential with the utmost force and unity. In contrast to the Social-Democratic parties with their profound inner contradictions, their

fatal and far-reaching "freedom of opinion" among the leading group, their increasing and finally dominating petty-bourgeois tendencies, Lenin created a new party, a party with a single aim a sharp instrument, hard, pliable and unbreakable, like a tempered steel sword, a party of the revolutionary class struggle.

In the course of development the Mensheviks became more and more obviously a reformist party. Shrinking at every decisive moment from the final consequences, clinging mechanically to the belief that the working class of backward tsarist Russia was good for nothing more than to hobble in the wake of developments in the West, underestimating the enormous revolutionary forces of the Russian people and their tremendous revolutionary energy, they never understood the role of the allies of the proletariat in this huge peasant land, nor the role of the Party as the leader of the masses.

FROM THE REVOLUTION TO COUNTER-REVOLUTION

In the February Revolution of 1917 the Mensheviks did all in their power to establish "normal" conditions as soon as possible and to guide the revolution along "orderly lines". The masses fought for the socialist revolution, the Mensheviks, however, wanted to go back to capitalism. They characterized Lenin, who demanded and prepared the proletarian revolution, as "mad", as an enemy of the working class, as paving the way for counter-revolution; they allied themselves with every bourgeois force against Bolshevism, sabotaged the Soviets and strove for "freedom for all", *i.e.*, for the counter-revolutionaries also. At the same time their government banned the Bolshevik newspapers, sought to imprison Lenin, and drove him into hiding.

Today, after the victory of fascism in nearly all the Central European states, in all those states in which the working class went the way of Menshevism after the Revolution, it is

not necessary to guess what the inevitable consequences of a Menshevik policy in Russia would have been. Today every worker understands that bourgeois democracy, bourgeois parliamentarianism, would have been converted into open counter-revolution much sooner in Russia than elsewhere (the Kornilov putsch, in the middle of 1917, showed these tendencies).

The masses of the petty-bourgeois strata of the Russian people, above all the masses of the Russian peasantry, whose most elementary demands were not satisfied by the bourgeois revolution and the Menshevik governments (for only the dictatorship of the proletariat was in a position to satisfy their elementary demands) could have become a reservoir of counter-revolution. Today nobody will have the slightest doubt that bourgeois parliamentarianism would rapidly have turned the scales in favor of the bourgeois parties, behind which the White generals stood, ready and more than ready to drown not only the proletariat but also bourgeois democracy in blood. The wavering and timid Mensheviks, who lacked all faith in the creative forces of the masses, shrank from following out their principles in face of the unexampled difficulties, and recommended capitulation. Today even the Social-Democratic workers no longer doubt that the path of the Mensheviks is the path of defeat, that only the policy of Lenin and the Bolsheviks saved the revolution, pushed it forward and led to the victory of the working class. But the leaders of the Mensheviks are no more ready to recognize this today than they were then; some of them have drawn the correct conclusions and have gone over to the Bolsheviks, the majority, however, have taken their place in the ranks of counter-revolution.

History has its own laws; in so-called "normal" times there are transitional groups, groups of indeterminate character, whose allegiance to one or another class is not clearly perceptible to the masses. Between the class fronts vacillate the middle strata, the masses of middle peasants and the petty

bourgeoisie, allying themselves now with the bourgeoisie, now with the working class, buffeted hither and thither in a whirlpool of conflicting interests. The proletariat can win these strata as allies only if it is not tainted by these wavering and undecided elements, only if it does not belie its revolutionary aims or betray its revolutionary steadfastness.

The Bolsheviks have always striven for an alliance with these strata, and have always understood that this alliance can be effected not by means of concessions in principle but only by actually defending the interests of the toiling masses against the financial oligarchy. The Mensheviks, on the contrary, have sunk deeper and deeper into the limbo of petty-bourgeois sentiments, and embodied in their policy the vacillation and indecision of the middle strata, thereby sacrificing the interests of the petty-bourgeois strata to monopoly capital and thus alienating these middle strata from the working class. The Mensheviks used to be a part of the labor movement. They gave themselves out to be representatives of the interests of the proletariat. But they lacked faith in the creative power of the working class and in its ability to lead. They were filled with the profound uncertainty of the petty bourgeoisie. They were in a position to develop in either direction—like the middle strata whose dual character they reflected.

In times of revolution and social change, however, everything takes on a simpler and more direct character. Revolution forces decision on the middle strata, results in differentiation in their ranks, isolates the elements which are bound up for better or for worse with big capital, attracts the broad masses of toilers to the side of the proletariat. The more decided in aim, the more energetic, the more aware of its role as leader, the greater will be the success of the working class in winning over the masses to its side; and the more dilatory and unsure of its role as leader, the more it will push the masses into the ranks of counter-revolution. The more the revolution develops, the less tenable are all intermediate positions, and the

more unequivocally are parties like the Mensheviks forced to disclose their real character.

In every atom, modern physics teaches us, there rotate electrons that are more firmly, and electrons that are less firmly bound. Under the influence of "normal" light rays the electrons become more active, it is true, but remain bound to the atomic nucleus. Under the influence of high-frequency light rays, loosely-bound electrons break away from the atom constellation. Revolution is like these high-frequency rays; the general activity is increased but the elements bound firmly to the proletarian nucleus remain bound to that nucleus while the others are torn away and become one with the counter-revolution. Many Mensheviks in 1917 and 1918 subjectively were certainly not counter-revolutionaries, but in so far as they fought against the proletarian revolution they were servants of the counter-revolution; many of them remained in the same position where they had stood before, but counter-revolution had moved into these positions, while the working class had marched on to new positions. Thus the Mensheviks who remained in their old positions suddenly found themselves, whether they would or no, a part of the counter-revolutionary front. In revolution there are no middle courses; a decision is made for everyone, even if he makes no decision himself.

ARMED FORCE AGAINST THE REVOLUTION

Many of the Menshevik leaders have continued their dilly-dallying and irresolution, still considering themselves men of the bourgeois revolution, whereas historically they were already men of the counter-revolution; many others have put an end to this half-way position and have openly joined the counter-revolution.

German Social-Democracy used to say: "The enemy is on the Left"; and just as Ebert and Noske surrounded themselves with White-Guard officers in order to put a bloody end to the Spartacists, so these Mensheviks considered Bolshevism the

arch enemy and joined the ranks of the White-Guard battalions.

Immediately after the October Revolution, on November 10, 1917, the Central Committee of the Mensheviks passed a resolution stating:

> "Until the complete liquidation of the Bolshevik adventure, any agreement with the Bolshevik Party concerning the organization of joint power with them is absolutely inadmissible. . . . The All-Russian Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland and the Revolution shall command the Committee of War and Revolution immediately to lay down arms, surrender the power it has seized and order those of the troops which are obeying it to put themselves at the disposal of the Provisional Government."

The Committee of War and Revolution was the executive organ of the October Revolution. But what was that "All-Russian Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland and the Revolution" to which the Mensheviks appealed, and which they regarded as a savior in time of need? This glorious committee provides the best description of itself in the following appeal:

> "Do not acknowledge the power of these perpetrators of violence! Do not obey their orders! Come to the rescue of the fatherland and the revolution! Use armed force to fight against the mad adventure of the Bolshevik Committee of War!"

Use armed force against the proletarian revolution—that was the slogan of the All-Russian Committee. The White generals gladly obeyed this slogan, and the Central Committee of the Mensheviks called upon the All-Russian Committee to put an end to the "Bolshevik adventure", the proletarian revolution!

Many Menshevik organizations responded to this appeal; Menshevik workers defended the proletarian revolution side by side with the Bolsheviks; in many districts the Mensheviks after long hesitation gave the word to defend the Bolsheviks against the Whites; and in many districts the Mensheviks had

already gone over to the counter-revolution. In Georgia they made common cause with the Western imperialists. One of their leaders, Jordania, declared at that time in the Georgian National Assembly:

> "I know the enemy will say that we are on the side of the imperialists. Therefore I must categorically declare here: 'I prefer the imperialists of the West to the fanatics of the East.'"

In Siberia, in the Volga and Ural districts, the Mensheviks supported the counter-revolution with armed force. In Samara the Menshevik Party organ of June 2, 1918, acted as the tool of Russian counter-revolution by calling on the workers to use armed force against the Bolsheviks in support of the Czech legions which were in alliance with the Entente and the Whites and were forcing an entry into the fatherland. The appeal reads:

> "Without a doubt the Soviet power will make new efforts to reoccupy Samara, if only for a week. In the face of this contingency we must always be ready to offer the necessary opposition. Over and above the fact that a powerful, effective regular army must be created among the Czechoslovakian troops, the workers of Samara must not only give moral support for the protection of the democratic and free republic of Samara, but if necessary, use *armed force* against the commissars and their hirelings."

Most monstrous of all was the attitude of the Menshevik leader Garvy, who greeted the French troops in Odessa as "liberators" and openly fraternized with the international forces of counter-revolution. On October 26, 1918, Garvy published the following article in the Menshevik organ *Yuzhny Rabochy (Southern Worker)*:

> "The last Congress of the French Socialist Party, at which the followers of Longuet obtained a majority, passed a resolution of strong protest against the intervention of the Allies in Russian affairs. There can be no doubt that this resolution was dictated by the best of feelings towards Russia and the deepest respect for the principles of national sovereignty.

"Nevertheless, we must categorically declare: The decision of the French Socialist Congress is radically opposed to the interests and duties of international democracy in general and socialist democracy in particular.

"One or the other: either the French Socialists are deaf and blind to what is going on in Russia, and regard the regime of the Soviet deputies as a normal form of human society—in which case their decision is reactionary, because it is directly or indirectly supporting a tyranny such as has not been known in recent history—or the French Socialists know what is happening under the regime of the Soviet deputies, know that reaction such as Europe has not known for a long time rules in Russia, but nevertheless repudiate the intervention on the principle of the self-determination of nations; in which case their position is equally reactionary, for the best possible formula of progress and liberalism slips easily enough into the formula of Pontius Pilate when one makes abstractions from the reality in which this formula is to be applied. . . .

"We believed until now that the sangfroid of the diplomats and the standpoint of these ruling cliques, in face of the panic in the 'Allied states', was a heritage of bourgeois politics, which sanctified the slogan of non-intervention, and even created an important liberal tradition on this basis. How is it that this lying and hypocritical ideology has penetrated into the ranks of the Socialists? To Marx and the Marxists of his time this awe of the idols of international politics was completely foreign —and whether Marx was right or wrong in the particular case— in principle he had the right to demand a campaign against Russia to destroy the Cossack dominance here.

"He had not that mystic fear of criticism by force of arms in questions of international politics, when there was no alternative.

"Longuet would do well to recollect this tradition of his great predecessor."

This Garvy had the unexampled cynicism to refer to Marx as an authority when he demanded the entry of French troops into the Soviet Union and the overthrow of the proletarian revolution by foreign arms. As if Marx would have appealed to the Prussian troops for the bloody overthrow of the Paris Commune! And as the troops of the Allies approached, this Garvy wrote in the *Yuzhny Rabochy* of November 19, 1918:

"In Odessa the Allies are expected any day. A new stage in the development of Russia is bound up with their arrival. The Allies are interested in the unification of Russia and this interest of theirs is at the same time a fundamental interest of Russia itself, and therefore the entry of the Allies into Russian territory is an event of great political importance, which can have highly beneficial results in the task of bringing about a rebirth of our country."

The "highly beneficial results" did not last. The troops of the international counter-revolution broke into the country, stood Bolshevik commissars against the wall and shot them, fought side by side with tsarist generals to make a shambles of the workers and peasants. The Russian Social-Democrat Garvy allied himself with the butchers of the Russian proletariat; the French Socialist, Marty, and the sailors of the French Black Sea Fleet acted quite differently. They rose against the interventionists and allied themselves with the Russian proletariat. The Russian Social-Democrat Garvy, who betrayed the revolutionaries of his country to the international counter-revolution, and the French revolutionary Marty, who rose against the French commanders to defend the Russian Revolution—these are *two* men *who represent two worlds.*

Marty is today a member of the Presidium of the Communist International. Garvy has betaken himself to his allies abroad. He has become the expert on Soviet affairs for German Social-Democracy. In the *Vorwaerts,* the central organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, he has for years slandered and attacked the Soviet Union. He has represented the Mensheviks at congresses of the Second International. And today he is still among the leaders of the Mensheviks.

BLOODY DEEDS AND PAPER DECLARATIONS

During the years of the revolution did the Central Committee of the Mensheviks approve the policy of its Party comrades in Georgia, in the Ural and Volga districts, in Samara, Odessa and the Ukraine? The Central Committee did

not dare openly to approve of this policy of foul and bloody betrayal. The resolution signed by Dan and others and adopted by the Menshevik Party conference, held from December 27, 1918, to January 1, 1919, states the following:

> "In the first place the Conference notes that the Party organizations in the Ural and Volga districts . . . are systematically supporting the policy of the Constituent Assembly, which is leading to an inevitable conflict with the Bolsheviks and alliance with the openly counter-revolutionary elements.
>
> "Secondly, the Conference notes that at the congress of southern *zemstvos* and the cities of Simferopol the Social-Democratic fraction represented there affiliated itself to the Cadet and Socialist-Revolutionary congress majority, which in its turn resolved to organize state power on the basis of a coalition with the bourgeoisie, in alliance with the Entente imperialists.
>
> "Thirdly the Conference notes that the Georgian Social-Democrats tried to save the democratic order and the autonomy of Georgia by looking to assistance from abroad."

The resolution of the All-Ukrainian Conference of Mensheviks, which met in Kharkov from April 19 to April 23, 1919, states the following:

> "The political dealings carried on by a number of responsible Party representatives and groups which are pushing for a policy of orientation towards the Allies and an agreement with the bourgeoisie, in opposition to the general Party line, constitute a crime against the proletariat, the Revolution and socialism, have discredited the Party, and caused a split in its ranks.
>
> "Instances of dealings of this kind in Ukraine are: support of the Voluntary Army, and representations in favor of an agreement with the Allies."

Thus, large sections of the Mensheviks realized the logical consequences of their policy. They were obliged to acknowledge that the fight against Bolshevism necessarily involved alliance with open counter-revolution. Jordania in Georgia and Garvy in Odessa were not individuals of no standing, but recognized leaders of the Mensheviks; the organizations in

the various districts did not feel that their alliance with open counter-revolution was a violation of the "general Party line", but rather the unavoidable consequence of this general Party line. Dan and the others invented a speciously clever policy of "on the one hand, on the other hand": on the one hand a fight against the proletarian revolution, on the other a fight against counter-revolution. But the inexorable mechanism of civil war, of revolutionary change, allowed of no "on the one hand, on the other hand" policy. It demanded "either-or"; either union with the Bolsheviks in their fight against counter-revolution, or union with counter-revolution in its fight against the Bolsheviks. Any party "between these two fronts" had finally to join one or the other; the genuine revolutionaries, who belonged there, joined the great party of the revolution, the others openly or secretly joined the counter-revolution. Jordania, Garvy and others openly went over to the counter-revolution. True, the Central Committee censured this, but drew no logical conclusions from its censure. Garvy is still a leading Menshevik. In view of this fact, what opinion can one have of the paper declarations of the Central Committee? What opinion can one hold as to the sincerity of these declarations of a Party which indeed condemns open desertion to counter-revolution, but does not throw the deserters out of its ranks, which does not change the policy that leads inevitably to the sort of dealings carried on by Garvy and Jordania? This policy was a crime against the proletariat, the revolution and socialism, not only when it was carried to its ultimate consequences, but in its entirety.

The proletarian revolution could not long tolerate a party of which one section worked openly with the White Guards, and another section consciously or unconsciously acted as an accomplice in other ways. The forces of counter-revolution are far too clever to proclaim their aims openly in times of revolution; they hide behind democratic slogans, they promise to introduce "genuine" democracy, they proclaim themselves

the spokesman of the "democratic" elements. However, the Mensheviks also have tried to incite the masses against Bolshevism in the name of democracy. Thereby they not only drew dangerously close to White-Guard counter-revolution, but actually became a part of the counter-revolutionary movement, whether they wanted to or not. They found themselves in increasingly bitter opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the more the proletarian masses turned to Bolshevism the closer became the union between the Mensheviks and the rural non-proletarian anti-Soviet elements. Finally, the Central Committee of the Mensheviks transferred abroad and there occupied itself partly with organizing the fight of the illegal groups in the Soviet Union against the dictatorship of the proletariat, partly with weaving conspiracies against the Soviet Union in the Second International.

THE CLIQUE OF INTRIGUERS

Severed from the proletarian movement, plunged ever deeper in their hatred of Bolshevism, they predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union from month to month, attempting to make use of the Western Social-Democratic Parties and their connections to undermine the dictatorship of the proletariat, and became a clique of intriguers furnishing Soviet enemies with material. They were aware of *one* fight only: the fight against Communism. However, there was always one difference between them and the Social-Democratic Parties of the West, which were pursuing a reactionary policy; in the Social-Democratic Parties there were great masses of workers who participated in the daily class struggle, and functionaries who followed the pernicious Party policy but were still bound up with the masses. The Mensheviks, however, were cut off from all this; their fight was directed exclusively against the victorious Party of the victorious Russian Revolution, against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, and thus against the interests of the

entire working class. And even if they draw a distinction between themselves and the Russian White Guards, actually their immediate aim differed in no way from the immediate aim of the White Guards: the overthrow of Bolshevism, the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

GARVY APPEALS TO THE KULAKS

Let us turn to what some of the leaders of the Mensheviks have to say, and how they formulate their aim themselves. Garvy, whom we have already had occasion to mention, published an article in the Berlin Social-Democrat *Vorwaerts* of July 22, 1930, just at the time of the widespread collectivization of agriculture in the Soviet Union. In this article he says:

> "When the failure of the lightning drive for forced collectivization this spring was at its most acute point, the Right opposition missed what was probably its only chance of making a bold attack, winning the leadership for itself and overthrowing the dictator; the venture necessitated an appeal to the country and to the oppressed peasantry. The Right opposition, which fears the people and, like the Stalinists and the Trotskyists, is for the dictatorship, was unable to take advantage of the historic opportunity. . . .
>
> "Capitalism is undoubtedly a bad economic system. But this postulate by no means implies that the Soviet economic system, which incidentally has nothing in common with socialism, is better or superior. The Party Conference is over. The ferment in the country, the general uncertainty and the growing discontent have found no reflection in the Party Conference. The Bolshevik Party is congealing into a new ruling order, which is constantly losing all contact with the masses. The mood at the Party Conference can be characterized in essence as 'dizzy with success'. The awakening will be terrible."

This is clear and understandable. The Menshevik Garvy blames the Right opposition for not appealing to the "oppressed peasantry", that is, the kulaks, in order to bring about a violent overthrow of the regime. We need only go back to the year 1930, to the last great outbreak of the kulak counter-

revolution against the proletarian dictatorship, the organized slaughter of livestock, instigated by the kulak and White-Guard elements in order to produce a famine, the murders of numerous Communist officials by kulaks and the mighty effort made by the united forces of the proletariat in the last decisive phase of the Revolution; we need only recall all this, if we want to understand the significance of that "appeal to the oppressed peasantry" urged by Garvy, and his conception of the overthrow of the "dictator" and the dictatorship. In his opinion the Right opposition had not taken advantage of the "historic opportunity" because it was for the dictatorship, and did not unscrupulously organize the kulak counter-revolution.

Glimpses of Garvy's hopes in the kulaks, the dispossessed rich peasants, appear in an article which he published on February 14, 1931, in the Berlin *Vorwaerts*. In this article he says:

> "The Stalinist dictatorship is playing with fire. It is destroying the fragile *smychka*, the alliance between the peasantry and the Soviet power. Instead it is giving rise to a spontaneous *smychka* between the exploited and oppressed workers and the dispossessed peasants, which can mean the doom of the Party dictatorship."

Today even the world of our enemies is obliged to acknowledge that the agrarian revolution, brought to a successful conclusion under the leadership of Stalin, the building of socialism carried out under his leadership, and the *smychka*, the alliance between the workers and the peasants, have finally assured the "exploited and oppressed workers" and "oppressed peasantry" of prosperity, culture and a life of happiness. But it is characteristic of the Mensheviks that they not only continued to prophesy the collapse of the Soviet power, month after month, but that they leagued themselves with the counter-revolutionary kulaks.

DAN WISHES TO RESTORE CAPITALISM

It might be answered: Well and good, this Garvy is beyond

doubt a counter-revolutionary. But what about Dan, the "Left" leader of the Mensheviks, who may belong to the same party and the same party leadership as Garvy but nevertheless advocates a different policy? Dan himself attaches great importance to such nuances. Social-Democrats who work with him declare: Garvy is a knave, Abramovich is a reactionary enemy of the Soviet Union, but Dan is a sincere Socialist.

Let us quote from a speech made by this "sincere Socialist" on November 5, 1928, in Vienna, and reported in the Social-Democratic *Arbeiterzeitung* of November 7. Dan had hurried to Vienna at that time in order to counteract certain pro-Soviet sympathies that were manifesting themselves in the ranks of the Austrian Social-Democrats, and to bring about a union of the Viennese workers with the Mensheviks. In this speech he says:

> "*The establishment of capitalism in Russia is inevitable.* The task of maintaining the present state capitalism which can no longer satisfy the economic requirements of the peasants is beyond the powers of the Bolshevik dictatorship. The one and only source for the formation of capital in Russia is the village. But the village is in need of capitalist development. *These are facts we must acknowledge, however distressing they may be to us.*
>
> "It is we who say to the Russian worker in this momentous situation, now, while Russia stands at the cross-roads: you must not trust a dictatorship or a government, however good it may be. You must recognize that today, when Russia is coming face to face with capitalism, the Russian workers must themselves rally together and themselves build up the organization of defense.
>
> "We are against any violent overthrow of the Bolshevik dictatorship, we demand simply compliance with the Soviet Constitution and the gradual extension of democracy. We are aware that the only democratic force is the working class, which must pursue its way without allying itself with the so-called democratic bourgeois groups, because today there are no democratic bourgeois groups in Russia. The outcome of the Russian Revolution after the achievement of political liberty will be the creation of free conditions of struggle for the aspiring working class. But

if Russia does not proceed along the path we predict, it may well be that when capitalism is established *the working class will be put down by a bloody counter-revolution, and held in subjection for many years to come.*"

This, then, is what Dan, the "Left" leader, the "sincere Socialist" sets out as his political demand: *the re-establishment of capitalism in the Soviet Union.* The proletarian dictatorship is not capable of this, hence it must be demolished. The workers are not to trust the dictatorship, but must with their own hands build up the "organization of defense" (defense against whom?), and see to it that capitalism makes a peaceful comeback. If they do not do this, then, of course, our "Left" friend Dan can no longer help them; then the bloody counter-revotion must carry out the task and drag in the capitalism that the Russian people need so urgently.

How is this "Left" program to be distinguished from the counter-revolutionary demands advanced by Garvy? It differs from the openly counter-revolutionary programs only in that its formulations are considerably more muddled and confused, that it drips with the unction of noble "distress" which our "Left" Dan pours lavishly over it. Dan assures us that he does not want the violent overthrow of the dictatorship, but that unfortunately the dictatorship is incapable of establishing capitalism (when he's right, he certainly *is* right), and that capitalism is absolutely essential for the salvation of the Russian people even if—O sore distress!—history can be fulfilled only by bloody counter-revolution in the event that the workers do not turn from the dictatorship in time, rally together, and build up organizations to abolish the dictatorship.

It must be stated that the honest cynicism of a Garvy is positively attractive in comparison with this plaintive speech, this mixture of a clear exposition of counter-revolutionary aims (or possibly the aim of establishing capitalism in the Soviet Union is *not* counter-revolutionary?) with a confused indication of the way to attain these counter-revolutionary

aims. Garvy wants the kulaks to bring about a violent overthrow of the dictatorship, Dan "limits" himself to advocating the re-establishment of capitalism.

AN APPEAL OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The Mensheviks mobilized the leadership of the Second International for their fight against the Soviet power. In the crisis year of 1930, when the counter-revolution was gathering its forces in every capitalist country, when the counter-revolutionary forces within the Soviet Union reared themselves against the proletarian dictatorship, the Executive of the Second International addressed an appeal to the Russian people. This appeal, which appeared on May 13, 1930, stated the following:

> "The Socialist workers of all lands are deeply concerned over the fate of the Russian Revolution. They hear of the famine in your cities. They know that your working conditions are often less favorable still than those of the workers in capitalist countries. They are aware that the violent methods used to collectivize the peasantry have failed. They are horrified to hear of the continuation and increasing harshness of the bloody terror. . . .
>
> "The Soviet government claims to rule in the name of the working class. It lies in your power, workers of the Soviet Union, to force them onto the path they must take. . . .
>
> **"It is the common desire of all sections of the Labor and Socialist International that are active within the borders of the Soviet Union to proceed together on the one hand to the transformation of the political organization of the country by the introduction of complete democracy, and, on the other hand to the preclusion of the establishment of a White counter-revolutionary regime which would represent the most serious threat to peace, democracy and the labor movement of Europe."**

That was an unequivocal appeal to the Mensheviks and all other "sections of the Labor and Socialist International active within the borders of the Soviet Union", *i.e.*, Georgian, Armenian, and others, to unite against Bolshevism and "force" the government "onto the necessary path". How is a government "forced onto the necessary path"? The Mensheviks who

were carrying on illegal agitation within the Soviet Union have answered this question quite logically: without influence among the masses, severed from the working class that is heroically building socialism, constituting small groups of discontented intellectuals and petty bourgeois, they set about using every opportunity that presented itself to "force" the government "onto the necessary path".

They organized sabotage against the building of socialism. They tried to magnify the difficulties, to hamper the supply of raw material and food to the cities, and to establish connections with all the counter-revolutionary groups. They hoped thereby to cause splits in the ranks of the working class, to destroy their confidence and diminish the strength of the Soviet Union to such an extent that it would not be able to offer adequate opposition to the expected pressure from without. The Menshevik organization abroad sent its Party members in the Soviet Union not only journals and letters of instruction, but also leading officials to add to those instructions by word of mouth. One member of the organization abroad, Braunstein, was arrested in the Soviet Union, and the Menshevik Union Bureau, in charge of the destructive activities, was smashed by the G.P.U.

THE DESTRUCTIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE MENSHEVIKS

The depositions of the arrested Mensheviks throw a clear light on the functions of Menshevism in the class struggle. Betrayed by their organization abroad, disowned by Dan, Garvy and Abramovich, and acknowledging the error of their deeds, the accused told at the public trial, which was attended by many foreign journalists, how they had come to sink deeper and deeper into the counter-revolutionary camp. Until they suddenly realized their crass betrayal of the working class, some of them were absolutely convinced that they were serving the proletarian cause in their own way. But when there is a dictatorship of the proletariat, anyone who sets

up illegal organizations, even if the original intention is not the violent overthrow of the dictatorship, thereby places himself on the side of the counter-revolutionaries and is compelled step by step to use every means of sabotage, betrayal and disruption, to ally himself with all the forces of the counter-revolution. The Mensheviks in the Soviet Union followed this path to the end.

Let them tell their story themselves.

The founding of the Menshevik Union Bureau is described by the leading member of the Bureau, Scher, in the following deposition of November 30, 1930. In 1926 the Mensheviks received the following information from a liaison agent:

> "The Central Committee of the Mensheviks is profoundly dissatisfied with the rate at which Party work is progressing and considers it essential to go over to tactics of direct disorganization in the various branches of Soviet economy, wherever we occupy cells in the leading circles of the various organizations. This was a great surprise to me, as up to this time the work of disorganization had no place in our Party program. . . . I decided to verify the correctness of this communication in any case, and took advantage of Petunin's journey abroad for this purpose."

Petunin went to Berlin in 1927. At the trial he gave the following account:

> "Dan's first commission to me was to inform the Moscow Mensheviks that the Trotskyist movement was to be supported by us, as it weakened the Communist Party and Soviet power and thereby made the task of the Social-Democrats easier. Dan read my communication about the unfavorable prospects of winning support among the workers; and he thereupon stated that the Soviet did not allow of the proper conditions for political agitation, but that these conditions must be created anew by means of sabotage and the stirring up of mass discontent as a result of this sabotage. The existing composition of the Menshevik Party was particularly appropriate for such work, because the organization was not bound up with the working class, but on the other hand was closely connected with the most important branches of the national economy. Dan expressed the opinion that the activity of the organization must have as its final result

the curtailment of industrial output, the limitation of agriculture, and the creation of crises in the system of distribution and in the financial system."

Another member of the Union Bureau, Gromann, gave the following account in his deposition of December 25, 1930:

"It was apparent from Braunstein's words [Braunstein was a member of the Menshevik organization abroad] that Garvy was the direct inspirer of Kautsky's most recent and openly aggressive statements against the Soviet Union, which show that Kautsky gave direct support to intervention [military interference on the part of the capitalist powers]. As Braunstein informed me, this attitude of Kautsky's has recently been winning a considerable following among the leading members of the Second International, and in the leading party in it, the German Social-Democratic Party, which is coming up against increasingly grave difficulties in its fight against the German Communist Party and the Communist International."

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY UNION

Early in 1929 a union was effected between the Mensheviks and the counter-revolutionary kulak group headed by Kondratyev and Chayanov, its purpose being, according to the deposition of the accused Scher "to afford this party every possible assistance in organizing peasant revolts". Besides this a fighting alliance was set up between the Mensheviks and the counter-revolutionary "Industrial Party", led by Ramzin, a bold and ambitious engineer who aimed at a military dictatorship.

The deposition of the accused Salkind, concerning the Second Plenum of the Union Bureau which took place in the autumn of 1929, shows the social strata to which the Mensheviks looked for support. Salkind stated:

"The main theses of Scher's report and of the discussion on it can be summed up as follows. The first question with which the report dealt was the question of the social basis on which the R.S.D.L.P. (Mensheviks) could rely at that time. In the discussion on this question, two points of view were expressed.

The one shared by the majority was that at that time it was entirely out of place to count on even a limited workers' composition in the R.S.D.L.P. The masses of workers were so completely under the authority and influence of the C.P.S.U. (Bolsheviks) that there were no grounds even to hope for anything in this sphere. The second opinion on this question can be summed up thus: There was at the time a section of the working masses which was alien to these masses in its class nature, but which formally adopted the position of the workers. This stratum was composed of the village bourgeoisie, the city tradesmen, and in certain cases also office employees who were compelled to take up factory work in their search for a livelihood. The R.S.D.L.P. could count on these elements. In the end, the Plenum came to the conclusion that the main social basis on which the R.S.D.L.P. could rely at the moment was the declassed petty bourgeoisie, and primarily that part of the office employees of the state and cooperative apparatus whose roots were embedded in the past and who at that moment were being hard pressed by the new Soviet 'purging'. The widespread purge of the Soviet apparatus had placed these elements into so awkward a position that they were extremely favorable material for drawing into the ranks of the R.S.D.L.P. Equally favorable material was the petty bourgeoisie engaged in trade in the cities."

We have selected some of the extensive material of the records of the trial in order to show the nature of the aim and methods of Menshevik policy in the Soviet Union. The organization of the Mensheviks abroad, which was exposed before the workers of all countries in the 1931 trial of the Union Bureau, denied all connection with the accused. It declared in one breath that the depositions had been extorted by force, the accused being martyrs to the terror, and that the accused were undesirable elements with which the Mensheviks had nothing to do. The Second International published a pamphlet in which it declared that most of the accused had not been Mensheviks for years, but were agents provocateurs. An article published under Friedrich Adler's name stated the following:

"Psychologically the most interesting among the accused are those who, like Gromann in the first place, are certainly not

agents-provocateurs and have yet made depositions of whose untruth they must in their own minds be aware. . . . The one man among the accused who was actually a member of the R.S.D.L.P., Ikov, was not charged with sabotage in the accusation, but of having helped to promote the alliance with the Union Bureau by means of his connections both in person and by letter with representatives abroad. It is true that he did illegal work in Russia for their foreign section."

The weightiest argument of the Mensheviks in the Second International was that it was impossible to base the accusations against them solely on the depositions of accused men. But considered in relation to the general activities of the Mensheviks, who used armed force against the proletarian revolution in the civil war, were they likely to shrink at sabotage of Soviet economy? The Mensheviks, who like Garvy greeted the Allied troops as liberators, are not the ones to hesitate at further union with the enemies of the Soviet Union. Are we to believe that the Mensheviks, who like Dan demanded the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and like Garvy advocated an agreement with the kulaks, refused to admit the consequences of their demands? Out of touch with the masses, isolated from the working class, finding response only from the counter-revolutionary derelicts left by the destruction of capitalism, the Union bureau was driven to these last desperate conclusions. And suddenly the Mensheviks working abroad began to pose as defenders of the Soviet Union, and as opponents of any attempt to undermine the proletarian dictatorship, cause discontent among the masses, or hinder the building of socialism.

STRANGE "DEFENDERS" OF THE SOVIET UNION

The charges against the Mensheviks do not rest solely on the depositions of the accused. The above-mentioned pamphlet of the Second International on the trial states the following:

"The Labor and Socialist International is today as never before ready to defend the Soviet Union with all its power.

But it is also fully aware of the fact that it must be *on its guard against the war policy of the Soviet Union.* The Marseilles and Brussels Congresses were in perfect accord with the Congress of Hamburg as regards the defense of Soviet Russia. But the Marseilles and Brussels Congresses were at the same time constrained to utter a warning against the *war danger threatened by Soviet Russia.*"

Strange defenders of the Soviet Union, who impute bellicose intentions to the workers' and peasants' state, which has been pursuing a consistent and undeviating peace policy, a policy which was and is one of the strongest guarantees of world peace; strange defenders, who warn the capitalist states against *"the war danger threatened by Soviet Russia"*, who invented the shameful expression "Red imperialism"—and all this at a time when the imperialist states were drawing up very real and very serious plans to form a "holy alliance" against the Soviet Union, when nothing pleased them more than to be able to call the Second International as witness, when they raised the cry of a "war danger threatened by Soviet Russia", in order to cover up their own war preparations.

THE VICTORY OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

They said they were opposed to every attempt to undermine the proletarian dictatorship. But what do we see? In 1931 when Otto Bauer confirmed the success of the Five-Year Plan in his book *Rationalization—False Rationalization* and stated that he approved of the Bolshevik path in Russia, even though he did so with a number of reservations, rejecting it for Europe, the Mensheviks attacked this book furiously. Dan declared in a polemic:

"Jugov has shown that, looked at even from a purely economic viewpoint, Bauer's hopes are deceiving; for the actual development of affairs is creating the exact opposite of the economic hypotheses upon which Bauer builds his expectations. If possible, however, his social and political hypotheses are in an even worse plight."

Karl Kautsky, the old theoretician of the Second International, deadly enemy of the Soviet Union, cites these statements of Dan's, in the *Gesellschaft* of November, 1931, and adds:

> "At present what we see in Russia, therefore, is *not socialism but its opposite.* Socialism can come only when, to quote Marx, the expropriators and usurpers now in power are expropriated. . . . Soviet Russia has indeed torn the means of production away from the capitalists, but this was effected in such a way and under such conditions that the place of the capitalists was taken by still more powerful and still harsher rulers, who put even greater obstacles in the way of the proletariat towards socialism than can be found in countries where developed capitalism and deep-rooted democracy exist."

At the Vienna Congress of the Second International, in 1931, the Menshevik line prevailed. The Congress reports on the various parties of the Second International state:

> "Russian Social-Democracy opposes the policy of the general line [the Five-Year Plan] because it sees in it not the way to economic progress, democracy and socialism, but, on the contrary, *the way to economic catastrophe, subjugation of the country to the dictates of world capital, and the triumph of counter-revolution.*"

This was the prospect that the Mensheviks and the Second International held out to the Social-Democrats carrying on illegal activity in the Soviet Union—the way of Bolshevism signifies economic catastrophe and the triumph of counter-revolution! Is it to be wondered at that such a prospect led to the employment of every method of struggle, that the Menshevik agents in the Soviet Union working with this prospect in view were in league with death and the devil to overthrow a system which their party leaders asserted would lead to catastrophe and to the triumph of counter-revolution? For the Mensheviks abroad to have turned their backs on those who took their rabid anti-Bolshevik propaganda seriously, who saw the Bolsheviks not as the people of the victorious revolu-

tion but as the destroyers of the country, and therefore attacked them in every way, was as illogical as it was contemptible.

But the Five-Year Plan has not collapsed, as the Mensheviks predicted; the path of Stalin has led not to counter-revolution but to the victory of socialism. The Mensheviks even at the Vienna Congress sought to justify their existence before the international labor movement in the following words:

> "The Russian Social-Democrats, in the event of the failure of Stalin's economic policy, a failure which they consider inevitable, will have the task of defending the Russian Revolution and the economic independence of the country against all attacks by world imperialism and counter-revolution, in order to prevent a victory of reaction first in Russia and then internationally."

ABRAMOVICH TELLS TALES OUT OF SCHOOL

To play themselves up as the future saviors of the Russian working class and the revolution they had seriously to set about convincing the European workers that Stalin's policy was leading to catastrophe and counter-revolution—and *then* it would be their turn to defend the revolution. As soon as the victory of Stalin's policy became obvious it was impossible for the Mensheviks to play this role any longer, and they had to patch up some other reason to justify their existence, think of some other way to persuade the Social-Democratic workers that their fight against the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union was not counter-revolutionary but really the essence of revolution and socialism. It was a difficult task, and one of their leaders, Abramovich, so far forgot himself as to express this with some anger. In the *Gesellschaft* of July, 1931, he wrote:

> "The harsh and inflexible fact that apparently forces us to a totally new reorientation towards the Russian question is *the visible success of the Five-Year Plan* and the recently won confidence in the stability of the present Soviet government. Whereas it was possible only a year ago to believe that Stalin's general line would collapse and bury the entire Soviet regime

under its ruins, we now know that *the dictatorship is unshaken* and that in all probability the Five-Year Plan will succeed."

After duly bewailing the irresistible socialist construction in the Soviet Union, a "harsh" fact to the Mensheviks but a fact that kindled unparalleled enthusiasm in the world proletariat, Abramovich continues:

"If in the event of its success the general line is the path of socialism in Russia and the 'colossal strengthening' of socialism throughout the world, then it implies at the same time—whether we will or no—justification of the dictatorship that created and carried it out. In that case, all struggle against the terror is counter-revolutionary, in that case every demand for the abolition of the dictatorship and a return to democracy is anti-socialist. In that case, the International should consider itself fortunate that the Soviet government did not concede to its past demands at that time. For where would the general line be now, if upon pressure by the Hamburg, Marseilles and Brussels Congresses the Politbureau of the Soviet Union had introduced democracy [meaning, of course, capitalist democracy —E. F.] into the Soviet system? But a changed attitude towards the general line entails not only a complete reorientation as regards Russia, but also leads to grave consequences for Socialist policy in Europe. What has been historically justified in so signal a manner in Russia and what has led to the victory of socialism there must with appropriate modification be applicable elsewhere."

To frighten the Second International with the gravity of these conclusions Abramovich told tales out of school and has thereby given us an admirable characterization of the Menshevik policy. He says: if the Five-Year Plan succeeds, if the Bolsheviks build socialism, then the fight we have been and still are waging against them is counter-revolutionary. *The Five-Year Plan has succeeded, the Bolsheviks have built socialism—your fight, gentlemen, was and is counter-revolutionary!*

There is ample justification, however, for the Menshevik Abramovich's question as to what would have become of the general line and of the victory of socialist construction if the Bolsheviks had followed the admonitions of the Second Inter-

national. What would have become of the Soviet Union, today the hope of the people and the bulwark of peace, if the proletarian dictatorship had permitted the Mensheviks to carry out their policy? And there is ample justification for the Menshevik Abramovich's cry: "What has been historically justified in so signal a manner in Russia, and what has led to the victory of socialism there, must with appropriate modifications be applicable elsewhere!"

But in saying this Abramovich is not expressing his *own* opinion. He is *polemizing* against those West-European Social-Democrats (like Bauer and others) who were inclined (not without reservations) to give credit to Bolshevism and the proletarian dictatorship for their undisputed successes in the Soviet Union, but who insisted on "other paths" for Europe. In contrast to them, Abramovich says: Admit (at our, the Russian Mensheviks' expense) that the Bolshevik path in Russia can lead to the victory of socialism, and you must logically admit the possibility of the same (even with appropriate modifications) for other countries, including your West-European countries. But that is just what you do not want to do, what you cannot afford to do without going back on your own most essential assumptions. Therefore, do not go back on us, the Russian Mensheviks, do not leave us in the lurch, do not "rehabilitate" Bolshevism in Russia despite its "apparent successes", do not extend your hand to them, or else—become Bolsheviks yourselves.

It cannot be denied that the most *consistent* in this dispute was Abramovich who, even under the present conditions, has not abandoned his intention of fighting the Soviet regime and of employing every possible means thereto.

THE FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT

Naturally, the means must alter in accordance with the altered situation. The final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, the love of the toilers for their socialist father-

land and for the leadership of the Communist Party, the growing power of the great workers' and peasants' state compel them to adopt new tactics.

If Dan were to cry to the workers today: "The establishment of capitalism in Russia is inevitable. The village is in need of capitalist development. If Russia does not proceed along the path we predict, it may well be that when capitalism is established the working class will be put down by a bloody counter-revolution and held in subjection for many years to come"—his words would be drowned in laughter.

If Garvy were to assert today that Stalin's policy gave rise to "a spontaneous *smychka* between the exploited and oppressed workers and the dispossessed peasants which can mean the doom of the Party dictatorship"—in face of the alliance between the workers and peasants, between town and country, which resulted from the policy of Stalin, from the policy of the Bolsheviks, he would be considered incurably weak-minded. Always, events turned out to be just the opposite to what the Mensheviks predicted. Always, the proletarian dictatorship succeeded in striking the weapons from their hands. They are compelled to adopt new tactics, new methods.

The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, the victory of fascism in a number of Central European states, the unparalleled accentuation of contradictions, the constant threat of the outbreak of war due to the fascist adventurers—all this has given the working class a powerful new impetus, all this has given rise to the mighty movement of the united front, of the people's front against fascism.

Ever-increasing masses of the people are recognizing that the Soviet Union is the strongest fortress of freedom and the leading force in the fight against world fascism. If the Mensheviks possessed even the least remnant of a feeling of kinship with the Russian proletariat, the least remnant of devotion to the interests of the world proletariat, they would today abandon their fight against Bolshevism, unreservedly declare themselves

on the side of Bolshevism and make it their sole aim to support the united front of Communists and Social-Democrats. But nothing of the sort: they want to use the mighty stream of the united front movement only as a means to help them get out of the shallows where they have run aground, so that they can embark afresh on their intrigues against Bolshevism. The "Left" leader Dan, it is true, expressed himself in favor of the united front and characterized it as the "most vital problem before the working class", but at the same time he demanded the removal of certain "trifles" which in his opinion hampered the united front. To be sure, he no longer says that capitalism must be re-established in the Soviet Union if the united front is to be realized, but he does consider necessary *the liquidation of the Communist International and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union*, if the united front is to be possible.

In *Kampf* of December, 1935, he had an article which stated the following:

> ". . . Certainly the reports and resolutions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern contain much that gives rise to severe criticism. If, however, we consider the essence of the practical political resolutions of the Congress and primarily the motivation for them as stated in the innumerable speeches, we cannot get away from the fact that in principle they signify nothing but a complete repudiation of Communist ideology as a part of the labor movement that is completely isolated from all the rest of the proletarian class movement and inimical to every other section of it. In principle the Parties of the Comintern stand on the same political, tactical, and organizational platform as that on which the Parties of the Socialist International also stand and fight."

It is somewhat staggering, coming as it does from the Mensheviks busy with their cliques on the outer fringe of the labor movement, to hear Communism described as a "part of the labor movement that is completely isolated from all the rest of the proletarian class movement", Communism, which

has been victorious on a sixth of the globe and which includes mass parties like the Chinese, the French, the Czech, and the most important illegal parties in most of the fascist countries.

But the method becomes understandable enough when one brings to mind the situation in which the Mensheviks find themselves at present. For years they have been predicting the collapse of the proletarian dictatorship, of the Stalinist policy, as they predicted the collapse of the Leninist policy; and they tried to make the Social-Democratic workers think that they were the people who would *then* leap into the breach to save the Russian Revolution.

The victory of the Stalinist policy, a victory of world-wide historic significance, and the tremendous construction of socialism in the Soviet Union make it impossible for them to play this role any longer; Abramovich was clear enough on that point. What then did they do in an attempt to preserve some semblance of justification for their existence in the eyes of the Social-Democratic workers? The Mensheviks have entered on a new role; on the one hand they pass as the "Lefts" within the Second International, on the other hand they assert that what is being built in the Soviet Union is far from socialism, is in fact reaction, exploitation, bourgeoisification, while the economic advance, rising production and increasing welfare are only evidences of a new ruling class. The "class of the jubilant and triumphant", we are given to understand, has seized power, and Communism has betrayed its original aims. In the years of economic difficulties, when the Soviet Union was boldly forging its way to classless society, their cry was that only capitalism could save Russia; now, with the rapid increase in prosperity, they cry that this is a betrayal of Communist ideas, that it is the domination of a new class. In the old days they condemned the Communists for their undeviating march towards their aims, today they condemn the Communists for their alleged betrayal of those aims.

The Mensheviks have been fighting the Communist Inter-

national with these same methods ever since the Seventh World Congress. At this Congress the Communist International drew closer to the masses of workers and middle strata of society which are becoming more revolutionary, and the weight it carries with the masses has grown extraordinarily—Communism is beginning to "set the tone" in the working class. The Mensheviks are trying to counteract the influence of Communism, which—to quote Abramovich—if it led to the victory of socialism in Russia "must with appropriate modifications be applicable elsewhere". They say that the Seventh World Congress has betrayed Communism, and that the Communists have really transformed themselves into Social-Democrats, having the same political, tactical and organizational platform as the Second International.

The same platform as the Second International? This platform is beginning to collapse under the feet of the Social-Democratic Parties. On it nothing can thrive but a confusion of opinions, and as war grows more imminent the parties of the Second International become less and less capable of uniting with each other to organize the working class fight against fascism, to show the people a way out of their difficulties. Political support of the Germany of Hitler fascism on the part of the British Labor Party and their satellites on the one side, pessimism and indecision on the other; opposition to the united front on the one side, recognition of the united front on the other; savage rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the one side, approval with reservations of the proletarian dictatorship on the other; honest revolutionary Socialists like Caballero and Zyromski on the one side, undisguised reactionaries like Soukup and Albarda on the other—all this stands on the flimsy platform of the Second International, a platform so split and shattered that on it any unity of action among the Social-Democratic Parties is out of the question. The Mensheviks also find a refuge on this platform, but it is no platform for the united, militant Party of world

Communism that is showing the people the road to victory. It bases itself on the platform of revolutionary class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the firm platform of Marxism-Leninism. Great masses of the people in all countries are beginning to realize that this platform is more trustworthy than the shaky platform of the Second International.

Now that these masses are drawing nearer to the platform of the united front and Communism ever since the Seventh World Congress, the Mensheviks are trying their utmost to hold them back, and with this end in view boldly assert that it is not the Social-Democratic workers who have been revolutionized but Communism that has reformed. These bold allegations lead Dan to the following conclusions:

> "If the leaders of the Comintern found it desirable and expedient to consider the new situation thoroughly and to announce their conclusions out loud, they would be obliged to concede that from now on there are no imperative reasons for maintaining the schism, no insuperable barriers to restoring unity. *The ideological liquidation of the Comintern should really be followed by immediate liquidation of its independent organizational existence.*"

The liquidation of the Comintern would indeed relieve the Social-Democrats of the united front, and at the same time considerably facilitate the task of fascism. Later, when Dan was publicly attacked for his statement, he retreated and explained that "liquidation" was not at all what he meant, but a "fusion" of Bolshevism with the "democratic principles" of the Second International on the "platform" of these principles. When he says "liquidation", then, he means "fusion"—and when he says "fusion" he obviously means "liquidation", for amalgamation on the basis of the peculiar "democratic principles" which, it is true, allow the majority to vote for the united front, but leave the real decision to a minority, led by the British Labor Party; which, indeed, permits all to have their say, but allows no one to act—such amalgamation is nothing but liquidation.

We are for democracy in the International, but for a militant democracy; for a democracy which is able to act; for a democracy in which every question is discussed by all, in which decisions are binding for all, for a democracy which is capable of uniting all its forces for joint action; whose existence is not a series of confusions, but the expression of a clear aim and a determined will to fight. Liquidation of the Communist International, establishment of a "united front within the Second International, within Social-Democracy"—that is the demand of the most reactionary leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties. It is preposterous for Dan to act as if this were unknown to him, as if when he said "liquidation" nothing was further from his mind than the thought that it could be understood really to mean "liquidation".

What he is doing is simply embellishing the wishes of the most reactionary leaders of the Second International with "Left" phrases. The Mensheviks know well enough why they still remain on the Executive of the Second International as before, although they have nothing behind them but a doubtful past, represent no party, nor even the slightest fragment of a movement, but only their own anti-Soviet opinions.

The Executive has limited the number of representatives from the illegal parties that are carrying on the struggle in fascist countries—but the little Menshevik sect is allowed to act as though it were a party. Why? Because the reactionary leaders of the Second International need the Mensheviks, in order to pit them against the Soviet Union and the united front; if the Mensheviks would change their attitude to the Soviet Union they would lose all claim to existence in the eyes of their patrons. It is for this reason that the Mensheviks demand what their patrons are striving for: liquidation of the Communist International. Dan is, of course, not so stupid as to take his own demands seriously; he sees clearly enough the growing power and importance of the Communist International he realizes the increasing desire for the united front on the

part of the masses of Social-Democratic workers, and that is why he wants to throttle the attempts at unity—with the hypocritical slogan: "Establish unity on the platform of the Second International!"

Two armies are to unite in order jointly to destroy a common enemy. What would be said of an officer who made the following proposal: "We shall best achieve unity if we disband the more effective army which is at close quarters to the enemy and take into our ranks the soldiers who are pouring back in retreat!"? An officer like this would be turned out with scant ceremony; but Dan keeps his place in the train of the Second International.

THE DEMANDS OF THE SABOTEURS

The liquidation of the Third International is not sufficient for the Mensheviks; they also demand the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. Dan says:

> "It will very soon be obvious that no serious or honest 'united front' of the two Internationals can possibly exist for any length of time so long as it does not include the labor movement of the Soviet Union, which represents nine-tenths of the forces of the Comintern and dictates 99 per cent of its policy. The united front 'in capitalist countries only' will very soon disclose its real character as, at best, a self-delusion. The 'united' international labor movement would then become either the abject instrument of Stalin's policy or a field for bitter inner dissensions, which would destroy once more the newly won unity."

This is open sabotage of the united front! The business before us is to defeat a strong and dangerous enemy—fascism. All the forces of the working class must be welded together to overcome this strong and dangerous enemy. All the armies of the proletarian class struggle must operate as one, the combined leadership of each working out a joint plan of attack, irrespective of their disagreements; and in every country the troops must be welded together in comradely union for joint

action. That is the united front proposed by us. And what happens is the following:

The strongest of the proletarian armies, the proletariat of the Soviet Union, threw out several officers some time ago, because they were destroying the fighting morale of the troops, conspiring with the enemy and in some cases openly giving him support. These banished officers were taken into the army with which we are today establishing a united front—and turn up suddenly with demands. They say: "A united front against the class enemy, against fascism? That is too little, we can't agree to that. We must form a united front against the General Staff of the army with which we are uniting. We must be reinstated as officers of this army, we must be given the opportunity to incite the soldiers against the commanders, we must be allowed to resume with impunity the activities for which we were thrown out. Without this united front against the General Staff of the army allied to us we can allow of no united front against the enemy, against fascism. Our reinstatement as officers in the allied army, our right to instigate conspiracies against the General Staff of this army and to stir up discontent, is more important than the joint struggle against the class enemy, against fascism." That is the position of the Mensheviks with regard to the united front. It is the position of wreckers and saboteurs.

In a subsequent speech, the "Left" Dan effected a strategical retreat in this matter also. True, he talked of a united front between Communists and Social-Democrats in the capitalist countries. He said that this united front could not last long, and would prove to be a "self-delusion", unless it included the Soviet Union. A united front in the Soviet Union—of whom with whom? A united front of the Bolsheviks and the Russian Social-Democrats? A "misunderstanding", Dan assures us. It true he said "united front", but he did not mean "united front"; just as he said "liquidation", but did not mean "liquidation". What, then, did this constantly misunderstood person

mean? In an article appearing in the *Populaire* for March 29, 1936, he assures us that what he meant was merely the "democratization of the Communist Party and the trade unions in the Soviet Union". Curiously enough, it was at the identical moment when Otto Bauer pointed out the desirability of allowing the Mensheviks in the Soviet Union; and curiously enough, in the *Socialist Messenger* of January 25, 1936, Abramovich demanded the establishment of a "regime of freedom for all" in the Soviet Union, that is, of freedom for avowed counter-revolutionaries, too. And Garvy wrote in the *Socialist Messenger:* "Only substantial changes in the political regime of the Soviet Union . . . can create *the necessary basis for the united front in the West.*" Is Dan going to tell us that all this means simply "the democratization of the Communist Party and the trade unions", with no question of allowing a Menshevik Party? If Dan honestly meant this, if he were not in favor of allowing a second party, a Menshevik Party, in the Soviet Union—then he would be obliged to liquidate the Menshevik Party abroad too, which would thereby have lost the last vestige of a claim to existence. But the plan is all too transparent: to use the united front as a cover for attempts to undermine the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, and to make the joint fight of the workers against fascism depend on whether the enemies of Bolshevism are to be allowed to organize a fight in the Soviet Union against the "regime" and against Stalin.

SHOULD THE SOVIET UNION IMPORT INFECTIOUS MATTER?

Let us for once assume that the Soviet Union would grant permission to the Mensheviks, the Trotskyists and all other groups of Soviet enemies legally to *organize* their own parties. What would be the result? Every worker who has any sort of political understanding can answer this question. Parties are *instruments of the class struggle, representatives of definite class interests. In the Soviet Union there are no class antago-*

nisms, although there are still remnants of capitalism, still elements who for one reason or another vacillate, are uncertain and discontented and carry on a struggle against the proletarian power, against the socialist state.

The workers and peasants, who are building socialism with the utmost enthusiasm, contributing their share to the strength and greatness of their socialist fatherland, and who are unreservedly devoted to the leadership of the Communist Party, would be opposed and hostile to any and every new party. But the dregs of the old capitalist world would immediately be absorbed into the new parties; dispossessed kulaks, idlers, discontented and personally embittered people would form the cadres of the new parties. All the agents of the class enemy, all the individuals in the pay of the counter-revolution abroad would scent that something was afoot and immediately form connections with the new parties. The new parties would of necessity be organs of counter-revolution from the very beginning.

Take the Stakhanov movement. Stalin's speech on cadres, his slogan, "Cadres decide everything", have called forth a broad movement among the Russian workers. The creative power of the masses has developed tempestuously, "the proletariat has begun to seethe in our veins", to use the incomparable words of an old Stakhanovite working woman. In all the most varied districts and industries of the Soviet Union, workers have begun on their own initiative to think out improvements in labor processes, and thereby to increase labor productivity to an unprecedented degree. The miner Stakhanov, the shoe worker Smetanin, the textile worker Vinogradova and many others, independently of each other, have all become masters of the new technique, have made the machine the servant of man, have surpassed the old standards of output established by experts. Occasionally they could achieve their ends only after a bitter struggle against the self-stisfaction of some specialists and conservative bureaucrats; but with the

help of the Party they carried out their ideas. The result was a powerful mass movement to increase productivity.

"Rationalization" under capitalism means unemployment, increased exploitation, a drop in wages and a rise in profits—the spontaneous movement for higher productivity, brought about by the masses under socialism, means a rapid development of industry, an increase in the workers' income, a drop in prices and increasing prosperity for the entire Soviet people. The Stakhanovites, the heroes of labor and of socialist construction—these are the "jubilant and triumphant" whose "rule" the Mensheviks maliciously try to liken to the rule of capitalism. They try to persuade the workers in the West that the Stakhanov movement is no different from capitalist rationalization, and the fascist journals immediately adopted this assertion as their own. The fascists see with uneasiness that socialism is superior to capitalism, that the Marxist prophecy to the effect that socialism means a higher productivity of labor is being translated into a fact; and they owe a debt of thanks to the Mensheviks for their "arguments" against the creative power of socialism. The Mensheviks, who are now busily engaged in attacking the Stakhanov movement abroad, want to continue this attack in the Soviet Union and stir up all the backward elements against the heroes of labor.

And there is still another serious consideration. The Soviet Union is surrounded by enemies. It must build up all its forces and unite all its people in a powerful and concentrated front. It must imbue the masses with a powerful and concentrated will to make known to a world of enemies the successful superiority of socialism. It must fill the masses with the spirit of Bolshevism, that great and proud spirit which is daunted by nothing in its march to victory—the spirit embodied in Lenin and Stalin.

And now consider the action of the Mensheviks in the Revolution and the Civil War: how they spread uncertainty, doubt and defeatism, how at every critical stage they vacillated

and demanded capitulation, how they finally joined with the enemies of the Revolution, how their petty-bourgeois pusillanimity finally became open class betrayal. Do you think they would act differently today? Do you think they would keep up with the Herculean tasks of the Soviet Union? Nothing of the sort! The people who constantly predicted the collapse of socialism, who demanded the re-establishment of capitalism as a means of "salvation", who doubted the creative ability of the working class and finally looked for salvation to the bayonets of the counter-revolution—these people would continue with the melancholy task which the proletarian dictatorship prevents them from completing. They would bring nothing but destruction to the Soviet Union, they would fulfil one function and one only: that of a constantly festering wound in the body of the Russian proletariat. It would be a crime against the entire working class to import this infectious matter into the Soviet Union.

Otto Bauer (in *Kampf*, April, 1936), states that if the Mensheviks were allowed in the Soviet Union they would speed up development of proletarian democracy. What gives him the audacity and the right to make this assumption? From the very first the Mensheviks have been enemies of the proletarian revolution, trying to obstruct and hinder it. The task they undertook was to counteract each new step in the proletarian revolution. In the October Revolution; in the Civil War; in the period of War Communism and of N.E.P.; in the struggles of the opposition, when it despaired of the building of socialism, against the Party leadership; in the period of the Five-Year Plan and of collectivization—they were always in league with the enemies of the proletarian revolution, they always sided with those who created difficulties for the building of socialism and the defeat of the class enemy. They have always predicted with infallible confidence what never came to pass, demanded what was prejudicial to the development of socialism, and supported what stood in the way of its growth.

Has all this changed? Perhaps they are not really fighting against the Stakhanov movement today, against the heroes of labor, whose eagerness and enthusiasm are bringing ever increasing prosperity and power to the Soviet Union, against Stalin and his Party, which is leading the Soviet people from victory to victory with steady strength?

When a house is being built, workers of every kind are needed, from the master-builder to the man who carries the bricks—but who would think it necessary to employ people whose only function was to grumble, to upset things, to get in the way of the workers, and tell them that everything ought to be done differently, that it was wrong to finish laying the bricks till the rooms were furnished, etc.? These people are not wanted for construction work, no one will think them necessary, everyone will think them harmful. The Soviet Union is building socialism; shall it summon to its assistance people whose idea of their job is to upset things instead of to work, and to create obstacles instead of helping to carry out the plan of construction? These people have no place in the building of socialism. The Mensheviks have no place in the proletarian democracy. which is rapidly raising all its forces to their highest pitch.

THE ESSENCE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The leaders of the Second International want to persuade the Social-Democratic workers that the realization of democracy as they understand it, namely, bourgeois democracy, in the Soviet Union is essential, and that the essence of democracy implies the legalization of the Menshevik, Trotskyist and all other parties whose aim it is to destroy Bolshevism. The Soviet Union does not need to learn from Western "democrats" what real proletarian democracy means; the Soviet system is a hundred times more democratic than all the systems of bourgeois parliamentarianism. We will call upon witnesses regarded by every Social-Democrat as above suspicion, two old

teachers of reformism, members of the English—and therefore the oldest—bourgeois democracy, opponents of Communism on principle—the two Webbs, who recently published a book entitled *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?* They say in their book that the government of the Soviet Union is "the actual opposite of a dictatorship", and add:

> "Our own conclusion is that if by autocracy or dictatorship is meant government without prior discussion and debate, either by public opinion or in private session, the government of the U.S.S.R. is, in that sense, actually less of an autocracy or a dictatorship than many a parliamentary cabinet."

They speak of a

> ". . . multiform democracy in which soviets and trade unions, cooperative societies and voluntary associations provide for the personal participation in public affairs of an unprecedented proportion of the entire adult population."

And their judgment is summed up thus:

> "In short, the U.S.S.R. is a government instrumented by all the adult inhabitants, organized in a varied array of collectives, having their several distinct functions and among them carrying on, with strangely new 'political economy', nearly the whole wealth production of the country."

The theoreticians of English reformism have realized more clearly than many "Left" Social-Democrats that democracy is not the same thing as parties and parliamentary party representation. Democracy in the Soviet Union is something much greater and much broader. It is the rule of the working class, of the toilers. It is "participation in public affairs of an unprecedented proportion of the entire adult population". It is the freedom of the workers in the factories, of the peasants in the collective farms. It gives an unlimited opportunity for all people who work to rise to the highest positions in the state. It is complete political, cultural and social equality for all people who work, in contrast to the purely formal "equality

before the law" of bourgeois democracy. It is the constant and direct control of the toilers over every public body, the constant and effective criticism of the masses about all economic and social measures.

To adduce only a few examples: Every deputy to the Soviet is charged with definite commissions by his electors, which are entered in a book open to public inspection; the electors can at any time satisfy themselves as to whether the deputy is discharging their commissions, and can withdraw him and substitute another deputy. Or again: Every Communist must from time to time undergo a Party cleansing, put himself thereby at the disposal of not only the Party members but also of the factory meeting for discussion and answer to questions, give truthful replies to every question, and answer to the workers for all he has done or not done. These are only two examples, given to indicate the scope and complexity of democratic control in the Soviet Union.

Naturally, during the period of Civil War and social upheaval Soviet democracy was subject to many limitations. Elections to the central Soviets were not direct. There was no secret ballot. The peasants had limited electoral privileges as compared with the workers. The victory of socialism, and the radical change in the peasants from individual producers to collective farmers, made these limitations superfluous today and led to the full development of Soviet democracy.

The draft of a new constitution has appeared. At a time when bourgeois democracy in many capitalist countries is being ruthlessly curtailed, in the end to become a mere heap of withered leaves for fascism to sweep away, this constitution is giving the Soviet people universal, equal and direct suffrage and a secret ballot. It is the most democratic constitution in the world. It will join the "many-sided democracy", that won the admiring testimony of the Webbs, with a great and universal freedom: it will put the finishing touch to the political structure of the Soviets and trade unions, the cooperatives and

voluntary associations. The election campaign will have an incomparably greater scope and will be participated in more actively by the masses than is the case in any of the bourgeois-democratic countries—election campaigns in which all the organizations, all the factories, collective farms, etc., put up their own candidates, in which the whole people discusses the problems of socialist construction, in which all the institutions and public bodies have to give an account of themselves to the masses, and the deputies are subject to strict control by them. One thing certainly does not exist in the democratic system of classless society. *Since there are no antagonistic classes, with their conflicting interests, since the entire people is unanimously interested in the further progress of socialist construction, increased production, prosperity and culture, there are no different political parties.*

Many democrats in capitalist countries *cannot* and many *will not* grasp this fact. Deeply enmeshed in capitalist class society, incapable of imagining another social content and other political forms, applying the laws of the class state mechanically to the Soviet state, where antagonistic classes no longer exist, they consider political parties an essential of democracy. The Mensheviks seek to make use of these prejudices; they say, "What sort of democracy is this, that does not allow us to organize an opposition!" The workers certainly will not consider the Mensheviks an essential part of democracy; they will be of the opinion that freedom for the toilers is a different thing from freedom for saboteurs, freedom to carry on their sabotage with impunity; a different thing from freedom for renegades, some of whom practised "criticism" by means of armed force against the proletarian revolution, some opposing it in other ways.

The workers will understand of themselves that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not allow its enemies to hinder, upset and sabotage the building of socialism; they will understand this doubly well in a situation in which the world front

of the counter-revolution is more and more openly preparing war against the Soviet Union, in which the firmness, driving force and united energy of the Soviet Union constitute the decisive factor in the fate of the international working class. In this situation, to make the proletarian united front dependent on the establishment of a Menshevik-Trotskyist counter-revolutionary "united front" in the Soviet Union would be a monstrous outrage to the international working class.

For years the Mensheviks have been fighting against the proletarian revolution. We have briefly described various stages of this fight. We have shown that the form of this fight may change, but that the substance never changes. Many Social-Democratic workers have not tried to stop this fight, many have even supported it. But in recent years there has been a great change; ever greater masses of Social-Democratic workers are realizing that the path of the Bolsheviks has led to the victory of socialism, that of Social-Democracy to the defeat of the working class in many countries. They realize that the Soviet Union is the most powerful bulwark against war and fascism, that only the proletarian united front can ward off fascism and bring about its overthrow. Ever greater masses of Social-Democratic workers are drawing the logical conclusions from this realization, are fraternizing with their Communist class comrades, are unreservedly taking their stand in a common front with the Soviet Union.

But the Mensheviks are doing nothing to further this movement and everything to endanger it. Formerly part of the Russian labor movement, once—in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—although on the wrong path, yet pulsing with the blood of the Russian proletariat, in the period of the proletarian revolution they have broken all ties and lost the last remnant of a connection with the socialist fatherland. Filled with envy, hatred and resentment against the Soviet Union, weaving intrigues in the Second Interntional, they regard the Social-Democratic workers as a means to an end, as a

mere instrument in their fight against Stalin, against Bolshevism, against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The united front is something for them to play around with; the workers' fight against war and fascism an opportunity for trying to win concessions from the Soviet Union; the mass desire for unity a chance for them to creep into the ranks of the Russian workers in order to bring about confusion and disruption.

AGAINST THE SABOTEURS OF THE UNITED FRONT

The united front against war and fascism is an elementary necessity. Hitler and his mob are harrying peace to its death. They have put Germany under a yoke, and they now want to shackle Europe. They preach war against the Soviet Union. They are arming for war against Czechoslovakia, against Austria, against Holland, Belgium and France. It becomes more and more evident to the nations bordering on Germany that their very existence is at stake. The workers are realizing ever more clearly that their last democratic liberties and rights, their value as human being, their very lives, are at stake.

Hitler's war can flare out on the world with lightning speed. The establishment of a peace front against it is proceeding all too slowly. The backbone of this peace front is the united front of the working class; *only the united front* of the working class can mobilize all the forces of peace against the instigators of war, can unite all the forces of the people to ward off the catastrophe. Everything that holds back this unity of action is a crime against the working class, against all who work; every intrigue against the united front is support for war-breathing fascism. Speedy action or delay can decide.

The Communist International is doing its utmost to establish the united front and ward off the threatened war. At the Seventh World Congress Dimitroff called on all workers and all workers' parties to join together in attacking the deadly enemy of the proletariat. The Communist International has

called on the Socialist International more than once for joint action against war. The Communist Parties in every country are indefatigably seeking to conclude a fighting alliance wtih the Social-Democratic Parties. In France, in Spain, in Italy, in Austria, they have been successful in concluding an agreement for unity of action and have realized the first successes of this unity of action. That is much, but not enough. In face of the maniacal determination of Hitler and his allies to loose war and set fire to the world as they set fire to the Reichstag, we must close up our ranks more quickly than ever and deal with enemies and saboteurs of the united front more stringently. Every attempt to disrupt, mislead or undermine unity of action in this situation is a crime not only against the working class but against all toilers, a betrayal of the peace of the peoples and an instigation for Hitler's war.

The Soviet Union is today the strongest bulwark of the working people all over the world, the strongest bulwark of world peace. Support of the Soviet Union means support of world peace. Arms against the Soviet Union are arms against world peace. The Mensheviks are still busy manufacturing such arms. They pretend that it is in the interests of the labor movement, in the interests of the Soviet Union. But even Hitler pretends that he is preparing war in the interests of world peace. Whoever carries on disruptive activities against the Soviet Union, lying to the workers that there is no socialism in the Soviet Union, that a new class of the "jubilant and triumphant" rules in the Soviet Union, that the "system" in the Soviet Union must be changed, is no friend, but an enemy of the Soviet Union. Whoever tries to persuade the workers that the united front in the capitalist countries depends on a "united front" in the Soviet Union with the wreckers, on "substantial changes in the political regime of the Soviet Union", is no friend, but an enemy of the united front.

Let us overcome all obstacles and all difficulties in the way of the united front as rapidly as possible! Let us remove all

saboteurs of the united front from the ranks of our movement as rapidly as possible, so that those ranks will be strengthened all the more quickly by the addition of the millions who are ready to defend peace against Hitler! Let us build a ring of defense to hem in raging fascism as rapidly as possible; a solid, unbreakable united front of the working class!