

MARXISM

THE DOCTRINE OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

Address delivered in Moscow on
the Fiftieth Anniversary of the
: Death of Karl Marx :

MARCH 14, 1933



D. Z. MANUILSKY

STUDY and DISTRIBUTE the TEACHINGS of MARX!

KARL MARX *and* FRIEDRICH ENGELS
The Communist Manifesto

Special Edition

Five Cents

KARL MARX
Wage Labor and Capital

Ten Cents

Critique of the Gotha Programme

Fifty Cents

Civil War in France

Twenty-Five Cents

V. I. LENIN

The Teachings of Karl Marx

Special Edition

Ten Cents

FRIEDRICH ENGELS *on the* DEATH *of* KARL MARX

The Fourteenth of March 1883

Ten Cents

L. PERCHIK (Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute)

KARL MARX

Fifteen Cents

FRIEDRICH ENGELS

**Germany: Revolution and
Counter-Revolution**

Sixty Cents

●
Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.) New York City

14900
FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DEATH OF KARL MARX

MARXISM
THE DOCTRINE
OF PROLETARIAN
DICTATORSHIP

Address delivered in Moscow on
the Fiftieth Anniversary of the
: Death of Karl Marx :

March 14, 1933

D. Z. MANUILSKY

WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS,
P.O. Box 148, Station D, New York.

THE DOCTRINE
OF PROLETARIAN
DICTATORSHIP

BY
LENIN
AND
STALIN

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE UTOPIA PRESS, LTD. (T.U.), 44, WORSHIP STREET,
LONDON, E.C.

MARXISM

The Doctrine of Proletarian Dictatorship

Fifty years ago Karl Marx, the mightiest revolutionary of all times, the founder of scientific socialism, the ideological creator and inspirer of the present world communist movement, breathed his last. To-day, the spectre of communism is not only haunting Europe, as Marx wrote eighty-five years ago, but communism has become an enormous force, uniting millions of adherents in all corners of the earth. It has found its material embodiment in the first workers' state. It has penetrated through the age-old Great Wall of China. It is bringing into movement the toilers of all nationalities and races.

The inevitability of the downfall of capitalism, which Marx proved scientifically, is taking shape before our very eyes in the form of the general crisis of the capitalist world. But on one-sixth part of the earth the proletariat has overthrown the capitalist system, has set up the dictatorship of the proletariat, has victoriously completed the first Five-Year Plan and is building the new, socialist society, thus vividly demonstrating the advantages of socialism over the capitalist system, which has outlived its age.

More than ever before in history the "ruling classes are trembling at the thought of communist

revolution.” They are fanning the flames of warfare in the Far East in the search for a way out through new imperialist wars. In Germany, the centre of capitalist Europe, infuriated capitalist reaction is trying to turn back the wheels of history by destroying the six million communist army of the proletariat. The whole mechanism of capitalist society has lost whatever stability it had. All classes are being swept into movement. Millions of workers, of peasants who have been ruined by the agrarian crisis, and of the petty-bourgeoisie who have lost their illusory position of independence, are confronted with the radical, decisive question of our epoch: capitalism or socialism, bourgeois dictatorship or proletarian dictatorship, “for or against Marxism.”

Everything has been put into operation against communism by the ruling classes. The present-day capitalist obscurantists are throwing aside the outer cover of parliamentary conventions and false democratic phrases, which camouflaged bourgeois dictatorship, and are ever more openly and cynically having recourse to the most merciless system of terror against the working class. White terror is, as it were, the “material” basis of bourgeois class rule to-day, the ideological superstructure of which is the crusade of all the darkest forces of reaction against Marxism.

At the same time, Marxism, which is persecuted by the governments of the capitalist countries, is becoming the generally recognized doctrine of vast masses of workers in capitalist countries and of the vast masses in the Land of the Soviets. Revolutionary Marxism is the guiding thread of the Communist International as also of both the economics and politics of the U.S.S.R. Under the banner of revolutionary Marxism, the Bolsheviki led the proletariat

to the victory of the October Revolution. Revolutionary Marxism is the basis of the party's general line and makes it possible for the Party to consolidate proletarian dictatorship and achieve decisive victories along the road of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. We have now a party and a country that knows where it is going and what it wants, and what it intends doing on the morrow, as against the bewilderment and vacillation of the capitalist world; and this is just because our country has become a mighty laboratory of Marxist thought and Marxist action under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

In the irreconcilable life and death struggle of two worlds—the socialist world and the capitalist world, the world of the insurgent exploited and the world of exploiters, stands revealed the profoundly militant significance of this fiftieth anniversary of Marx's death. We, communists of all lands, and first and foremost communists of the party of victorious proletarian revolution, have never allowed anyone to besmirch the militant banner of Marx, and will never allow it.

Marx belongs to us, communists, both to members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has embodied his doctrine in the invincible cause of socialism, and to the communists of the capitalist countries, who by their sacrifices and the blood they have shed in daily class struggles, are proving their loyalty to Marx's doctrine. In the light of the most intense class conflicts of our time, Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat concerning *the downfall of capitalism, concerning proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship*, is doubly important for the international proletariat. Marx taught the international proletariat that:

“ between capitalist and communist society there

lies a period of revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This period corresponds also to the political transitional period in which the state can be nothing else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

(Marx, *Criticism of the Gotha Program*.)

What does the Second International teach its followers? Through Kautsky it teaches that between the capitalist and communist societies there lies a "political transition period . . . when the government, as a general rule, will take the form of a coalition government." (Kautsky, *The Proletarian Revolution and its Program*, 1922, p. 196.)

The question of proletarian dictatorship is now the most important sector of the class struggle between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world, and between the proletariat and bourgeoisie in capitalist countries.

I. MARXISM—THE DOCTRINE OF PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.

Marxism as the doctrine of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship is not merely a problem of tactics. Marx links it up with his philosophical and economic system of thought, forming a unified, complete world outlook of the proletariat. Marx's dialectical materialism and economic doctrine are the scientific basis of a doctrine of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The doctrine of proletarian dictatorship cannot be separated from the whole Marxian theory of the overthrow of capitalism. Since the doctrine of proletarian dictatorship, like all Marx's doctrines, is based on dialectical materialism, it is no fossilized dogma, but like all Marx's doctrine is susceptible to further develop-

ment on the basis of the experiences of the proletarian revolutionary struggle. Hence all the new elements contributed by Lenin and Stalin to the theory of proletarian dictatorship, in the light of the experiences of the October Revolution and the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., form a development of the fundamental position set forth by Marx, and together with Marx's doctrine forms a unified *Marxian-Leninist doctrine* of proletarian dictatorship.

Marx's doctrine could arise, and did arise, only in specific historic circumstances, only at a definite stage of development of capitalist society and the class struggle inside it. From the very beginning Marxism entered the arena of social struggle not as a doctrinal sect, bringing enlightenment "from on high" to suffering humanity, but as a critical, revolutionary doctrine, which came to maturity on the high road of world civilization. Thus it immediately met with response from the most advanced class—the revolutionary proletariat.

"Marx's doctrine," says Lenin, "is the legitimate inheritor of all the best creations of humanity in the nineteenth century in the form of German philosophy, English political economy and French socialism." But Marx did not merely assimilate the doctrines of his forerunners; he critically elaborated them and analysed the class roots of their bourgeois narrowness. Having reversed Hegel's dialectical theory and placed it on its feet, thus endowing the old mechanical materialism with the method of dialectics, and extending it to social development, Marx created dialectical materialism, the revolutionary world outlook of the proletariat. Marx foresaw that, in the long run, as a result of the development of industry and technique, as a result of the victory of the pro-

letarian revolution, science itself would become a single whole: the science of natural history and the science of society as a natural-historical process.

Basing himself on his independent investigations of English capitalism, Marx achieved a revolution in political economy. Developing further the *labour theory of value* of Adam Smith and Ricardo, and freeing it of its internal contradictions, Marx worked out the theory of surplus value, the corner-stone of political economy, converting it into a revolutionary weapon of the fighting proletariat.

The French utopian socialists unmasked the capitalist system and preached socialism as the alternative; but they did not see the world-historical, actual force which would be called upon to realize this revolution. Having discovered this revolutionary force in the proletariat, and taking as his starting point its social and economic position together with the class struggle, Marx transformed socialism from a utopia into a science, the revolutionary theory of the working class.

Marxism is not a dogma, but *a guide to action*, as Lenin loved to quote frequently from Engels. Marxism as a "guide to action"—here is the essence of Marx's doctrine. The best proof of this is that Marx's doctrine of the role of the proletariat, as the only revolutionary class which is consistent to the last, represents a generalization of the experience of the English Revolution in the middle of the seventeenth century, of the great French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, the uprising of the Lyons weavers, the Chartist movement, the European revolution of 1848, the June uprising of the Paris proletariat in 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871. All this generalized experience demonstrates the inevitability

and necessity of the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Marx's doctrine is the complete unity of theory and practice, a unity of philosophy, economy and politics. Of all its component, indissolubly connected parts, that which must be dealt with first of all is *Marx's dialectical materialism and Marxist economic doctrine.*

Marx's materialistic dialectical theory in the sphere of philosophy considers the unity of the world as a whole in its material nature, in the manifold, indissoluble connections between all its parts and the transition of one phenomenon into another and into its opposite; it thus undermines the whole basis of philosophical idealism, which is a veiled form of religion. All the latest discoveries and inventions of the period since the death of Marx in the sphere of natural sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, geology), and even of mathematics, discoveries and inventions which were possible only thanks to progress in the development of productive forces and technique, are confirmation of the correctness of dialectical materialism. The most advanced and prominent bourgeois scientists are compelled, on the one hand, to recognize the crisis of bourgeois natural science, which cannot be overcome by anti-dialectical thought, and on the other hand, to make timid, inconsistent attempts in favour of adopting the materialistic dialectical method.

Dialectical materialism as applied to human society, and the Marxian materialist conception of history, for the first time presented us with the key to a scientific understanding of historical events. Where, previously, everything seemed arbitrary, the play of chance or blind fate, Marx found the law of development of human history; he discovered in economics the basis of social life, above which towers all the "super-

MEMORIAL LIBRARY
MEMORIAL LIBRARY
structure" (classes, the state, ideology, and so on). Marx found in the class struggle the most important driving force in the development of social formations from the moment when the primitive, communist society, in consequence of the rise of private property, broke down and gave way to class society. It is not consciousness that determines being, as the idealists, the French encyclopaedists and utopian socialists thought, but social being that determines social consciousness, that determines the motives of the classes struggling against one another and the behaviour of the masses, who are the real creators of history.

In analysing the mutual relations of economics and politics, Marx established the fact that the state in every society based on exploitation, has always been, and is still, the organ of the ruling class for the maintenance and consolidation of the system of exploitation.

Marx established that the basic cause of all revolutions lies in the fact that at a definite stage of development the growing productive forces come into conflict with the existing productive relations, which become fetters upon the productive forces.

Marx's historical materialism gives a scientific explanation of the conditions and causes of revolutions on the part of the enslaved classes, revolutions which lead to the destruction of the old, obsolete, social formations, and their replacement by new ones. In applying this law to capitalist society and the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, Marx pointed out the characteristic distinction between the proletarian revolution and all previous revolutions, which consists in the fact that its task and essence is not to set up a new exploiting society with its state, but the creation, through proletarian dictatorship, of the classless communist society.

In the sphere of economics, Marx discovered the

fundamental economic *law of motion* of capitalist society. He discovered the deep secret of the creation of *surplus value* and of the creation of the wealth of the capitalists at the expense of the unpaid, surplus labour of the workers. Marx revealed the mechanism of the capitalist method of production and the method of appropriation which resulted from it, by tearing away the outer covering of commodity fetishism. Thus Marx armed the proletariat with the consciousness of its position, and of its role as the grave-digger of capitalism and the revolutionary organizer of the new social system.

The best scientists and economists, before Marx, regarded economic phenomena merely as a relationship between things. Marx, when he discovered the secret of commodity fetishism, the secret of surplus value, showed the dual character of the commodity, and the dual character of the labour embodied in the commodity and, at the same time, revealed that behind the relationship between things there is hidden the relationship between people and, in the last analysis between classes. Thanks to Marx, the workers were for the first time able to understand that wages in capitalist society are an irrational form, which conceals the relationship of exploitation which exists between the workers and capital.

Marx did not invent "economic principles," but soberly analysed actual contradictions. He showed in a strictly scientific manner the whole path of the movement of capitalist economics, the transition from simple commodity production to capitalist industry, the conversion of labour power into a commodity; he revealed the law of value and the law of surplus value; he discovered the whole process of accumulation, concentration and centralization of capital.

As capitalist production and accumulation develops,

a process takes place in which separate, individual capitals become amalgamated (concentration) and parallel with this, urged rapidly forward by two mighty levers—intensification of competition and the growth of credits—there proceeds the centralization of capitals in the hands of a few capitalist magnates by the process of expropriation of small and middle capitalists by big capitalists. Analysing the essence and significance of the capital of limited liability companies and the first signs of large-scale capitalist monopolist combines, Marx in 1874 already came to the conclusion that the highest stage of centralization of capital signifies “the inevitable transition point to the conversion of capital back into the property of the producer, into direct social property.”

The inevitability of the overthrow of the capitalist order is shown by Marx on the basis of an analysis of the development of the main contradictions of capitalism, on the basis of his discovery and explanation of the character and causes of periodical crises. The basis of periodical crises is to be found in the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist method of appropriation.

The aim, the driving force of capitalist production, is profit. But the rate of profit, owing to changes in the organic composition of capital, is subject to a tendency to fall steadily. This “tendency of the rate of profit to fall side by side with the development of society,” discovered by Marx, is, according to Marx himself, “one of the mightiest triumphs in regard to the touchstone of all political economy to this day.” He signalizes the limit beyond which the capitalist method of production can go no farther, thus:

1.—“The law of the falling rate of profit is converted into an obstacle to the development of pro-

ductive forces, an obstacle which can only be overcome each time by crises.”

2.—“ The extension or curtailment of production is defined not by the relation of production to social requirements, but by a definite rate of profit.”

Periodically, too much of the means of production and means of existence are produced for them to function as means for exploiting the workers, and giving a definite rate of profit; periodically too much wealth is accumulated in its capitalist, antagonistic forms, while huge masses of the proletariat and toilers are deprived of the essential means of existence, are thrown out of work, or deprived of the chance of working in the most favourable and most productive conditions.

But Marx takes the economic law of motion of capitalist production, accumulation, concentration and centralization of capital, the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, periodic crises and, in general, the whole course of development of the main internal contradictions of capitalism which inevitably lead to the downfall of the capitalist system, not from the viewpoint of fatalist objectivity, but from the class revolutionary angle, as the struggle between classes, as the basic contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The absolute, universal law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx consists precisely in that the greater social wealth becomes, the greater the dimensions of capital and the higher the level of industrial technique, the more rapidly concentration and centralization of capital takes place, and the higher the productivity of labour becomes—the greater becomes the absolute number of proletarians, the more extensive is the ruination of the small pro-

ducers, the greater the magnitude of the industrial reserve army, the more hopeless the living conditions of the workers, the greater the relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class. *But the class war also becomes ever sharper and more violent.* In the course of this struggle the proletariat gains experience, creates for itself an organization that will carry the struggle to the overthrow of capitalist rule, to the organization of the new society through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The course of development of capitalism and of its contradictions, during the period which has elapsed since Marx's death, the conversion of capitalism into monopoly capitalism, into imperialism, the subsequent advent of the general crisis of the capitalist system, and the period of world proletarian revolution which began with the victorious October uprising of the Russian proletariat in 1917—all this is the best possible proof of the correctness, of the strictly scientific character, and revolutionary actuality of Marx's economic doctrine. The inevitability of the overthrow of the capitalist system and the necessity for setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat as the transition stage from capitalism to communism—this is what Karl Marx proved, and scientifically grounded on the basis of dialectical materialism and upon the economic law of motion of capitalist society. It is therefore comprehensible that the bourgeoisie, its ideologists and scientists, as well as its agents inside the working class movement, hate Marx's dialectical materialism and its economic doctrine.

* * * *

Marx's elaboration of the *basis of proletarian Party organization, the Party's strategy and tactics in the struggle for proletarian dictatorship*, is all part

and parcel of his doctrine of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The first question here is that of the relation between the objective and subjective factors of the revolution, which subsequently found its classical expression in Lenin's famous thesis on the revolutionary situation. In another form, this is the question of the mutual relationship between historical necessity and the class will of the proletariat. The strength of revolutionary Marxism lies in the fact that it not only explains the world as it is, but also indicates the road for its revolutionary transformation. Militant action has always been the soul of revolutionary Marxism. It is energetic action on the part of the proletarian masses which accelerates the rate of objective ripening of the downfall of capitalist system, and not fatalist waiting for the automatic collapse of capitalism, which is the theoretical cover for the treacherous practice of the whole line of international social-democracy.

It was in this connection that Marx set before the proletariat the task of the struggle for the proletarian revolution in 1848, when capitalism was still developing on the ascendant line, for Marx knew full well that the class-consciousness of the proletariat, its organization and its fighting capacity, and finally the mass struggle of the proletariat, can be the decisive factor in shortening those historical periods, which the objective course of development allows to the capitalist system. Understanding the enormous importance of the subjective factor in the revolution, Marx organized a working class party, first in the form of the "Communist League," and then the International Workingmen's Association, *i.e.*, the First International, which was the first to raise the banner of international working class solidarity.

Though hounded from land to land by the persecution of reaction, Marx took a directly active part in the revolutionary struggle of the masses.

In the second place, the significance of the subjective factor in the revolution was closely linked up by Marx with the *correct strategical calculation of the alignment of class forces*. And to calculate correctly the alignment of class forces means, firstly, to weigh the forces of the proletarian class, the forces of revolution; secondly, to weigh the forces of the class enemy, the forces of reaction; and, thirdly, to define the position of those classes which vacillate and which may, in certain circumstances, align themselves on the one side or the other. Precisely this method of a concrete approach to each situation that arises, of carefully elucidating the position of all classes without exception, of soberly estimating the proletarian forces and the forces of the class enemy, has always constituted the basis of Marxist strategy and tactics.

Thirdly, the consideration of the correct alignment and movement of class forces presupposes a correct estimate of the proletarian forces. The force of the proletariat is first and foremost the level of its class consciousness and the degree of its organized class preparedness, which in their turn presuppose its independence of all other classes of bourgeois society. And this means, first and foremost, organizational independence on the part of the proletariat expressed in the form of a party as the vanguard of the class. It was this position of organizational independence that Marx recommended as essential to the Communist League in his famous appeal to the Central Committee. He suggested that in the event of joint struggle with petty-bourgeois democrats against the common enemy, they should "advance separately but

strike together," and not agree to any organizational amalgamation.

On the basis of this position of class independence, Marx recommended that the League should put forward its own, independent working class candidates at elections, and not be afraid that, as a result in certain localities reactionaries might get in, *i.e.*, he recommended a tactic which was the prototype of the present tactic of the Communist International of "class against class."

Finally Marx recommended the League, in the event of the advent to power of petty-bourgeois democracy, to carry through the arming of the workers immediately and everywhere, not under any circumstances to allow the weapons out of their hands, to organize a workers' guard and to create a revolutionary working-class government side by side with the existing petty-bourgeois government. This tactical instruction of Marx was subsequently applied during the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, in the formation of soviets and of the armed workers' militia.

Fourthly, it is not enough to have an organization. The organization must be firmly knit around a single revolutionary program of struggle. Such a program of struggle Marx gave the proletariat in his unparalleled document *The Communist Manifesto*, in which he expounded the fundamentals of scientific socialism. Both in the Communist League and subsequently in the First International, Marx fought on behalf of the mass character of the working-class party as against the petty-bourgeois elements, who polluted socialism and the working-class movement with its eclectic covering of all and sundry, brought in from all sides. Pre-Marxian socialism was the "non-class" socialism of the petty-bourgeois.

“The *petty-bourgeois*, in modern advanced society,” he wrote, “by force of his own position becomes, on the one hand, a socialist, and on the other, an economist, *i.e.*, he is blinded by the splendour of the big bourgeoisie and sympathizes with the sufferings of the people. At one and the same time he is a bourgeois and one of the people. In the depths of his heart he is proud that he is non-party, that he has found true equilibrium, which he pretentiously imagines differs from the usual mediocrity. This type of petty-bourgeois worships *contradiction* because contradiction is the basis of his existence. He himself is nothing but a social contradiction, embodied in action.”

Marx fought against *English trade unionism*, at the same time giving a correct estimate of the role and importance of mass labour organizations. He was the first to give a scientific explanation of the conservatism of English trade unionism, in consequence of the creation of a labour aristocracy, which grew up on the basis of colonial monopoly profits obtained from the exploitation of India and other colonies.

Marx was no less severe in his criticism of *Proudhonism*, as a petty-bourgeois tendency inside the working class. Marx saw the social and economic basis of the ideological influence of Proudhonism in the fact that capitalism was not far developed, the proletariat was still divided, small workshops were undergoing transformation, and that Proudhon idealized and magnified the importance of the petty-shop-keeper, the small peasant, the handicraftsmen, the workers in small workshops. Marx criticized Proudhon for making an eternal principle of the forms of bourgeois social relations. Proudhon never

rose above bourgeois society. He did not understand that the bourgeois method of production is an historical and transitory form. Proudhon supported the maintenance and development of commodity production and competition, but without all its unfortunate consequences.

Marx, moreover, trounced Bakunin in the First International as the representative of petty-bourgeois revolutionism and adventurism. Characterizing his program, he said:

“ His program is a confused program taken from all over the place: the members of the International are offered *equality of classes (!)*, *abolition of rights of inheritance*, as the starting point of the social movement (Saint-Simon's ravings), *atheism as a dogma*, and as his chief dogma he suggests that the members *refrain from participation in politics.*”

Marx not only fought against the ideological basis of Bakuninism, but also against the factional activities of the Bakuninists, against their intrigues inside the International.

Here also Marx reveals himself as a powerful party organizer, from whom many communist parties could learn a lesson on how the fight against deviations should be organized.

Marx was determinedly opposed to Lassalleanism in Germany, and unmasked, on the one hand, its conciliatory attitude towards the Bismarck regime, and its consequent refusal to wage a revolutionary fight against the Junkers, and, on the other hand, its sectarian doctrinairism.

Why was Marx so irreconcilable? Because the fight against opportunism, against theoretical distortions of the basic theses of scientific socialism, was, for Marx, one of the forms of the class struggle. In order that

the proletariat should be capable of beating the class enemy outside, it must smash the enemy's agents inside the working class movement.

Fifthly, the correct estimate of the forces of the class enemy pre-supposes a consideration of the class movements in the process of the ever-developing class struggle and revolution, an estimate of the dialectical transformation of classes such as the temporary allies of the proletariat to-day into its enemies to-morrow.

In the course of changes of this sort which occurred during the 1848 revolution, the youthful Marx had to draw up the strategy and tactics of the proletariat.

“While the democratic petty bourgeois,” he said, “wants to finish the revolution as quickly as possible . . . our interests and our task is to see that the revolution is permanent (uninterrupted), until all the more or less propertied classes are removed from ruling.” (Appeal to the Central Committee and the League.)

The idea of the uninterrupted revolution advocated by Marx was closely connected, first of all, with the idea of proletarian hegemony in the revolution, and, secondly, with the bourgeois-democratic revolution growing into the socialist revolution. This was subsequently brilliantly confirmed during the three Russian revolutions; it was elaborated by Lenin, and was incorporated into the theoretical arsenal of the whole Communist International. Marx gave a noteworthy thesis concerning the tactical line of the revolutionary working-class party to its temporary allies:

“The attitude of the revolutionary working-class party to petty-bourgeois democracy,” he said, “is that it (*i.e.*, the working-class party) goes side by side with petty-bourgeois democracy against the fraction whose overthrow it strives to ensure;

it goes against it at all times when it wants to strengthen its own position."

When Lenin subsequently applied Marx's thesis to the concrete situation in Russia, he gave the following definition of the alignment of class forces in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which was to develop into the socialist revolution: in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the proletariat brings the peasantry to its side, neutralizes the liberal bourgeoisie, destroys the monarchy once and for all, together with all mediaeval, private, landownership. Next, the proletariat joins hands with all semi-proletarian elements (all the exploited and toilers), neutralizes the middle peasantry, and overthrows the bourgeoisie: this is the whole difference between the socialist, and the bourgeois-democratic, revolution.

Sixthly, in estimating the relative positions of proletarian class forces both in the bourgeois-democratic, and in the proletarian revolution, the proletariat should be able, by consistent, determined struggle, to make allies for itself from among the peasantry and oppressed nationalities.

In defining his attitude to the peasant movement, Marx even in 1848 relentlessly criticized the social-revolutionary "black re-distribution" ideology of the Germano-American, Communist-Utopian, Krieg; but he considered it essential to support the peasant movement itself, in so far as it had a revolutionary character and in so far as, striking at landed property, it aimed a blow at bourgeois property in general, especially if the movement were linked up with the proletarian movement.

In the *Eighteenth Brumaire*, Marx wrote:

"The peasantry thus finds its natural ally and leader in the *urban proletariat*, whose historic task it is to overthrow the bourgeois order."

He writes on the same subject in his letter to Engels on April 16, 1856:

“The whole outcome of the affair in Germany will depend on the possibility of the proletarian revolution giving its support for a second edition, as it were, of the peasant war.”

The second ally of the proletariat is the national-revolutionary movement. We know that in his attitude towards the national movement in Ireland, to the movement of the Poles, the Hungarians and the Italians, as opposed to his attitude towards the Czechs and Yugoslavs, who were the outposts of Tsarism, Marx gave the fundamental starting point for our ideas on the national and colonial question. Lenin, defending the Bolshevik slogan of the right of nations to self-determination, including separation, emphasized at the same time that the policy of Marx and Engels on the Irish question was a model of how the proletarian should behave towards the oppressed nations and the national movement. The new contribution of Lenin and Stalin in this sphere is that they collated these ideas of Marx and wove them into a harmonious system of conceptions, showing that national-colonial revolutions are a constituent part of the international proletarian revolution.

Marx in 1850 foresaw the imperialist march on Asia and the role that China, the “stronghold of conservatism” would play in the ripening world proletarian revolution. “May not the European reactionaries, marching upon Asia, meet with the words ‘Chinese Republic: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ inscribed on the Great Wall of China?” said he. And to-day, one of the best sections of the Communist International, the Communist Party of China and its young Red Army, might well answer Marx that the mighty war-cry of the *Communist Manifesto*—

“Proletarians of all countries, unite!” and the glorious slogan of the October Revolution, “Long live the Soviets,” are already written over one-seventh part of China.

Seventhly, the most important basis of the Marxist tactics of the proletariat—in the struggle for proletarian dictatorship—is the correct choice of the moment when the uprising should be launched to overthrow the power of the ruling classes. The choice of the moment for an uprising is closely connected with the correct estimate of the objective and subjective factors of revolution, the whole alignment of class forces, the organizational and political preparedness of the proletariat for an uprising, the degree of unpreparedness on the part of the class enemy, the vacillations of the proletariat's allies, who can only be set in motion by means of determined tactics on the side of the revolution. On the one hand, to avoid getting snowed under and divorced from the masses and to avoid mere reliance on the revolutionary upsurge of the people, and on the other hand to avoid losing the most favourable moment by delay, which allows the enemy to prepare his attack and brings by this hesitation demoralization into our own ranks, and especially among our vacillating allies—this was the great art exhibited by the Bolsheviks in October, 1917. And the October victory was assured precisely because the moment for the uprising was correctly chosen. Marx teaches us not to play with revolution, but once begun, to carry it on to the end, following up each victory with a fresh onslaught against the enemy, calculated to bring confusion and embarrassment as a result of its forcible tactics. “It is death to an uprising to take the defensive,” said Marx. He criticized the Paris communards for the very reason that by their procrastination, their hesitation and irresolution they allowed the

Versaillese to rearrange their forces and aim a fresh blow at the Communards.

If the sum total of Marx's philosophical, economic, and political views were reduced to a single common denominator, to a single point that expresses the core and purpose of this view, that common denominator and fundamental point would be the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In his oft-quoted letter to Weydemeyer of March 5, 1852, on the subject of proletarian dictatorship, Marx writes that the class struggle inevitably leads to proletarian dictatorship. He refers to the same subject again in his observations on Bakunin's book *State and Anarchy* written in 1874, in which he clearly raises the question of the need for violent means and dictatorship so long as classes exist. He refers also to proletarian dictatorship in the *Criticism of the Gotha Program* in 1875. He speaks of it after the lessons of the Paris Commune, pointing out the necessity for the proletariat to smash the machinery of capitalist rule and to replace it by a proletarian state like the Commune. We find the same thoughts scattered in dozens of places in his articles, his books and his letters. Everywhere, Marx comes forward as the champion of proletarian dictatorship, and not as an advocate of winning a majority in parliament by peaceful means. It is just as though he were polemizing with the modern coadjutors of fascism like Hilferding and Otto Bauer, when in his notes on the debate on the anti-socialist law in the Reichstag in 1878, he points out that while allowing that it is possible for the working class in England or America to win a majority in parliament, nevertheless the proletariat would have to resort to violence and dictatorship in retaliation against the violence and resistance of the bourgeoisie against the new "lawful government".

What has the Second International made of Marx's doctrine of proletarian dictatorship?

MARXISM AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.

The collapse of the First International occurred directly after the defeat of the Paris Commune, *i.e.*, on the border line of the transformation of industrial capitalism, the capitalism of "free competition," into monopoly capitalism, imperialism. A new period began in the development of all social-economic relations both of separate countries and of the whole world. The process of the formation of national states, and with it the epoch of bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Western Europe was, on the whole, finished.

Radical changes in the structure of the working class, and also in the organizational forms of its movement, began to take place on the background of the comparatively peaceful development of capitalism in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the colonies and semi-colonies were being divided among large capitalist states. At one pole the aristocracy of labour arose, which became a "regular phenomenon" not only for England, but also for all the advanced capitalist countries. At the other pole, alongside of the headlong growth of big industry and of the gigantic development of the productive forces of capital, the proletarian masses become concentrated and firmly knit together, and the working class movement develops, chiefly in the large industrial centres breaking down all the barriers of bourgeois prohibitions and repressions. Mass political and trade union organizations grew up, year by year, the Social-Democrats gained increasing election successes, and the trade unions and social-democratic parties came closer and closer together. "Non-class socialism" leaves the arena together with the old "semi-handicraft prole-

tariat." Marxism developed extensively and became the universally recognized doctrine of the proletariat; it began to be taken up by the masses and to rally to its banner all the best, advanced workers of all capitalist countries, from Tsarist Russia to America and Japan.

Lenin and Stalin revealed to the full the peculiar features and the *dialectic character* of the "historical destiny" of Marx's doctrine during the imperialist epoch: all the changes in the form of struggle adopted by the bourgeoisie against Marxism in the early period of its extensive development, the social and economic roots of opportunism, as well as the inevitability of its conversion into social-imperialism.

The bourgeoisie at first maintained a discreet silence on the works of Marx. Then, they turned to open struggle against Marxism, and in the face of the certain victory of Marxism, they altered their methods. Liberalism decked itself out in Marxist colours and tried to wipe out the revolutionary content of Marxism. It found its agents among the labour aristocracy, which began to "talk Marxist," in order to win and consolidate key positions in the working class organizations, establishing in them the hegemony of the parliamentary fractions which were divorced from the masses. The labour-lieutenants of the bourgeoisie made close, direct contacts with the hangers-on in the labour party from the petty-bourgeoisie, which was being steadily ruined by the development of imperialism; they made close contacts first and foremost with the ideologists of the "new middle strata," who saw their own social and economic salvation in the rising imperialist sun. On the other hand, the very expansion of the working class movement and the drawing in of ever more new strata of "recruits" into the working class organizations could not but be accompanied by hesitation and vacillations on the basic

questions of the program and tactics of Marxism, especially during the period when capitalism was developing comparatively peacefully. This, in its turn, necessarily strengthened the position of the labour aristocracy and the petty-bourgeois elements in the proletarian organizations.

According to Comrade Stalin's classic definition, the social-democratic parties of the pre-war period, represented a *bloc* of proletarian and petty-bourgeois interests, which found their most characteristic expression in three tendencies: open revolutionism, centrism, and the left wing, which "lived in harmony" within the framework of the formally united, common party.

From the very beginning *revisionism* made itself manifest as an international tendency. Wherever it appeared, whether in France, England, Germany, Austria, Bulgaria or elsewhere, it not only dotted every "i," by revealing all the characteristic elements of future social-imperialism and social-fascism without exception, but it also evinced extreme flexibility in the way it adapted itself to and orientated itself around the vacillations of the backward strata of the working class and the petty-bourgeois hangers-on, by establishing and strengthening both its organizational apparatus and its ideological influence within social-democracy. "Dear Eddie, they do not talk about it, they do it," wrote one arrant reformist sharper to Edward Bernstein. And proclaiming the demands of their imperialist states to be essential "amendments" to Marxism, the revisionists systematically and persistently attacked all the main theories of Marxism. First, on the question of the proletarian outlook, Jaures in France, Bernstein and Conrad Schmidt in Germany, the Fabians and I.L.P.ers in England, from the very beginning repudiated the materialist concep-

tion and proposed idealism, Kantism and other reactionary philosophies in its place. Whereas Bernstein considers that materialistic dialectics is an echo of Hegelianism, which led Marx to make baseless revolutionary conclusions and "leaps," Jaures considered that Marx came to his conclusion about the absolute impoverishment of the working class only in consequence of his playing with dialectics.

Secondly, so as to cut out all the revolutionary content of Marx's economic doctrine, the revisionists concentrated all their efforts on the *refutation of Marx's theory of concentration* (especially as regards agriculture), and of his theory of the inevitable relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class masses, his theory of crises and the downfall of capitalism. According to Bernstein and Jaures, the process of concentration of industry indicated by Marx, is not accompanied by the elimination and ruination of the small producer in agriculture, in view of the "stability" of the individual peasant farm. The revisionists further declare that centralization of capital, especially in the form of limited liability companies, leads to the "democratization of capitalist property," since in the long run all toilers who invest their savings in limited companies become partners in capitalist wealth. Jaures even went so far as to say that "limited liability companies" are an element of communism within capitalism," and that the bourgeois state through its system of taxation, stands "halfway" between private property and communism—collective state ownership. But the revisionists aim their heaviest blows against Marx's theory of impoverishment, putting against the fact that the working class masses are relatively and absolutely growing more and more impoverished, their illusion of ever increasing improvements in the position of the workers,

Closely bound up with this is the revisionist view that the development of trusts, cartels and syndicates reduces capitalist competition, and thereby the capitalist anarchy of the market, to nil, which signifies therefore, that all development must gradually and peacefully go forward to socialism.

Thirdly, the Right wing opportunists connect their revision of the Marxian doctrine of the downfall of capitalism *with denial of the fact that the class struggle is becoming sharper and with denial of the role of the bourgeois state*, as the organ of force of the bourgeoisie against the workers. The bourgeois state, according to Jaures, "aims at maintaining and defending living conditions, order and civilization, for both classes in common." Therefore the revisionists oppose the "Blanquism" of Marx and put the idea of evolution in the place of revolution, and advocate class collaboration with the bourgeoisie in place of the struggle for proletarian dictatorship. They openly advocate the need for class collaboration by participation in bourgeois governments. At the International Socialist Congress in Paris, 1900, Jaures, with the overwhelming support of the revisionists of the whole world, recommended that Millerand enter the Left radical government and thus set an example in tactics to the social-democratic parties of the world. As Lenin said subsequently: "What Bernstein showed, Millerand proved."

What was the position taken up by *centrism* towards the followers of Bernstein and Jaures, the Fabians, the Independent Labour Party and Mensheviks? Centrism had always declared itself to be a true stalwart defender of "orthodox Marxism." This was immediately revealed by an examination of the most important questions of tactics confronting

the social-democratic parties of the Second International. Whereas open revisionism continually presented the demand that the principles and tactics of Marxism should be "re-examined" and "brought up-to-date," centrism in words defended Marxism, but in deeds retreated from one position after another. This was quite clear at every critical turning point; for instance, in relation to the Russian Revolution of 1905.

The more acute the class contradictions of imperialism became and the closer the first imperialist war approached, the more stubbornly did the centrists emphasize the legal, parliamentary and trade union struggle as the only form of proletarian movement. They actually refused to adopt mass political strikes or to organize the masses for revolutionary action; they adhered to the viewpoint of the "civilizing role" of capitalism in the colonies; and even manifested strong leanings towards the "socialist colonial policy" advocated by out and out revisionists like Noske, Van-Kol and so on. As regards the peasant masses ruined by imperialist development, instead of taking an *active* stand in favour of drawing them into the proletarian revolution as reserves, the centrists limited themselves to platonic utterances, or took up the attitude of "objective observers," as Kautsky puts it.

The centrists made their biggest turn towards open social-imperialism on the question of the imperialist war even before the war broke out. At the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart in 1907 Bebel and Guesde both ardently advocated "defence of the fatherland," the one in the interests of the fight against tsarism, and the other on the pretext that strikes and armed uprisings in war time, when the frontiers had to be defended, would be

impossible. Sophism about the need for the proletariat to support "wars of defence" was characteristic of the centrists even at that time. This is all closely connected with the refusal of the centrists to carry on any anti-militarist work, acclaiming this work to be the tactic of "barrack-room conspiracies" which, they said, was altogether contrary to Marxism.

The entire centrist standpoint on questions of revolutionary tactics and strategy is expressed in its most concentrated form in regard to the question of the proletariat's attitude to the bourgeois state, *the question of proletarian dictatorship*. As Lenin pointed out, Kautsky even in his best years in *polemizing with Bernstein* deliberately avoided the question of proletarian dictatorship and failed to unmask the Bernstein distortions of Marx's assertion that the proletariat cannot *simply* take over the ready-made state machine; and he similarly evaded the question in his *Road to Power* (published in 1909). Finally in his dispute with Pannekoek in 1912 he went so far as to say that "the task of the mass strike can never be to *destroy* state power, but merely to persuade the government to make concessions on a definite question, or to elect a new parliament which would come to terms with the proletariat in the place of the old one which was hostile to it."

Another typically centrist figure in the pre-war International was Trotzky, the organizer of the August *bloc* against the Bolsheviks, who, like the *Tushinskii vor*,* periodically paid short visits to the Bolshevik camp on separate questions, each time

**Tushinskii vor*—thief of Tushino; the nickname given to Dmitrii the Second, the Pretender to the tsarist throne, who first made his appearance in 1607, using the village of Tushino as his stronghold.

returning to the Menshevik standpoint both on questions of the Russian revolution and on questions of the international working-class movement.

As Comrade Stalin has quite correctly observed, the opportunists adapted themselves to the bourgeoisie, and the centrists to the opportunists—and the chain was thus completed.

The sharp intensification of imperialist contradictions and the approach of the first imperialist war hastened the conversion of revisionism and centrism into social-imperialism. Even before the war, *the Second International's departure from Marxism on all fundamental questions* was an accomplished fact. By distorting Marx the revisionists, together with the centrists, strove to prove that "only the level of productive forces decides the question of revolution," thus justifying the capitalist expansion of their own states and the enslavement of the colonies (Heine and Noske before the war, Parvus and Lensch during the war in Germany, Guesde in France, Plekhanov in Russia, Van-Kol in Holland, etc.), or in order to prove that "capitalism is not ripe for socialism" (Kautsky).

Only one party of the working class, the one party *not* built upon a *bloc* between proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, but from the beginning, approximately thirty years after the Commune, an organization of proletarian revolutionaries guided by Lenin, raised the banner which had fallen from the hands of the Communard heroes, the banner of revolutionary Marxism. Guided by Lenin, the Bolsheviks, both in Russia and on the international arena, carried on their irreconcilable political and economic struggle for pure Marxism, unmasking the revisionists and centrists and criticizing the semi-

Menshevik standpoint of the "left radicals" and urging them to split with the opportunists.

By elaborating and contributing to Marx's outline and clear indications concerning the peasant and the national questions, questions of tactics and forms of the working-class movement and the question of the communist organization, the Bolsheviki created a new type of proletarian party, built up on a program which was true in principle and at the same time concrete and militant, and the *organizational core of which was a determined split* with the opportunists of all shades. For the first time since Marx's death there is included in the program of the revolutionary party of the working class the point concerning proletarian dictatorship (of which the compilers of the Erfurt program of social-democracy never even dreamed); for the first time the question is sharply raised of "the right of nations to self-determination including separation"; for the first time an analysis is given of the relation of class forces in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the role of the proletariat as the leader of this revolution, which is to develop into the socialist revolution.

This gave Leninism, in the earliest days of its development, an *international* character, inasmuch as the Russian Revolution of 1905 itself became the lever for joint struggle of the proletarians of imperialist countries and the oppressed peoples in the colonies.

Guided by Lenin, the Bolsheviki during the 1905 Revolution used the weapon of the mass political strike as the most important method of revolutionary proletarian struggle; they realized proletarian hegemony in the revolution in the form of soviets which were organs of revolt against the exploiting classes; they organised and led the masses in the

uprising in Moscow and other places, thus raising the question of the uprising as the highest form of struggle, before the entire international working class.

Leninism, by restoring revolutionary Marxism, simultaneously developed it in all spheres of economics, politics and philosophy, and thus proved the correctness and living character of Marxian doctrine as a guide to action.

The most exhaustive definition of what Lenin did to develop Marx's doctrine has been given by Comrade Stalin. According to his definition, Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. It elaborates the question of imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, of the inevitable downfall of capitalism and the possibility of the victory of socialism in single capitalist countries taken separately, of proletarian dictatorship and its embodiment in the form of soviets, of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and the role of the national and colonial revolutions, of the party and, finally, as the culmination of revolutionary Marxism—of the foundations and methods for building socialism in the period of proletarian revolution.

MARXISM IN THE EPOCH OF GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM.

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE U.S.S.R. THE ROLE OF THE THIRD COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

The imperialist world war, 1914-18, was the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism. The October Revolution in Russia marked the beginning of the world proletarian revolution. The October Revolution opened up a new epoch in the interna-

tional working-class movement, a new epoch in the history of mankind. On August 4, 1914, and November 7, 1917, an unbridgable gulf was formed between the Bolsheviki and the Second International. What had to take place took place at last; what had been prepared for in the pre-war International by the growth of revisionism, on the one hand, and revolutionary Marxism represented by the Russian Bolsheviki, on the other, actually came to pass. International social-democracy passed openly to the side of imperialism. The Bolsheviki remained where they had always been, on this side of the barricades with their Leninist banner which stood for the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war.

But the Second International not only sent the masses to the war, but tried to send them against the October Revolution in 1917. It killed the proletarian revolution in Germany and Austro-Hungary. The fight for the proletarian dictatorship is now no longer a subject for political discussion, but a question of civil war between the proletariat on the one side and the bourgeoisie and Second International on the other.

The Second International opened fire upon Marxism and the Marxists during the world imperialist war, and is firing upon them during the world proletarian revolution which has now begun. Rivers of blood separate Marxist-Communists from social-democracy. Social-democracy, by saving decaying capitalism, accompanies capitalism all along the road to the last violent outburst of the world economic crisis, which has revealed so clearly all the parasitism of capitalism, its convulsions expressed in fascism, and the over-ripeness of capitalist relations which have now become fetters upon the productive forces. The whole essence of the fascization of social-

democracy lies in the defence of this capitalism of the period of general crisis.

It is enough to compare the program of fascism and of post-war social-democracy to see that the roots of fascism lie both in pre-war revisionism and in the post-war ideology and practice of social-democracy. In both, the capitalist state is presented not as a product of irreconcilable class contradictions, not as the organization of bourgeois class rule to oppress the exploited, but as an organ for reconciling the conflicting interests of the exploited and exploiters. This is precisely also the central idea of the fascist, corporate state.

The second fascist idea stolen from social-democracy is the idea of abolishing the proletarian class struggle by introducing class collaboration. The third leading idea of fascism, borrowed from social-democracy is the introduction of compulsory arbitration in the place of strikes. It is the common aim of social-fascism and fascism to save capitalism in the period of general crisis. There is not a single theory of Marxism which has not been trampled upon by international social-democracy.

Pre-war revisionism was turned into an orgy of anti-Marxism, which ideologically prepared the way for the present attack upon Marxism by the followers of fascism. The theories of Kant and Mach are being made the substitutes for dialectical materialism. Materialist atheism is replaced by Christian socialism as advocated by McDonald and Sollman.

The whole of Marx's economic doctrine has been subjected to the criticism of social-democratic lecturers like Nölting. An ex-collaborator on the bourgeois *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Naphtali, is declared to be Marx's successor. In opposition to Marx is put the greatest exploiter of our day, Ford, whose auto-

biography has been referred to by one of the leaders of the reformist trade unions, Tarnov, as "the most noteworthy work that has ever appeared in economic literature." The Belgian Socialist, De Man, gloats over the fact that nothing of Marxism has been left in the practice of international social-democracy and the reformist trade unions. Vandervelde, the President of the Second International, bowing and scraping before English Mondism, declares that to reduce socialism to Marxism would mean to make it contract into something smaller.

Who will remember these people, and all those who persecuted Marxism, in a few years' time? For Marx's doctrine, embodied in the state of proletarian dictatorship, in the cause of socialism, in the bulwark of the international proletarian revolution, has conquered in the U.S.S.R. The general contours of the state of proletarian dictatorship, which were indicated by Marx, have been given concrete shape by the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., by the creation of the Soviet state, as a form of proletarian dictatorship.

Not a single proletarian revolution in the world will now take place without this form. The Soviets as well as its armed defender, the Red Army, created by the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., have become part of the flesh and blood of the international working class.

In the October Revolution Marxism won a universal, historic victory. Marx's doctrine of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship is being enriched by the concrete experiences which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is giving to the international proletariat. The policy of the C.P.S.U. during the period of civil war and war communism, the policy of the New Economic Policy

(NEP) in its Marxist, dialectical development, the transition to socialist industrialization, which liquidated the economic backwardness of our country and put the question of the level of productive forces in a new light, the Leninist-Stalinist light, the rooting out of capitalist relations in the village by collectivizing agriculture, the stand taken on the question of the class war in circumstances of proletarian dictatorship at its different stages—all these features have now become constituent parts of Marx's doctrine of proletarian dictatorship.

Lenin and Stalin theoretically formulated this enormous experience of proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. in all their works. On the basis of the doctrines of Marx and Lenin, Stalin gives the most exhaustive, the most complete definition of the "three sides" of proletarian dictatorship, which served the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., and will in future serve the international proletariat, as a guide in the struggle to establish proletarian dictatorship and to build up socialism.

Stalin says that "the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . has three main aspects:

" 1. The use of the power of the proletariat in order to crush the exploiters, in order to defend the country, in order to strengthen the ties with the proletarians in other lands, and in order to favour the revolution everywhere.

" 2. The use of the power of the proletariat in order to detach the labouring and exploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, in order to strengthen the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, in order to enlist these masses in the work of socialist construction, and in order to ensure that in the state the proletariat shall function as leader of these masses.

“ 3. The use of the power of the proletariat in order to organize socialism, abolish classes, and found a society without classes and without a state.”

Along the lines indicated by Comrade Stalin, the C.P.S.U. works indefatigably to strengthen proletarian dictatorship by extending its basis. The new socialist “being” determines the new socialist “consciousness.” A change is taking place in the human mind on the new material economic basis of socialist productive relations. And this is an important point in the dialectics of proletarian dictatorship, which, through its consolidation, advances to communism and which simultaneously presumes the withering away of the proletarian dictatorship as a state.

Thanks to the victory of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., Marxism, from being a doctrine which points out the road to proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, has become a doctrine verified by experience in the consciousness of millions of people, a doctrine of socialist construction. At the same time Marxism in the U.S.S.R. has become the strategy and tactics of *the proletariat which has been victorious* in one country in the struggle, not only against the remnants of hostile classes inside the country, but also against the whole of international capital. Marxism as the proletarian doctrine of proletarian revolution goes into single combat, in the new circumstances which have arisen, against all the theoretical schools of the capitalist world, not only in the ideological sphere, but on the material basis of the struggle of two world systems—the capitalist world and the socialist world. Vast masses of the people have to define their attitude towards Marxism, for or against, on the concrete experience of the

victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the defeat of capitalism caught in the grip of general crisis.

The victorious culmination of the first Five-Year Plan in circumstances of world crisis is the greatest test of the vital power of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, a test of world-historic importance. It means the victory of Marxism-Leninism, which our Party has used as a searchlight upon its way. It is a victory over all those who, when the proletariat had been victorious, wanted to revise the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of proletarian dictatorship after the manner of the Second International. It was on this fundamental question that counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and the Right opportunists which reflected the pressure of ruined capitalist classes inside our country and of international capital abroad, came to grief. The Rights revised the Marxist-Leninist standpoint on the question of the leading role of the proletariat in relation to the peasantry, and actually found themselves capitulating to capitalism; the Trotskyists doomed the proletariat to isolation from the peasantry, for they adopted the social-democratic viewpoint about the peasantry and regarded them as a reactionary mass, which, they emphasized, the proletariat was incapable of leading; thus they arrived at their Thermidor standpoint.* Both the Rights and the Trotskyists equally falsified the Marxist doctrine of the level of productive forces, which they represented as alone defining the possibility of building socialism; both these deviations were misled by their fatalist attitude to the "objective" conditions for the building of

**i.e.*, that the October Revolution would reach its Thermidor—July 27, 1793, the day of the overthrow of Robespierre, which marked the swing to the Right of the great French Revolution.—ED.

socialism, since on this question they actually followed along in the train of the most arrant leaders of the Second International. It was only by following the guidance of the *leader of our party and of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin*, by crushing these deviations and defending the purity of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, that the C.P.S.U. was able to consolidate proletarian dictatorship, in spite of the attempts to disrupt it by the intruders of the class enemy, and to advance the cause of socialism.

The second victory of Marxism-Leninism of universal historic importance was the creation of the Third International. The idea of international working-class solidarity, which was howled down by the Second International during the war, when it sent the working class into the trenches, was regenerated in the Third International, which was the continuator of the cause of the First International led by Marx, the International which combined the best elements of the world labour movement. The Communist International was born under the symbol of the victorious October Revolution and became the true, international organization of the toilers of all continents, of all races. The Communist International is actually the only world Communist Party, the party of world proletarian revolution, the party which has been forged in the international struggle of the working class for proletarian dictatorship. That which Marx fought for has become the cause of the workers' party which is leading millions of the working class and toilers. The Communist International took over from Marx the centralized character of the International Workingmen's Association, but, according to Marx's instructions, it has given this centralized organization the mass character which the First International did not, and could not, have.

Lenin's words in 1913 to the effect that "the coming epoch would bring still more triumphs to Marxism as the doctrine of the proletariat" are confirmed before our own eyes. "The doctrine of Marx is all powerful, because it is true." And this very truth of Marx's doctrine makes it possible for the Communist International headed by Lenin and Stalin, the leaders of the international proletariat, to foresee the trend of development of post-war capitalism, and to base its forecasts scientifically. Is there a single point on which the communists were not right? And is there a single point in the analyses given by the Second International that was ever confirmed by subsequent events? The communists said that after the world imperialist war there would occur a general crisis of capitalism, and that the relative, partial stabilization would be merely a short-lived episode. The communists said that the capitalist world could never avoid cyclic crises, that would assume a more and more acute form, and that they would develop within the framework of the general crisis of capitalism. The social-democrats talked about "organized capitalism," accepted the bourgeois theory of long cycles as the "last word," in the revision of Marx's theory of crisis. The communists said that the extremely fierce agrarian crisis would submerge the small peasants. The social-democrats opposed this assertion and talked about the "stability" of the small peasant farm, and on the basis of this small peasant farm the revisionists built up a whole system of political democracy. The communists said that a phase would occur in the capitalist world, when all capitalist contradictions, both internal and international, would be intensified to the extreme. The social-democrats assured us that an era would dawn of "peaceful" super-imperialism, which would have

no interest in war, and in which there would be a mitigation of internal class contradictions. The communists said that the League of Nations is a weapon for organizing new imperialist wars, for preparing for war behind the "hot air" screen of pacifist phrases. Social-democracy promised the masses to abolish war by means of the League of Nations. The communists said that the capitalist world is developing towards political reaction and fascism, towards open forms of bourgeois dictatorship, that the German social-democratic policy of the "lesser evil" was simply preparing the way for the fascists to seize power. Social-democracy foretold a golden age of democracy after the world imperialist war had finished, when the working class would penetrate into the pores of the bourgeois state and so change it into a democratic working-class state. The communists said that the present crisis, which is becoming intensified on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism, and which puts the heaviest burdens on the shoulders of the toilers, would inevitably increase the wave of revolution throughout the capitalist countries, and that in the weakest links of the capitalist chain it would bring about a rapid maturing of the revolutionary crisis. Social-democracy chattered about the automatic downfall of capitalism, to which Otto Bauer added his own characteristic of the present situation as being a counter-revolutionary situation. Who was right on all these questions? It would appear that the communists were right. But does the advent to power of the fascists in Germany mean the end of the wave of revolution, as Otto Bauer declares? Nonsense! German fascism came to power not in the beginning of capitalist stabilization, not when the tide of revolution was at its ebb, as in the case of Italian

fascism. It has come to power during a mighty world crisis, which shows no sign of abating, at a time when the tide of revolution is rising in all capitalist countries, and first and foremost in Germany. German fascism does not mean the "stabilization" of German capitalism, but just the opposite. It signifies that the elements of the revolutionary crisis in Germany are intensifying and spreading. The German proletariat in numerical strength, and with the skill which it gained during the 1918 revolution, though it ended in failure—is the best proletariat in the capitalist countries, and has created the mightiest Communist Party next to the C.P.S.U. Whoever tries to smash this party will do so to his cost. The five million votes obtained by the Communist Party, in spite of the orgy of fascist terror, are the best proof of the power of resistance of the German proletariat. We can make no guess as to how long the fascists will remain in Germany, but we are convinced that no amount of hysterical speeches on the part of political epileptics can fill up the empty gaps of capitalism. Fascism is now teaching the masses all the rules of civil war and revolution, just as they were taught in 1914-18 by the imperialist war. Political terror cannot save the classes whom history has doomed to destruction.

But social democracy is not alone in the bankruptcy of all its prognoses and forecasts. As the social support of the bourgeoisie, it is merely sharing the common fate of its master. What has become of Hoover's famous report in 1929 on "eternal prosperity"? What has become of all the forecasts of the innumerable bourgeois economic institutes? The bourgeois economists, all the Cassels, Keynes, Schumpeters, Mitchells, are helpless in the face of the violent hurricane; they are totally incapable of

understanding, of explaining, of giving any sane advice to their bewildered governments. "We know more of the velocity of an electron," wrote one influential English bourgeois newspaper, "than we do about the velocity of money. We know far more about the cycle of the earth about the sun and the sun about the universe than we do about the cycle of trade. We can predict the movements of unseen and inconceivably remote, heavenly bodies with vastly greater accuracy, than we can predict the end of the trade slump." (*Manchester Guardian*, January 9, 1931.)

The yawning abyss which, as a result of the crisis, is gaping between the economic basis and its social and political superstructure is driving the representatives of the ruling classes into the nebulous distances of the other world. Once more they are searching for the talisman of salvation in realms of theosophy, reactionary idealism and religious superstitions. Spectres of the past, which have appeared on the political stage, are exorcising the demons and ghosts of religion. Once more the old Prussian god has found a place not only in the ravings of modern representatives of fascism, but in the form of the Prussian policeman, who preaches national culture and the mysticism of the national holy spirit. Like leaves blown hither and thither by a gusty autumn wind, the representatives of the European intelligentsia visiting the U.S.S.R. express astonishment at the purposefulness of our younger generation. More than once they ask the question: what is the source of their vitality, their confidence in the road they have chosen? We can tell them the secret: *It is the Marxist-Leninist outlook which the toilers of our country acquire while working on the mighty socialist construction of the first land of proletarian dictatorship. They are*

sturdy because they have a banner, the banner of Marx and Lenin. They are self-confident, for, like millions of communists of all countries, they have the firm guidance of Stalin, the successor to Marx and Lenin. They are full of active determination for they have an aim, an immediate aim—the world proletarian revolution.

MARXISM — THE BANNER OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

“Uniting as it does the revolutionary workers, who lead the millions of oppressed and exploited against the bourgeoisie and its “socialist” agents, the Communist International regards itself as the historical successor to the “Communist League” and the First International led by Marx, and as the inheritor of the best of the pre-war traditions of the Second International. The First International laid the ideological foundation for the international proletarian struggle for socialism. The Second International, in the best period of its existence, prepared the ground for the expansion of the labour movement among the masses. The Third, Communist International, in continuing the work of the First International, and in accepting the fruits of the Second International, resolutely lopped off the latter’s opportunism, social-chauvinism, and bourgeois distortion of socialism and set out to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this manner the Communist International continues the glorious and heroic traditions of the international Labour movement of the English Chartists and the French insurrectionists of 1831; of the French and German working class revolutionaries of 1848; of the immortal warriors and martyrs of the Paris Commune; of the valiant soldiers of the German, Hungarian and Finnish revolutions; of the workers under the former Tsarist despotism—the victorious bearers of the proletarian dictatorship; of the Chinese proletarians—the heroes of Canton and Shanghai.

Basing itself on the experience of the revolutionary labour movement of all continents and of all

peoples, the Communist International, in its theoretical and practical work, stands wholly and unreservedly upon the ground of revolutionary Marxism, and its further development, Leninism, which is nothing else than Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

Advocating and propagating the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels and employing it as a revolutionary method of conceiving reality, with the view to the revolutionary transformation of this reality, the Communist International wages an active struggle against all forms of bourgeois philosophy and against all forms of theoretical and practical opportunism. Standing on the ground of consistent proletarian class struggle and subordinating the temporary, partial, group and national interests of the proletariat to its lasting, general international interests, the Communist International mercilessly exposes all forms of the doctrine of "class peace" that the reformists have accepted from the bourgeoisie. Expressing the historical need for an international organisation of revolutionary proletarians—the gravediggers of the capitalist order—the Communist International is the only international force that has for its programme the dictatorship of the proletariat and Communism, and that openly comes out as the organiser of the international proletarian revolution."

From "The Programme of the C.I."

Have You Read These?

- Social-Democracy—Stepping-Stone to Fascism, *D. Z. Manuilsky* 10c
- Marxism versus Social-Democracy
Bela Kun 10c
- Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism, *J. Stalin, L. M. Kaganovich,*
and *P. Postyshev* 10c

MARXIST STUDY COURSES

PRICE: 15 CENTS EACH

I. POLITICAL ECONOMY

1. Marxist Theory of Value
2. Capital and Surplus Value (*Part 1*)
3. Capital and Surplus Value (*Part 2*)
4. Wages and the Accumulation of Capital, *Part 1*
5. Wages and the Accumulation of Capital, *Part 2*
6. The Distribution of Surplus Value, *Part 1*
7. The Distribution of Surplus Value, *Part 2*
8. Economic Crises, *Part 1*
9. Economic Crises, *Part 2*

II. HISTORY OF THE WORKING CLASS

1. The Great French Revolution
2. The English Industrial Revolution & Chartism
3. The 1848 Revolution in France and Germany
4. The First International and the Paris Commune

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York City

LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

These little volumes contain Lenin's shorter writings and have become classics in the application of the teachings of Marx to period of modern imperialism.

THE TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX	15c
THE WAR AND THE SECOND INTERNA- TIONAL	20c
SOCIALISM AND WAR	15c
WHAT IS TO BE DONE?	50c
THE PARIS COMMUNE	20c
THE REVOLUTION OF 1905	20c
RELIGION	20c
LETTERS FROM AFAR	15c
THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION	15c
THE APRIL CONFERENCE	20c
THE THREATENING CATASTROPHE AND HOW TO FIGHT IT	20c
WILL THE BOLSHEVIKS RETAIN STATE POWER?	15c
ON THE EVE OF OCTOBER	15c
STATE AND REVOLUTION	30c

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York City