

Must Avoid Pitfalls In Anti-Fascist Fight

By AUGUST THALHEIMER

Due to the fact that the limitations of the united front are not defined, they are often overstepped. An example of this is the so-called "united front government" for years referred to as the "workers government" if the possibility of Communists participating in a Social-Democratic-Communist coalition government on a bourgeois democratic parliamentary basis should arise. The report of Dimitroff as well as the resolution leave room for such a possibility. The Communist Parties are to decide whether or not they will participate in such a government on the basis of the concrete conditions of their respective country. The resolution expressly states that the "united front government" is not yet a proletarian dictatorship, in other words, that it is formed "within the framework of bourgeois democracy". Space forbids us to deal with these questions in their full scope as far as the Russian and German experiences are concerned. We shall confine ourselves here to a few summary remarks.

EXPERIENCE OF 1923

The concept of a "united front government" with Communists participating is refuted by its own premise. One of the pre-suppositions for the formation of such a government, as laid down in the resolution, is the existence of a situation "in which the broad masses of workers revolt against fascism and reaction **BUT ARE NOT YET READY TO TAKE UP THE FIGHT FOR SOVIET POWER.**" If a Social-Democratic-Communist coalition government is formed on the basis of such a situation, such government will, for one thing, pass no real revolutionary measures whatsoever, and for another, the bourgeoisie will immediately begin a fight to the finish and the united front government will break down miserably since the workers are not yet ready to fight for Soviet power, which means that they are not yet ready for an armed uprising. This is the essence of the experiences of 1923 in Germany. The fact that the C.I. has until today failed to make any real criticism of the 1923 events is now having dangerous consequences. The Communist Opposition did this but instead of profiting by it the CI is falling into old errors under the guise of new names.

ON COALITION GOV'T

The "Peoples Front government" is mentioned in the resolution but is not at all discussed. The "Peoples Front government" is nothing but a coalition government with bourgeois parties. The name "Peoples Front" does not change this fact. In the case of such a Peoples Front government it is out of the question that Communists participate in it or that they even demand its formation or support it.

It is necessary to add that the United Front government as well as the Peoples Front government are not necessary stages but mere possibilities according to the resolution. The indication of such possibilities however leads the Communist Party to discuss the formation of parliamentary governments and to its ultimate compromise. We reject the slogans of a united front or Peoples Front government in fascist countries altogether.

On the basis of past experiences and a theoretical analysis of the situation there is the following very slight possibility: under certain conditions, Communists may ask Social Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions to take over the government on the basis of a definite program of action following a

number of successful mass actions, and for Communists to pledge support of such a government inasmuch as it put its program into practice and grants the Communist party full freedom of action.

DEFENSIVE AND OFFENSIVE ACTIONS

It is correct to say that in applying united front tactics we must go from the defensive to the offensive. The following decisive points must be kept in mind, however. This transition must be prepared for by the C.P. organizationally and politically. This in turn requires the propaganda of revolutionary transition slogans: for soviets; for workers control of production; etc. not only in a period of a sharp political crisis but previous to it. This transition is impossible if the C.P. confines itself to the propaganda of partial demands only. The propaganda of revolutionary transition slogans for the preparation of the transition from the defensive to the offensive is an absolutely indispensable stage in revolutionary strategy.

PEOPLES FRONT

The resolution defines the "Peoples Front" as a class alliance between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie. The resolution calls for the "formation of a broad anti-fascist Peoples Front on the basis of the proletarian united front in which the Communist parties come out for all those special demands of these toiling sections (toiling peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie, toiling masses of oppressed nations) which coincide with the fundamental interests of the proletariat."

This is correct and necessary—except that it completely contradicts the Peoples front as constituted in France which is simply a cartel with the Radical Socialist Party, a bourgeois party with a bourgeois program, bourgeois leadership and a petty bourgeois mass following. The French Peoples Front which originated in a parliamentary improvisation is nowhere rejected. Thus there arises a danger of equivocation.

TRADE UNION QUESTION

As far as the trade union question is concerned the resolution calls for the complete liquidation of the ultra-left course—the inevitable result of the practical bankruptcy of a dual unionist course.

It goes without saying that this decision is yet to be applied but it does provide a basis for the fight for a correct trade union policy. Resistance to the execution of these decisions will come from two sides. For one thing, from the members of the Party who sincerely believed in the correctness of the ultra-left course, for another, from the reformist trade union leaders and also from trade union members who have learned to mistrust Communists as a result of 6 years of ultra-leftist tactics in the trade unions. It is evident that correct trade union tactics can be applied only with the aid of those Communists who fought the old course and were not guilty of ultra-leftism, namely, the Communist Opposition.

ORGANIC UNITY

The resolution repeats the conditions already formulated by Dimitroff in his speech for the formation of a united revolutionary party of the proletariat.

(Continued on Page 4)

You are always sure of obtaining the
MOST DELICIOUS FOOD
and
MOST LIBERAL PORTIONS
at

Avoid Dangers In Anti-Fascist Fight

(Continued from Page 2)

These conditions amount to an acceptance of Communist principles and aims. This proposal is exactly the same as the one issued by the CPGO a year and a half ago under the slogan of a "United Communist Party of Germany". This slogan had and has the purpose of eliminating those doubts which Social-Democratic workers moving towards Communism had when asked merely to enter the C.P. This process is facilitated by demanding unification with equal rights on the basis of the Communist program. This is the essence of the thing. The fact that in the proposals of the CP of France and the 7th Congress, for the new united party, the name "Communist" is left out is merely a superfluous gesture which will at most mislead a few Communists.

FASCISM OR DEMOCRACY?

The incorrect statements of Dimitroff that it is no longer a choice between bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship but between bourgeois democracy and fascist dictatorship and that Communists in such a case must defend bourgeois democracy are not repeated in the resolution.

We have here the following formulation: "In its struggle for the defense of bourgeois democratic rights and gains of workers against fascism and for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, the proletariat develops its forces, strengthens its fighting bonds with its allies and centers its struggle on the aim of winning true democracy for the masses—on Soviet power."

This formulation is not incorrect, but in view of the confusion which has been created on the relation of Communism to bourgeois democracy, it is inadequate.

It is necessary to state that Communists do not defend bourgeois democracy

as old guard socialists. When a self-advertised socialist paper can sneer and jeer at class-struggle policies within the unions it merely exposes its extreme reformism and in an inner union sense its dependence on and support of the reactionary (anti-class-struggle) bureaucracy. —G. F. MILES.

**The first returns show a vote of 187 for and 54 against affiliation.*

as such, not even when they defend the democratic rights of workers against the attacks of fascists and reactionaries; that in the struggle against fascism in a bourgeois democratic state democratic rules must be cast off; that the democratic rights of the workers can be defended effectively only thru the revolutionary liquidation of bourgeois democracy which is the origin of fascism; that the transition from bourgeois democracy to the proletarian dictatorship must be prepared for by broad united front organs elected by the masses which grow into soviets. Furthermore, that soviets are the indispensable organs for the preparation and leadership of the revolutionary uprisings.

INNER-PARTY DEMOCRACY

Despite all of these errors, shortcomings, gaps, etc. this resolution could form the starting point for a correct Communist policy provided inner-party democracy is established, thus making for an easy and rapid correction of errors. If, however, this condition is not fulfilled, we predict that this resolution will lead to opportunist deviations in a number of countries. Should this condition be fulfilled, thus enlisting the aid of the most mature and critical elements of the Communist movement, the Communist Opposition, the resolution can become the starting point for the complete liquidation of the ultra-left course in practice, for an effective united front and trade union policy, for the elimination of the errors contained in the resolution.