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of Pacific Coast Dairy vs. the Department of Agriculture had this to say: "Legal refinements are not the worse for having eluded the quick understanding of the layman."

And now, my friends of the Seattle Bar, as we from the provinces go about your fair city, guide us, protect us, abide with us while we hustle around doing the best we can for ourselves under the circumstances.

---

**EVERY CHILD MUST BE TAUGHT COMMUNISM IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**BY TRACY E. GRIFFIN**

I have long believed that Communism should be taught in our Universities. Further study has convinced me that Communism should not only be taught, but must be a required subject of intensive study by the youth of America. Before entering upon this thesis permit me to clear the atmosphere by a personal statement of principles—you may better then evaluate my argument.

I believe that every man and woman in these United States of America has an inalienable right to believe as he will in any political or economic system, form of government or lack of government, God or gods—to believe in Communism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, subject to Article III, section 3 of the Constitution, which states:

*Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.*

I do not believe in witch hunting, driving Communism underground, or at this writing outlawing the Communist Party.

I want to meet the issue in the arena of public opinion and understanding, not in the tunnels, fox holes, and cellars. The underground should be ferreted out and prosecuted for subversive activities. I do not believe that any Communist should be permitted to hold office, high or low, in this country unless duly elected as a Communist.

I believe in the congressional and legislative right of investigation to the end that no Communist shall hold any governmental position—federal or state.

And I believe that Communism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat must be taught in our public schools, both in theory and
certainly in practice, so that every boy and girl who can add two plus two and make it four—not seven come eleven—will see the difference between black and white, feel the distinction between wet and dry, tell an elephant from a mouse, a pig from a wren, will learn, see, feel, and realize the primary, vital, fundamental difference between Communism and the American way of life.

Many psychopaths know the difference between night and day, but are confused by the twilight. The time has come for America to turn the spotlight on the twilight zone.

Now having regaled you with my personal opinion, which is of slight if any moment, let us now discuss the beauty of Communism in theory and its glory in practice.

But first, before calling witnesses, permit me to point out the ghastly thesis on which our government is founded, and for which our forefathers "appealing to the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions" pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

I turn to the Bible—our bible, our Old Testament—the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self evident, That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the Governed. (Preamble)

And the New Testament—the Constitution of the United States:

We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America. (Preamble)

ARTICLE I
All Legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

ARTICLE II
The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States.

ARTICLE III
The Judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court,

and inferior courts as established, with right of trial by jury, plus the first ten Amendments—the people's Bill of Rights.
Such is the puny and abhorrent edifice where every citizen has a direct voice in government, where the executive under the Constitution—and omitting current decisions ignoring the fundamental law—cannot legislate—where there is a complete separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government—where the dignity of the individual is paramount—where the Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The state of a republican form of government which has builded for the welfare of mankind, the American way of life.

One hundred forty-five million people, who, after withdrawing to the banks of the Elbe, waiting sixteen days for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to enter and take Berlin, and thereafter rested, until the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was prepared and almost singlehanded, plus lend lease, completed the downfall of the empire of Japan, all at a time when these anemic Americans under their system of government "exploited and oppressed slaves to the shackles of Imperialism" (the words are Stalin's—not mine) had amassed the most powerful mobile fighting machine the world had ever known—supported by an economic capacity for production beyond that of the world combined—staffed by management and labor of, and I quote (the words are Stalin's—not mine), "'American practicality' that indomitable spirit that does not know nor will not be deterred by any obstacle, that plugs away until with business like perseverance and every impediment has been removed, they simply must go through with a job once it has been tackled. " (F.L. 122.) (Still the words are Stalin's—not mine.)

Yet, peace-loving, our people not being schooled in Marxism-Leninism—our "Leaders"—Yalta, Casablanca, Teheran, Potsdam—we silently folded our tents, not realizing our course of conduct was that of a juvenile delinquent playing hunches, and presently, our arms stacked, we face the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

And now may I present to you the enticing rapture of Communism in theory and its salvation to mankind in practice?

How many of you know anything—anything at all—about Com-
munism as contrasted with the pitiful American way of life—free enterprise, if you will—save as you have read the newspaper headlines, a magazine article by a reformed party member, the moaning of a fellow traveler on the radio, or the touching sentimental handouts "treacling" from some governmental agency, state department, or alphabetical?

You are lawyers. You rely upon the record. You study the briefs. You make findings of fact and reach your conclusions from the evidence. You prefer the written statement rather than the oral evasion.

I propose to deal only with the written record and call the witnesses who made the record. It is their statement of facts—not mine. They testified voluntarily and were not even subjected to cross-examination.

I propose to call witnesses. Not, so please you, from our enlightened State Department, fellow travelers, ex-Communists, professional idealists, congressional committee men, morons, or red herrings. If the court please, my opening statement will be brief—the witnesses will do the testifying.

A man by the name of Hitler—the initial is or was "A"—wrote a book entitled *Mein Kampf* When he testified therein the world gave little heed, except to appease; it did not even prepare. In attempting to implement his testimony by action Adolf Hitler shook the world—and it is still shaking. It will not cease to shake in our time. But, and the point is, he meant to do exactly that which he said he would do, and in the manner he testified he would do it. My witnesses intend to do precisely what they say they will do—and are intelligently doing it.

My witnesses are: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin—the latter's initial is "J." The God of Communism is Marx. Engels is his Collaborator and interpreter. Lenin in turn is the Blackstone-Jefferness of each.

Stalin is his collaborator and interpreter—and, I believe, a party member in good standing. He could almost qualify as an expert but at the same time is really a nice fellow, don't you know?

The Bible of Communism is the *Communist Manifesto* perfected by Marx and Engels in 1848—thirty-six pages. You can purchase it for 10 cents a copy (formerly 5 cents) at the Frontier Bookstore, 902 4th Avenue, Seattle, Washington, U. S. A.
The basic theory of Society as stated in the Communist Manifesto is:

Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat.

The "bourgeoisie" encompasses every state and sovereign power including the United States. The only purpose of this class — the bourgeoisie—is for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

It has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

It has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life.

The Proletariat, on the other hand:

direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves, they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash machinery to pieces, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

The social conditions of the old society no longer exist for the proletariat. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with bourgeois family relations, modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois
prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify, their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others, on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties Formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theory of the Communists may be summed up in one single sentence Abolition of private property:

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois, abolition of individuality and freedom. And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

In a word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so, that is just what we intend.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle class owner of the property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

Abolition of the family. Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you will say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations, when we replace home education by social.

And your education. Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention of society, direct or indirect, by means of schools, etc.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education, they do but seek to alter the char-
acter of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois claptrap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women, it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.

The workingmen have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to establish democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class, and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

The Manifesto lays down ten preliminary steps:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries, gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of child factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.

If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

Is the program laid down by this Bible one to be obtained in its great culmination by peaceful means? Marx and Engels give the answer.

A part of the bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society.

To this section belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organizers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind.

By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of Socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be effected only by a revolution, (but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations, reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labour, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work of bourgeois government)

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

I now quote the final paragraph of the basic document:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly
declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social-conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Workingmen of all countries, unite!

But you still may insist, having listened to the chirping self-styled idealists, that neither Marx nor Engels speaking of "revolution" meant an "armed force," or speaking of "violence" meant more than a slight bit of technical violence now adjudicated in some places as the right of "free speech."

I will endeavor to prove that you are entirely correct.

**Revolution by Force**

Lenin established the basis of Marxism-Leninism in two short books, required reading for the brethren—*State and Revolution* and "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder

Lenin now testifies:

According to Marx, the state is an organ of class domination, an organ of oppression of one class by another; its aim is the creation of 'order' which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the collisions between the classes. (S.R. 9.)

It is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power. (S.R. 9.)

Quoting Engels, Lenin says:

The State is not "abolished," it withers away. (S.R. 16.)

The bourgeois state can only be "put an end to" by a revolution.

That state in general, i.e., most complete democracy, can only "wither away." (S.R. 17.)

We have already said above and shall show more fully later that the teaching of Marx and Engels regarding the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. It cannot be replaced by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through "withering away," but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution. The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this point of view about violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teaching.

The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. (S.R. 19-20.)

The "forgotten words" of Marxism. "the state, that is, the proletariat organised as the ruling class." (S.R. 22.)

Such a course of events compels the revolution "to concentrate all its
"forces of destruction" against the state power, and to regard the problem as one, not of perfecting the machinery of the state, but of breaking up and annihilating it. (S.R. 27)

Marx, says Lenin

fought, not against the proposition that the workers should deny themselves the use of arms, the use of organized force, that is, the use of the state, for the purpose of "breaking down the resistance of the bourgeoisie."

(S.R. 51.)

Marx, says Lenin, was opposed to the argument that after the overthrow of the capitalist the workers ought to "lay down arms," or ought they to use them against the capitalists in order to crush their resistance. (S.R. 52.)

Marx quotes Engels, answering the argument that arms should not be used.

Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? Revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritative thing possible. It is an act in which one section of the population imposes its will on the other by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon, i.e., by highly authoritative means, and the victorious party is inevitably forced to maintain its supremacy by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day had it not relied on the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Are we not, on the contrary, entitled to blame the Commune for not having made sufficient use of this authority? And so either—or either the anti-authoritarians do not know what they are talking about, in which case they merely sow confusion, or they do know, in which case they are betraying the cause of the proletariat. In either case they serve only the interests of reaction. (S.R. 53.)

during the transition from capitalism to Communism, suppression is still necessary

Lenin testifies this will be easy:

is a matter of comparatively so easy, simple and natural that it will cost far less bloodshed. ", etc.

the people can suppress the exploiters even with very simple "machinery," almost without any "machinery," without any special apparatus, by the simple organization of the armed masses.

no special apparatus of repression is needed for this, this will be done by the armed people itself. (S.R. 75.)

We are concerned with the revolution. (S.R. 96.)

the tactics of the Anarchist become the tactics of despair instead of a revolutionary grappling with concrete problems—ruthlessly courageous
and at the same time cognizant of the practical conditions under which the masses progress. (S.R. 98.)

Arguing against peaceful means by way of parliamentary control, Lenin says that such argument is nothing but the most clear and vulgar opportunism, a repudiation of revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words.

We shall go forward to break with the opportunists for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the destruction of bourgeois parliamentarism, for a democratic republic after the type of the Commune, or a republic of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. (S.R. 99.)

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and the most ruthless war waged by the new class against the enemy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and victory over the bourgeoisie is impossible, without a long, stubborn and desperate war of life and death, a war which requires perseverance, discipline, firmness, inflexibility, and unity of will. (L.W 9.)

Speaking of the 1903 revolution in Russian Lenin says:

Of course, we rejected individual acts of terror only out of consideration of expediency. (L.W 18.)

The plan was and is:

transformation of the mass strikes into political strikes, then into revolutionary strikes, and after that, into insurrection. (L.W 20.)

The art of statesmanship (and the correct understanding by a Communist of his tasks) lies in correctly gauging the conditions and the moment when the vanguard of the proletariat can successfully seize power. (L.W 35.)

Note the use of the word "vanguard." I will return to it later.

The struggle must be waged ruthlessly to the very end. (L.W 35.)

Every sacrifice must be made, the greatest obstacles must be overcome, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, stubbornly, insistently, and patiently. (L.W 36.)

For the whole task of the communists is to be able to convince the backward elements, to be able to work among them, and not to fence themselves off from them by artificial and childishly "Left-Wing" slogans. (L.W 37)

Note that Lenin italicizes the simple word "convince."

It follows that for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the class-conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for revolution and
be ready to sacrifice their lives for it, secondly, that the ruling classes be in a state of governmental crisis and makes it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly (L.W 65.)

As to the time—and Lenin italicizes the words—for the final and decisive battle, one must not only ask oneself whether the vanguard of the revolutionary class has been convinced but also whether all classes are aligned in such a way that the decisive battle is fully matured, in such a way that (1) all the class forces hostile to us have become sufficiently confused have sufficiently weakened themselves (a) all the vacillating, wavering, unstable, intermediate elements (are) practical bankruptcy, and that (3) among the proletariat a mass mood in favor of supporting the most determined, unreservedly bold, revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie has arisen and begins to grow powerfully Then, indeed, revolution is ripe, then, indeed, if we have correctly gauged all the conditions outlined above and if we have chosen the moment rightly, our victory is assured. (L.W 73-74.)

Stalin writing two volumes—Foundations of Leninism and Problems of Leninism—drives the lesson home from a rather practical point of view

Stalin testifies:

Are not the foundations of the theory and tactics of Leninism suitable and obligatory for the proletarian parties of all countries? Was Lenin wrong when he spoke of the “International significance”? (P.L. 9)

As a premise Stalin quotes Lenin (Collected Works, Vol. 22, pp. 315-317, Russian edition)

“International imperialism, with all the might of its capital and its highly organized military technique, which represents a real force, a real fortress of international capital, could under no circumstances, under no possible conditions, live side by side with the Soviet republic, both because of its objective situation and because of the economic interests of the capitalist class which was incorporated in it, it could not do this because of commercial ties and of international financial relationships. A conflict is inevitable. This is the greatest difficulty of the Russian Revolution, its greatest historical problem the necessity to solve international problems, the necessity to call forth the world revolution.”

“Such,” testified Stalin “is the inner character and the basic idea of the proletarian revolution.”

Can such a radical transformation of the old bourgeois system of society be achieved without a violent revolution without the dictatorship of the proletariat?
Obviously not. To think that such a revolution can be carried out peacefully within the framework of bourgeois democracy means one of two things. It means either madness, and the loss of normal human understanding, or else an open and gross repudiation of the proletarian revolution.

That is why Lenin states that "the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power." (P.L. 20.)

Stalin now quotes Lenin (Collected Works, Vol. 24, p. 122, Russian edition)

"We are living," Lenin writes, "not merely in a state but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove it also by military organization." (P.L. 66.)

Stalin's single paragraph in comment is, "Clear, one would think!" (P.L. 67)

Stalin quotes Lenin again on world revolution:

"Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organised its own socialist production (My italics—J.S.), would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity, come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states." (Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, p. 272.) (P.L. 69.)

Again he quotes and states, "My italics—J. S."

"The existence of two diametrically opposed social systems gives rise to the constant menace of capitalist blockade, or other forms of economic pressure, of armed intervention, of restoration. Consequently, nothing but a victorious socialist revolution in a number of countries can provide the guarantee for the final victory of socialism, that is to say, guarantees against restoration. Leninism teaches that the final victory of socialism, in the sense of full guarantee against the restoration of bourgeois relations, is possible only on an international scale." (P.L. 71.)

Imperialism has not only made revolution a practical necessity; it has created favorable conditions for a direct attack on the citadels of capitalism. (F.L. 13.)

In the chapter on "The Method" for world revolution in Founda-
tions of Leninism, Stalin is contemptuous of his contemporaries who sought:

to "kill" capitalism by legal means. (F.L. 18.)

Instead of a revolutionary policy we saw the paltry dickerings of politicians. (F.L. 19.)

to a new revolutionary spirit in the education and preparation of the masses for the revolutionary struggle. (F.L. 20.) (Note the word "Party")

The opportunists say that the proletariat cannot and ought not to seize power if it does not itself constitute a majority in the country. No proofs are adduced for this absurd thesis that cannot be justified either theoretically or practically (F.L. 20.)

But suppose an historic situation arises (war, agrarian crises, etc.) in which the proletariat, a minority of the population, is able to rally around itself the vast majority of the working masses, why, should it not seize power then? Why should it not profit by the favorable internal and international situation to pierce the front of capitalism and hasten the general debacle? (F.L. 21.)

Answering the argument that under such circumstances the proletariat could not retain power, Stalin says in agreement with Lenin:

why not reverse the position and first seize power, create favorable conditions for the development of the proletariat and advance with seven league strides to raise the cultural level of the working masses and form cadres of leaders and administrators recruited from amongst the workers? (F.L. 21.)

He castigates the Second International (don't confuse it with the Third International as an "instrument of peace," and not of war.) (F.L. 30.)

Agreeing with Lenin, he says, speaking of the Russian Revolution.

"And if we succeed the revolutionary conflagration will encompass Europe; the European worker, wearied to exhaustion under the bourgeois reaction, will rise in his turn and show us 'how it is done', then the revolutionary upsurge in Europe will react upon Russia and we will find that an epoch of several revolutionary years has been prolonged to an epoch covering several revolutionary decades." (F.L. 38)

"The fundamental law of revolution that the exploiters should not be able to live and rule as of old. Revolution is impossible without a general national crisis affecting both the exploited and the exploiter (Emphasis mine—J.S.) (F.L. 42.)

It is therefore the essential task of the victorious revolution in one
country to develop and support the revolution in others.
Lenin has tersely expressed this thought by saying that the task of the victorious revolution consists in doing the "utmost attainable in one country for the development, support and stirring up of the revolution in all countries." (F.L. 43.)

Quoting Lenin, Stalin says:

The question of power is the fundamental question of revolution. The seizure of power is only the beginning. Therefore, the important thing is to retain power, to consolidate it and make it invincible. What is required to attain this end? At least three main tasks confronting the proletariat "on the morrow" of its victory must be fulfilled. They are: (a) to break the resistance of the landed proprietors and capitalists now overthrown and expropriated by the revolution, and to liquidate every attempt they make to restore the power of capital, (b) to organise construction in such a way as will rally all toilers around the proletariat and prepare the way for the liquidation, the extinction of classes, (c) to arm the revolution and to organise the army of the revolution for the struggle against the external enemy and for the struggle against imperialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary in order to carry out and fulfill these tasks. (F.L. 45.)

The aim of the Revolution in Russia is

consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a fulcrum for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The revolution goes beyond the confines of one country and the period of world revolution commences. (F.L. 88.)

strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves.'

'While the aim of strategy is to win the war, let us say against tsarism or against the bourgeoisie to its bitter end. Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinate and subservient to it.

Stalin lists

Local political strikes, political demonstrations, the general political strike, the boycott of the Duma, insurrection, revolutionary fighting slogans. " (F.L. 89.)

I trust you are now convinced by the testimony of the principal characters that Communism, Marxism-Leninism does not mean the overthrow of government by force.

In any event you realize that the new world government thus peacefully established will be the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. And by the Dictatorship of the proletariat we, of course, mean gov-
ernment by the great mass of humanity, the great and over-all majority of all the peoples, of all classes—except, of course, the bourgeoisie.

I will endeavor to demonstrate that you are absolutely right in that conclusion; at least before deduction of taxes.

**Dictatorship of the Proletariat**

Beginning with Engels on Marx we return to Lenin—*State and Revolution*. Says Engels:

The proletariat seizes state power. (S.R. 15.)

Says Lenin.

In the first place, Engels at the very outset of his argument says, that in assuming state power, the proletariat by that very act, "puts an end to the state as the state." (S.R. 16.)

It follows that the state must be replaced by a special repressive force of the proletariat for the suppression of the bourgeoisie (the dictatorship of the proletariat.) (S.R. 17)

The doctrine of the class struggle, as applied by Marx to the question of the state and of the Socialist revolution, leads inevitably to the recognition of the political rule of the proletariat, of its dictatorship, i.e., of a power shared with none and relying directly upon the armed force of the masses. (S.R. 23.)

Later I will tell you what portion of the masses are actually "armed."

The proletariat needs state power, the centralised organisation of force, the organisation of violence, both for the purpose of crushing the resistance of the exploiters and for the purpose of guiding the great mass of the population—the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie, the semi proletarians—in the work of organising Socialist economy (S.R. 23.)

The main point in the teaching of Marx is the class struggle. A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (S.R. 31.)

The transition from capitalism to Communism will certainly bring a great variety and abundance of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be only one—the dictatorship of the proletariat. (S.R. 31.)

Lenin states that Marx welcomed the French Revolution as the beginning of "The mass revolutionary movement." (S.R. 32.)

The transition from capitalist society, developing toward Communism, toward a Communist Society, is impossible without a "political transition period," and the state in this period can only be "the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (S.R. 71.)
Contending against general strikes as not being sufficient for revolution and which were advocated by some of Lenin's contemporaries, he says:

But we shall go forward to break with these traitors to Socialism, and we shall fight for complete destruction of the old state machinery, in such a way that the armed proletariat itself is the government. (S.R. 99.)

Stalin now defines "Leninism":

Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution, or, to be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. (F.L. 8.)

As an aside at this point it is interesting to quote another observation of Mr. Stalin on "Leninism"

Leninism has broadened the conception of self-determination, and interprets it as the right of the oppressed peoples in dependent countries and colonies to complete separation, as the right of nations to independent existence as states. This has precluded the possibility of annexations being justified on the grounds that the right of self-determination merely means the right to autonomy. (F.L. 74).

Complying with his own definition of broadened conception the Soviet Union has only annexed some 270,000 square miles in Europe and Asia with a population of 24,000,000 people and reduced to vassal states in eastern and southern Europe some 600,000 square miles with a population of 100,000,000 people.

Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed it, that the national question can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution and that the road to victory in the West leads through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national question is part and parcel of the general question of the proletarian revolution and of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (F.L. 75-76.)

"The various demands of democracy," writes Lenin, "including the right of self-determination, are not absolute in themselves, but are particles of the general democratic (now general socialist) world movement. In certain concrete instances a particle may contradict the whole in which case it must be cast off." (F.L. 77)

Leninism proceeds from the following postulates:

(a) the world is divided into two camps.

(e) the interests of the proletarian movement in the advanced countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies require that
these two aspects of the revolutionary movement shall form a united front against the common enemy, against imperialism,

(f) The victory of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of the united revolutionary front. (F.L. 79)

Lennism is a school of theory and practice which trains a special type of worker for the Party and the state and creates a special Leninist style. What are the special features (a) the wide outlook of the Russian revolutionist and (b) American practicality (F.L. 121.)

The peasants, the largest class and the great majority of the people in Russia, are not part of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The peasants, says Stalin, are the “Proletariat’s greatest reserve Power.” (F.L. 42.)

“Some think that the fundamental thing in Lennism is the peasant question, that the point of departure in Lennism is the question of the peasantry, its role, its relative importance. This is absolutely incorrect. The fundamental question in Lennism, its point of departure, is not the peasant question but the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the conditions under which it can be won, of the conditions under which it can be consolidated. The peasant question, as the question of the ally of the proletariat in its struggle for power, is a secondary question resulting from the fundamental question. (P.L. 10.)

Of course, the peasant question, as the question dealing with the ally of the proletariat, is of the greatest significance to the proletariat. (P.L. 11.)

Hence the practical deduction, that the toiling masses of the peasantry must be supported in their struggle against slave drivers and exploiters, in their struggle for deliverance from their misery and oppression. This does not mean, of course, that the proletariat should support any and every peasant movement. (F.L. 60.)

Stalin to his own satisfaction explains the 1905 revolution.

the peasantry saw the necessity to fall in line with and accept the guidance of this courageous leader of the revolution, the revolutionary proletariat.” (F.L. 64.)

Stalin quotes Lenin.

The state is in possession of the principal means of production, power in the state is in the hands of the proletariat, this proletariat is allied with the many millions of small peasants, the proletariat’s leadership over the peasantry is assured. etc. (F.L. 71.)

Lennism is right in regarding the masses of toiling peasants as the reserve of the proletariat. (F.L. 72.)
As to Russia, writing of strategy and tactics, Stalin says:

The main force of the revolution the proletariat. Immediate reserve. the peasantry. (F.L. 87)

It is precisely because the town does lead the country, and because in the town we have the rule of the proletariat, which holds all the key positions of national economy, it is precisely for this reason that the development of peasant economy must proceed by another path, the path of socialist construction. (P.L. 81.)

We are told that our peasantry, by its very position, is not socialistic, and, therefore, is incapable of socialist development. It is true, of course, that the peasantry, by its very position, is not socialistic. But this does not prove that the peasant farms cannot develop along the socialist lines, if it can be shown that the country follows the town, and that socialist industry is predominate in the town. The peasants, by their position, were not socialistic at the time of the October Revolution and they did not by any means want the establishment of socialism in our country. (P.L. 82.)

So the peasantry are not a part of the proletariat or a part of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

the proletarian revolution removes all groups of exploiters from power, and places in power the leader of all the toilers and exploited, the class of proletarians. " (P.L. 17)

The class which has seized political power has done so conscious of the fact that it has seized power alone. (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 26, Russian edition.) (P.L. 22.)

This does not mean, however, that the rule of this one class, the class of the proletarians, which does not and cannot share this rule with any other class, does not need an alliance with the toiling and exploited masses of other classes for the attainment of its objectives.

This special form of alliance lies in the fact that the leading force of this alliance is the proletariat, that the leader in the state, the leader within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a single party, the party of the proletariat, the party of the Communists, which does not and cannot share that leadership with other parties. (P.L. 22.)

Lenin’s proposition, says Stalin, is:

*The supreme principle of the dictatorship* is the preservation of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, in order that the proletariat may continue to retain the leading role and state power. (P.L. 24.)

it by no means follows that during the period of construction, the coercive side of the dictatorship has fallen away, or can fall away. The organs of supression, the army and other organisations, are as necessary
now in the period of construction as they were during the civil war period. (P.L. 27)

"Its quintesence (i.e., of the dictatorship—J.S.) lies in the organisation and discipline of the advanced detachments of the toilers, of their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat. " (P.L. 26—Lenn.)

"The dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily include the concept of violence. There is no dictatorship without violence if dictatorship is to be understood in the strict sense of the term. Lenin defines the dictatorship of the proletariat as "power based directly on violence." (Collected Works, Vol. 19 ) (P.L. 39-40.)

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle," Lenin says further, "sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit of millions and of tens of millions is a terrible force. Without an iron party steeled in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all who are honest in the given class (My italics—J.S.), without a party capable of keeping track of and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully" (Ibid. pp. 28-29.) (P.L. 42.)

It is precisely because the town does lead the country, and because in the town we have the rule of the proletariat, which holds all the key positions of national economy, it is precisely for this reason that the development of peasant economy must proceed by another path, the path of socialist construction. (P.L. 81.)

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the chief fulcrum of the proletarian revolution. (F.L. 44.)

"The question of power is the fundamental question of the revolution." (Lenn) The seizure of power is only the beginning therefore the important thing is to retain power, to consolidate it and make it invincible the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary in order to carry out and fulfill these tasks." (F.L. 44-45.)

"You will have to go through 15, 20 or even 50 years of civil and international war."—(Marx) (F.L. 47 )

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the fiercest, sharpest and most merciless war. " (Lenn) (F.L. 47 )

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not a mere change of government but a new state, with new organs of power, both central and local, it is the proletarian state which has risen upon the ruins of the old state.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on violence against the bourgeoisie. (F.L. 49.)

The state is an instrument in the hands of the ruling class to break the resistance of its class enemies. In this respect the dictatorship of the proletariat in no way differs, in essence from the dictatorship of any other class, for the proletarian state is an instrument for the suppression of the bourgeoisie. Yet there is an essential difference between the two, which is that all class states that have existed heretofore have been dic-
tatorships of an exploiting minority over the exploited majority, whereas the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the exploited majority over an exploiting minority.

The proletarian revolution must not merely “transfer the military-bureaucratic apparatus from one hand to the other.” (Marx F.L. 51.)

To put it briefly: the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination THAT IS UN-TRAMMELED BY LAW AND BASED ON VIOLENCE AND ENJOYS the sympathy and support of the toiling and exploited masses. (Cf. Lenin, State and Revolution.) (F.L. 49-50.)

I trust the witnesses have established that the Dictatorship of the proletariat limited to the leaders of the toilers, and excluding the bourgeoisie, the peasants, middle classes and all others, includes the great majority of all the peoples of any country, and eventually all of the peoples of the world.

There may have been some intimation in the testimony, such as the transfer of power to the proletariat, that such power would be exercised by state machinery

And you are doubtless in accord that there must be a state of some sort or other. Right again, but such is not the “theory” of Marxism-Leninism. The “practice” of Stalin is another matter.

The State

Lenin testifies that Marx’s basic idea of

The state is the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. (S.R. 89.)

According to Marx, the state is an organ of class domination, the organ of oppression of one class by another. (S.R. 9.)

Lenin interrogates:

What does this power mainly consist of? It consists of special bodies of armed men who have at their disposal prisons, etc. A standing army and police are the chief instruments of the state power. (S.R. 10.)

The state is a “special repressive force.” (S.R. 17)

Again he says the

“forgotten words” of Marxism. (are) “the state, i.e., the proletariat organised as the ruling class.” (S.R. 22.)

Further, the substance of the teachings of Marx about the state is assimilated only by one who understands the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for any class society generally but the essence will
inevitably be only one the dictatorship of the proletariat. (S.R. 31.)

Marx's idea is that the working class must break up, shatter the "ready-made state machinery," and not confine itself merely taking possession of it. (S. R. 33.)

To replace this machinery by "the proletariat organised as the ruling class," by "establishing democracy"—such was the answer of the Communist Manifesto. S.R. 35.)

"The first decree of the Commune was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people" says Marx. (S.R. 36.)

But to break up at once the old bureaucratic machine and to start immediately the construction of a new one which will enable us gradually to reduce all officialdom to naught—this is no Utopia, it is the experience of the Commune, it is the direct and urgent task of the revolutionary proletariat. (S.R. 42.)

Lenin testifies that

Marx agrees with Proudhon (leader of the Anarchists) in that they both stand for the "destruction" of the contemporary state machinery Marx is a centralist. Only people full of petty bourgeois "superstitious faith" in the state can mistake the destruction of the bourgeois state for the destruction of centralism. (S.R. 46.)

Stalin quotes Lenin approvingly as follows:

"...both in England and America, the "preliminary condition of any real people's revolution," is the break-up, the shattering of the "available ready-made state machinery," brought in those countries, between 1914 and 1917, to general "European" imperialist perfection. (F.L. 52.)"

"For once we find Lenin using the term "freedom"

Marx splendidly grasped this essence of capitalist democracy, when, in analysing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed were allowed, once every few years, to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class should be in parliament to represent and repress them! (S.R. 73.)

Only now can we appreciate the full correctness of Engel's remarks in which he mercilessly ridiculed all the absurdity of combining the "freedom" and "state." While the state exists there is no freedom. When there is freedom, there will be no state. (S.R. 79)

We have seen what Marx means—that the working class must shatter, break up, blow up the whole state machinery (S.R. 89.)

Marx and Engels, from 1852 to 1891—for forty years—taught the proletariat that it must break up the state machinery (S.R. 89.)

Any other view of Marx, says Lenin, is "obsolete" and contrary to the program of the Communist Manifesto. (S.R. 90.)
You will note that in his discussion of the state Lenin on Marx and Engels is endeavoring to explain, among other things, the phrase "the state withers away" to the end that there will be no state.

"The current popular conception, if one may say so, of the "withering away" of the state undoubtedly means a slurring over, if not a negation, of revolution."

Yet, such an "interpretation" is the crudest distortion of Marxism. (S.R. 16.)

What withers away from the revolution is the proletarian state or semi-state.

The bourgeois state can only be "put to an end" by a revolution.

The state in general, i.e., most complete democracy, can only "wither away." (S.R. 17)

We have

"transformation of quantity into quality" into something which is no longer really the state in the accepted sense of the word. And, once the majority of the people itself suppresses its oppressors, a "special force" for suppression is no longer necessary. In this sense the state begins to "wither away." (S.R. 37).

The exploiters are, naturally, unable to suppress the people without a most complex machinery for performing this task; but the people can suppress the exploiters even with very simple "machinery," almost without any "machinery," without any special apparatus, by the simple organisation of the armed masses (such as the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, we may remark, anticipating a little.)

Finally, only Communism renders the state absolutely unnecessary, for there is no one to be suppressed—"no one" in the sense of a class, in the sense of a systematic struggle with a definite section of the population. (S.R. 75.)

With their withering away, the state will also wither away. (S.R. 75.)

The state will be able to wither away completely when society has realised the rule. 'From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs,' i.e., when people have become accustomed to observe the fundamental rules of social life, and their labour is so productive, that they voluntarily work according to their ability. (S.R. 79-80.)

For when all have learned to manage, and independently are actually managing by themselves social production, keeping accounts, controlling the idlers, the gentlefolk, the swindlers and similar "guardians of capitalist traditions," when the escape from this national accounting and control will inevitably become so increasingly difficult, such a rare exception, and will probably be accompanied by swift and severe punishment (for the armed workers are men of practical life, not sentimental intellectuals, and they will scarcely allow any one to trifle with them), that very soon the necessity of observing the simple, fundamental rules
of every-day social life in common will have become a habit.
The door will then be wide open for the transition from the first phase
of Comunist society to its higher phase, and along with it to the com-
plete withering away of the state. (S.R. 84-85.)

Under Socialism, all will take a turn in management, and will soon
become accustomed to the idea of no managers at all. (S.R. 98.)

Socialism will shorten the working day, raise the masses to a new
life, create such conditions for the majority of the population as to en-
able everybody, without exception, to perform “state functions,” and
this will lead to a complete withering away of every state in general.
(S.R. 99.)

However, Mr. Stalin has some very brief comments upon doing
away with the state:

The state is an instrument in the hands of the ruling class to break the
resistance of its class enemies. In this respect the dictatorship of the pro-
letariat in no way differs, in essence, from the dictatorship of any other
class, for the proletarian state is an instrument for the suppression of
the bourgeoisie. Yet there is an essential difference between the two,
which is that all class states that have existed heretofore have been dic-
tatorships of an exploiting minority over the exploited majority, where-
as the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the exploited
majority over an exploiting minority.

To put it briefly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination
of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination that is untrammel-
led by law and based on violence and enjoys the sympathy and support
of the toiling and exploited masses. (Cf. Lenin, State and Revolution.)
(F.L. 49-50.)

Stalin points out that even Lenin believed in the necessity for a
state. He quotes Lenin:

“The proletarian revolution is impossible without the violent destruc-
tion of the machinery of the bourgeois state and its replacement by new
machinery” (The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky)
(F.L. 53.)

In his Problems of Leninism, page 85, Stalin concludes that a
state is necessary—

and without which no socialist construction is conceivable. (P.L. 85.)

Now we have the state back again. But what of democracy—to
us a Republican form of government?

To Lenin and Stalin we are a democracy and referred to as such.
Certainly they worship democracy and want to bring it about for
the entire world. You know that. And you, of course, are again correct. They love and respect democracy I will prove it by the witnesses.

**Democracy**

A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism and therefore, once capital has gained control of this very best shell, it establishes its power so securely, so firmly that no change, either of persons, or institutions, or parties in the bourgeois republic can shake it. (S.R. 14.)

We are in favor of a democratic republic as the best form of the state for the proletariat under capitalism, but we have no right to forget that wage slavery is the lot of the people even in the most democratic bourgeois republic. Furthermore, every state is a “special repressive force” for the suppression of the oppressed class. (S.R. 18.)

There can be no “peaceful development of democracy” (S.R. 22.)

Both in England and America, the greatest and last representatives of Anglo Saxon “liberty” in the sense of the absence of militarism and bureaucracy, have today (1917) plunged headlong into the all-European dirty, bloody morass of military bureaucratic institutions. (S.R. 34.)

To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and oppress the people through parliament—this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in the parliamentary-constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics. (S.R. 40.)

Engels emphasizes again and again that not only in a monarchy, but also in a democratic republic, the state, i.e., retains its fundamental and characteristic feature of transforming the officials, “the servants of society,” its organs, into the masters of society. (S.R. 64.)

under capitalism, fully consistent democracy is impossible, while under Socialism all democracy withers away. (S.R. 65.)

Lennin quotes Engels on Marx:

the ultimate political aim is to overcome the whole state, and therefore democracy as well. (S.R. 67)

In the current arguments about the state, the mistake is constantly made against which Engels cautions here, and which we have indicated above, namely, it is constantly forgotten that the destruction of the state means also the destruction of democracy; that the withering away of the state also means the withering away of democracy (S.R. 68.)

No, democracy is not identical with the subordination of the minority to the majority. Democracy is a state recognizing the subordination of the minority to the majority, i.e., an organisation for the systematic use of violence by one class against the other, by one part of the population against another. (S.R. 68.)
In lieu of Democracy according to the witness,

We set ourselves the ultimate aim of destroying the state, i.e., every organised and systematic violence, every use of violence against man in general. We do not expect the advent of an order of society in which the principle of subordination of minority to majority will not be observed. But, striving for Socialism, we are convinced that it will develop into Communism, that, side by side with this, there will vanish all need for force, for the 

(subjection) of one man to another, and of one part of the population to another, since people will grow accustomed to observing the elementary conditions of social existence without force and without subjection. (S.R. 68.)

Marx splendidly grasped this essence of capitalist democracy, when, in analysing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed were allowed, once every few years, to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class should be in parliament to represent and repress them! (S.R. 72-73.)

Speaking of “capitalistic democracy” — our democracy, if you please, always remembering it is a republican form of government, Lenin says:

We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage slavery; their resistance must be broken by force, it is clear that where there is suppression there is also violence, there is no liberty, no democracy (S.R. 73.)

Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e., exclusion from democracy of the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the modification of democracy during the transition from capitalism to Communism. (S.R. 73.)

Democracy is of great importance for the working class in its struggle for freedom against the capitalists. But democracy is by no means a limit one may not overstep, it is only one of the stages in the course of development from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to Communism.

Democracy means equality The great significance of the struggle of the proletariat for equality, and the significance of equality as a slogan, are apparent, if we correctly interpret it as meaning the abolition of classes. But democracy means only formal equality (S.R. 82.)

The abolition of classes not only means driving out the landlords and capitalists—that we accomplished with comparative ease—it means also getting rid of the small commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out or crushed. " (L.W 28.)

As long as the bourgeoisie is in power, as long as a small scale economy and petty commodity production exist will impede proletarian work both outside and inside the working class movement. " (L.W 94.)
Stalin agrees:

"For of small-scale production there still remains in the world, unfortunately, a very great deal, and small-scale production gives birth to capitalism and bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, in an elemental fashion, and on a mass scale. To abolish classes means not only to drive out the landlords and capitalists—these we have abolished with comparative ease—it means also to get rid of petty commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out or crushed. There must be an understanding with them, they can (and should) be remoulded and restrained only by very slow, gradual, cautious organisational work." (Left Communism) (F.L. 46,47)

Stalin again:

Democracy under the capitalist system is capitalist democracy, the democracy of an exploiting minority based upon the curtailment of the rights of the exploited majority and directed against this majority. Only under the dictatorship of the proletariat is real "freedom" for the exploited and real participation in the administration of the country by the proletarians and peasants possible. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat democracy is proletarian democracy—the democracy of the exploited majority based upon the limitation of the rights of an exploiting minority and directed against this minority. (F.L. 51.)

In western Europe and America parliament has become an object of special hatred to the advanced revolutionaries of the working class. L.W 45-46.

Communists should participate in parliament, should from within parliament help the masses of the workers to elect the weaker to defeat the strong. (L.W 64.)

It should propose "compromises" with the weaker to defeat the strong. (L.W 66.)

From this follow two very important practical conclusions: first, that the revolutionary class, in order to fulfil its task, must be able to master all forms or sides of social activity without exception (and complete after the capture of political power, sometimes at great risk and amidst very great dangers, what it did not complete before the capture of power), second, that the revolutionary class must be ready to pass from one form to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner. (L.W 75.)

"Only the soviet state organisation can definitely destroy at one blow the old, i.e., the bourgeois administrative and judicial apparatus." (F.L. 56.)

And for himself Stalin testifies:

The Soviet power combines the legislative and executive functions in a single state body and replaces territorial electoral divisions by units of
production, i.e., factories and workshops, and thereby connects the workers and the labouring masses in general directly with the apparatus of state administration and teaches them how to administer the country (F.L. 56.)

This is perhaps a good place to settle the "housing problem."

this much at least is certain, that in the large towns there are already enough dwelling houses, if these were made rational use of, to immediately relieve any real "housing shortage." This, of course, can only be done by the expropriation of the present owners and by quartering in their houses workers who are homeless or are excessively overcrowded in their present quarters, and as soon as the proletariat has conquered political power, such a measure, demanded in the interests of public welfare, would be as easy to carry through as other expropriations and quarterings by the state of today (S.R. 49.)

And lawyers are taken care of as well:

In Russia we abolished, and rightly abolished, the bourgeois legal Bar, but it is reviving in the guise of "Soviet," "legal defenders." (L.W 93.)

I trust the testimony has convinced you that Democracy and Communism are one.

Now then, what is Communism? Without having examined the record you know what it is, or do you?

Communism

"Communism," says Marx, "has just come into the world out of the womb of capitalism." It is the "first, or lower, phase of Communist society" (S.R. 76.) "Equality seems to reign supreme." (S.R. 76.)

At this stage

a form of state is still necessary, which, while maintaining public ownership of the means of production, would preserve the equality of labour and equality in the distribution of products.

For the complete extinction of the state, complete Communism is necessary (S.R. 78.)

At this

high stage of development of Communism (1) when the antagonism between mental and physical labor disappears.

The state will be able to wither away completely when society has realized the rule "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs," i.e., when people have become accustomed to observe
the fundamental rules of social life, and their labor is so productive, that they voluntarily work according to their ability. (S.R. 79.)

Until the "higher" phase of Communism arrives, the Socialists demand the strictest control, by society and by the state, of the quantity of labour and the quantity of consumption, only this control must start with the expropriation of the capitalists, with the control of the workers over the capitalists, and must be carried out not by a state of bureaucrats, but by a state of armed workers. S.R. 80.)

The

historical mission of the Soviets (is) to be the gravedigger. L.W 70.)

The main task of contemporary Communism in Western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path, or the particular turn of events that will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last and great revolutionary struggle. (L.W 76.)

The very purpose of the existence of Communists in the world, adherents of the Third International in all countries, is to change all along the line into new communist work. (L.W 77.)

In England, also, it is necessary to organize in a new way the work of propaganda, agitation and organization among the armed forces (L.W 78.)

We do not know which spark will kindle the conflagration (L.W 79.)

In all countries Communism must establish

the emancipation of the oppressed people from the yoke of imperialism (F.L. 81.)

to implant true internationalism the future union of all nations in a single world economic system. (F.L. 82.)

In a word, Communism is the Dictatorship of the Proletarian. Russia Today is the World of Tomorrow

You know that the Communists intend to, reach their objective by peaceful means as heretofore related, and, of course, in an open, honest, straightforward manner. You are correct as usual.

The witnesses testify:

The Straightforward Path

True, the Communists have

strenuously fought for and preserved the viewpoint that it is obligatory to combine legal and illegal forms of struggle, that it is obligatory to
participate even in the most reactionary parliament and in a number
of other institutions that are restricted by reactionary laws (insurance
societies, etc.). (L.W 21.)

"It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if
need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, manoeuvres, and illegal methods,
to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions,
to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all
costs. (L.W 38.)

when conditions are such that it is often necessary to hide "leaders" underground, the development of good, reliable, experienced and
authoritative "leaders" is an especially hard task, and these difficulties
cannot be successfully overcome without combining legal with illegal
work, without setting the "leaders," among other ways, also on the par-
liamentary arena. (L.W 47.)

Every effort must be made to save the Left Communists and the west
European and American revolutionaries, devoted to the working class
from deviation from Marxism. (L.W 53.)

there inevitably will be—class representatives who do not think
and are incapable of thinking. (L.W 51.)

To tie one's hands beforehand, openly to tell the enemy, who is now
better armed than we, whether and when we shall fight him is being
stupid, not revolutionary "

those politicians of the revolutionary class who are unable "to
manoeuvre, to compromise" in order to avoid an obviously disadvan-
tageous battle are good for nothing. (L.W 58.)

In

parliament and every other type of reactionary institution, you must
work inside them, precisely because in them there are still workers who
are stupefied by the priests and by the desolateness of village life, other-
wise you run the risk of becoming mere babblers. (L.W 42.)

Answering the opposition—for example, Parkhurst in England who
advocated honest action without compromise—Lenin scorns:

the authors of the thesis have become utterly confused and they have
forgotten the experience of many, if not all, revolutions, which proves
how particularly useful during a revolution is the coordination of mass
action outside of reactionary parliament with an opposition inside the
parliament which sympathises with (or better still directly supports)
the revolution. (L.W 44.)

Boycott must be studied in connection with International "Commu-
nist tactics." (L.W 45.)

Lenin argues that it is impossible
to bring about victory of the Soviets over parliament without getting
our "Soviet" politicians into parliament, without disrupting parliament-
arism fromwithin, without preparing the ground within Parliament for the success of the Soviets’ forthcoming task of dispersing parliament. (L.W 61.)

And if objection is raised:
these tactics are too “subtle” or too complicated, the masses will not understand them. I will reply don’t put the blame for your dogmatism upon the masses! (L.W 68.)

It is the very important business and task of the Communist who wants to be not merely a class conscious, convinced and ideological propagandist, but a practical leader of the masses in revolution to take them into account, to determine the moment when the inevitable conflicts between these “friends” which will weaken all the “friends” taken together and render them impotent, will have completely matured. It is necessary to combine the strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism with the ability to make all necessary practical compromises, to “tack,” to make agreements, zig-zags, retreats and so on, in order to accelerate the coming into political power. (L.W 74.)

Of those more friendly to Communism:
The Associated Press announced on September 30th, 1948, that the so-called Progressive Party had withdrawn thirteen of its candidates for the House, so as to elect Democratic nominees who “have now turned to a much more constructive liberal path;” the candidates withdrawn included those opposing representative Helen Gahagan Douglas and Chet Holifield in California, and Savage in the Third District in Washington.

revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of illegal struggle are very bad revolutionaries. (L.W 76.)

While Stalin manifestly believes in direct action he approves the Lenin method:

On the other hand, the Socialist of a small nation must place the weight of emphasis in his agitation upon the second half of our general formula. the “voluntary association” of nations. He can, without violating his duties as an internationalist, favour both the political independence of his own nation, and its inclusion in neighbouring states—X, Y, Z, etc. But in every instance he must fight against petty national narrowness, aloofness and insularity, he must fight for the whole and the general, for the subordination of particular interests to general interests.

People who have not thought over the question properly see a “contradiction” between the duty of Socialists of the oppressor nations to insist upon the “right of secession” and the duty of Socialists of the oppressed nations to insist upon the “right of union.” But a little re-
Reflection will convince them that there is no other road to internationalism and to the fusion of nations, that there is no other road which leads to this goal from the present position, nor can there be any other. (The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up, Collected Works, First Russian Edition, Vol. XIX, pp. 166-198.) (L.W 83, 84.)

The fatal error of the Second International lies not in having adopted the tactics of utilising in its time the parliamentary forms of struggle, but in overestimating the importance of these forms. (F.L. 85-96.)

What is the difference between revolutionary tactics and reformist tactics? Some are of the opinion that Lemnism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromises and to agreements in general. That is absolutely untrue. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that "every little bit helps," that under certain conditions reforms in general, and compromises and agreements in particular, are necessary and useful. (F.L. 100.)

The revolutionist will accept a reform in order to use it as a means wherewith to link legal work with illegal work, in order to use it as a screen behind which his illegal activities for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie may be intensified. (F.L. 101.)

Now having established by witnesses the beauty of Communism, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in theory, its glory in practice, is, of course, the blossoming of pure democracy and representative government where every individual has a voice in government.

But you may inquire, how are all the people, the little people, ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clad, or plain "ill" going to engage themselves in this art of perfection?

Can the Dictatorship of the Proletariat do it alone?

Remember what the proletariat is.

And in comparison, where our sadistic theory of the dignity of the individual, with his constitutional rights protected by our courts, justice under law becomes so asinine in theory and practice, when confronted by Communism: where the great mass of people and peoples—the little man—under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat comes into his own.

While the hour is late—read me some more about the "forgotten man," Professor.

Very well, my eager pupils. Joseph Stalin will testify and tell you how simple is the operation, how scientific and thorough—even though the patient dies.

He will testify following a few preliminary remarks by the witness Lenin.
The Party

The simple answer is "the Party" The Party—and What is the Party?

one of the most important ideas of Marxism on the subject of the state, namely, (1) the idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat.
"the state, that is, the proletariat organised as the ruling class." (S.R. 22.)

a power shared with none and relying directly upon the armed force of the masses.
The proletariat needs state power, the centralised organization of violence.

And first of all, the question arises how is the discipline of the revolutionary party of the proletariat maintained? How is it tested? How is it reinforced? by the correctness of the political leadership exercised by this vanguard and by the correctness of its political strategy and tactics. (L.W 10.)

As to what the proletariat will put in its place, instructive data on the subject were furnished by the Paris Commune. (S.R. 29.)
The first decree of the Commune was the suppression of the standing Army, and the substitution for it of the armed people, says Marx. (S.R. 36.)
The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. Whereas "any Parliamentary Country from America to Switzerland is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the 'common people.'" (S.R. 40.)
The venal and rotten parliamentarism of bourgeois society is replaced in the Commune by institutions in which freedom of opinion and discussion does not degenerate into deception, for the parliamentarians must themselves work, must themselves execute their own laws, must themselves verify their results in actual life, must themselves be directly responsible to their electorate. Representative institutions remain, but parliamentarism as a special system, as a division of labour between the legislative and the executive functions, as a privileged position for the deputies, no longer exists. Without representative institutions we cannot imagine democracy, not even proletarian democracy; but we can and must think of democracy without parliamentarism. (S.R. 41.)

we want the Socialist revolution with human nature as it is now, with human nature that cannot do without subordination, control, and "managers. " But if there be subordination, it must be to the armed vanguard to the proletariat. (S.R. 42-43.)

We workers ourselves shall reduce the role of the state officials to that of simply carrying out our instructions as responsible, moderately paid "managers" This is our proletarian task, with this we can and must begin when carrying through a proletarian revolution. (S.R. 43.)

But the mechanism of social management is here already to hand. Over-
throw the capitalists, crush with the iron hand of the armed workers the resistance of these exploiters, break the bureaucratic machine of the modern state—and you have before you a mechanism of the highest technical equipment, freed of "parasites," capable of being set into motion by the united workers themselves who hire their own technicians, managers, bookkeepers, and pay them all, as, indeed, every "state" official, with the usual workers' wage. (S.R. 43.)

The Commune is the form "at last discovered" by the proletarian revolution, under which the economic liberation of labor can proceed. (S.R. 48.)

The Soviet republic is thus the political form, so long sought and finally found, within the framework of which the economic emancipation of the proletariat and the complete victory of Socialism is to be accomplished. The Paris Commune handed it down to us in embryonic form. (F.L. 57)

Back to Lenin on Marx:

He fought, not against the theory of the disappearance of the state when classes disappear, or of its abolition when classes have been abolished, but against the proposition that the workers should deny themselves the use of arms, the use of organised force, that is, the use of the state, for the purpose of "breaking down the resistance of the bourgeoisie." (S.R. 51.)

Lenin criticises the Commune in not having used sufficient force (S.R. 54.)

Communists recognize that when once the proletariat has won political power it must utterly break up the old state machinery, and substitute for it a new one consisting of an organisation of armed workers, after the type of the Commune. (S.R. 94.)

The new state machinery admits centralism as much as the old, if the workers voluntarily unify their armed forces, this will be centralism. (S.R. 95.)

we are concerned with the revolution. And revolution consists in the proletariat's destroying the "administrative"apparatus and the whole state machinery, and replacing it by a new one consisting of the armed workers. (S.R. 96.)

The leaders of the vanguard, says Lenin, must not sink to the level of the masses. (L.W 41.)

and the vanguard must "lead the masses." (L.Y 73.)

The witness, Stalin, having testified to his qualifications based on experience now takes over, and, I submit, he really takes over.
“Its quintessence (that is, of the dictatorship—J.S.) lies in the organisation and discipline of the advanced detachments of the toilers, of their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat.” (P.L. 26.)

Now we must consider the dictatorship of the proletariat from the point of view of its structure, of its “mechanism,” of the role and significance of the “belts,” the “levers,” and the directing “force,” the totality of which comprise “the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat,” and with the help of which the daily work of the dictatorship of the proletariat is accomplished. (P.L. 29.)

The organisations are:

First of all these are the workers’ trade unions. They are not Party organisations. They constitute a school of communism. They unite the masses of the workers with their vanguard.

Secondly, we have the Soviets. The soviets are mass organisations of all the toilers of town and country. They are not Party organisations. The soviets unite the vast toiling masses with the proletarian vanguard.

Thirdly, we have co-operative societies of all kinds. These are mass organisations of toilers, not Party organisations.

Fourthly, there is the Young Communist League. Not a Party organisation.

Lastly, there is the Party of the proletariat, its vanguard. The Party’s strength lies in the fact that it draws into its ranks all the best elements of the proletariat from all the mass organisations of the proletariat. Its function is to combine the work of all the mass organisations of the proletariat, without exception, and to guide their activities towards a single goal, that of the emancipation of the proletariat. Only the vanguard of the proletariat, its Party, is capable of combining and directing the work of the mass organisations of the proletariat. Only the Party of the proletariat, only the Party of the Communists, is capable of fulfilling this role of chief leader in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (P.L. 29 to 32.)

As Lenin puts it

“the Party is the supreme form of the class organisation of the proletariat.” (P.L. 32.)

Without the Party as the main leading force, a dictatorship of the proletariat at all durable and firm is impossible.

Thus, in the words of Lenin:

on the whole we have a very powerful proletarian apparatus by means of which the Party is closely linked up with the class and with the masses, and by means of which, under the leadership of the Party, the class dictatorship of the class is realised! (P.L. 33.)
the Party realises the dictatorship of the proletariat. 'The Party is the direct governing vanguard of the proletariat, it is the leader.' (Lenn)
In this sense the Party takes power, the Party governs the country (P.L. 38.)
The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be contrasted with the leadership (the "dictatorship") of the Party. It is inadmissible because the leadership of the Party is the principal thing in the dictatorship of the proletariat. (P.L. 45.)
Here in the Soviet Union, in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fact that not a single important political or organisational question is decided by our Soviet and other mass organisations without directions from the Party must be regarded as the highest expression of the leading role of the Party. In this sense it could be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is in essence the "dictatorship" of its vanguard, the 'dictatorship' of its Party, as the main guiding force of the proletariat. (P.L. 34.)

This, says the witness, was Lenin's idea.

"The political party can organise only a minority of the class in the same way as the really class conscious workers in capitalist society can represent only a minority of all the workers. That is why we must admit that only this class conscious minority can lead the broad masses of the workers." (Collected Works, Vol. XXV, p. 347, Russian edition.) (P.L. 35.)

leadership means the ability to convince the masses of the correctness of the Party policy, ability to raise the masses to the level of Party consciousness, and thus to ensure the support of the masses and their readiness for decisive struggle. (P.L. 50.)

First of all we must persuade and coerce afterwards. We must at all costs persuade first and coerce afterwards. (My italics—J. S.) (Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 235, Russian edition.) (P.L. 52.)

Lenin says the same thing in his pamphlet, On the Trade Unions: "We applied coercion correctly and successfully when we had succeeded in first laying a basis for it by persuasion." (P.L. 52.)

"the Party has won the position of vanguard of the whole factory and industrial proletariat." (Collected Works, Vol. 24, p. 423, Russian edition.) (P.L. 55.)

"only the class conscious minority (that is, the Party—J. S.) can lead the broad masses of the workers," that it is precisely in this sense that "by the dictatorship of the proletariat we mean, in essence, the dictatorship of its organised and class conscious minority." (P.L. 36.)
not a single important decision is arrived at by the mass organisations of the proletariat without directions from the Party (P.L. 36.)
The Party, with a membership of several hundred thousand, leads the soviets, with the national and local ramifications, which embraces several millions of people. (P.L. 39.)
the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a concept of the state. The dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily include the concept of violence. There is no dictatorship without violence if dictatorship is understood in the strict sense of the term. Lenin defines dictatorship of the proletariat as “power based directly on violence.” (Collected Works). (P.L. 39, 40.)

The authority of the Party is sustained by the confidence of the working class. The confidence of the working class is gained not by violence—violence only kills it—but by the Party’s correct theory, by the Party’s correct policy, by the Party’s devotion to the working class, by its contact with the masses of the working class, by its readiness and ability to convince the masses of the correctness of its slogans. (P.L. 40.)

This does not mean, of course, that the Party must first convince all the workers down to the last man, and only then proceed to action, that only after this may it commence operations. Nothing of the sort. It only means that before entering upon decisive political actions the Party must, by means of prolonged revolutionary work, ensure for itself the support of the majority of the working masses, or at least the benevolent neutrality of the majority of the class.

Well, and what is to be done with the minority, if it does not wish, if it does not agree to submit voluntarily to the will of the majority? When the Party enjoys the confidence of the majority, can it and should it force the minority to submit to the will of the majority? Yes, it can and it must. Leadership is assured by utilising the method of persuading the masses, as the principal method by which the Party influences the masses. Thus, however, does not preclude, but presupposes the use of coercion if such coercion is based upon the confidence and support of the majority of the working class display towards the Party, and if it is applied to the minority after the majority has been won over. (P.L. 51.)

Coercion, says Stalin, is perfectly correct, for without these conditions no leadership is possible. For only in this way can we be assured of unity of action in the Party, if we are speaking of the Party, and of unity of action of the class, if we are speaking of the class as a whole. Without this there is schism, confusion and demoralisation in the ranks of the workers.

Such in general are the fundamentals of correct Party leadership. Any other conception of leadership is syndicalism, anarchism, bureaucracy or anything you please, but not Bolshevism, not Lemmism. (P.L. 53.)

Unity within the Party, says Stalin, is absolutely essential.

One cannot but recall Lenin’s golden words uttered at the Eleventh Congress of our Party: “Among the masses of the people, we (Communists—J. S.) are but drops in the ocean, and we will be able to govern only when we properly express that which the people appreciate. Without this the Communist Party will not lead the proletariat, the
proletariat will not take the lead of the masses, and the whole machine will fall to pieces." (Collected Works, Vol. XXVII, p. 256, Russian edition.)

"Properly express that which the people appreciate"—this is precisely the necessary condition that ensures for the Party the honourable role of the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (P.L. 59.)

Stalin testifies that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, that is, as you now realise, the dictatorship of the Party, cannot be maintained except on an International scale:

Then there is the question can a country, in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, consider itself fully guaranteed against foreign intervention, and consequently against the restoration of the old order, without the victory of the revolution in a number of other countries, a question which must be answered in the negative. (P.L. 62.)

On the question of the final victory of socialism it (Lenin) states "The final victory of socialism is a complete guarantee against attempted intervention, and that means against restoration, for any serious attempt at restoration can take place only with support from the outside, only with the support of international capital. Hence the support of our revolution by the workers of all countries, and still more the victory of these workers in at least several countries, is a necessary condition for completely guaranteeing the first victorious country against attempts at intervention and restoration, a necessary condition for the final victory of socialism." (Ibid.) (P.L. 64.)

Lenin, says Stalin,

better than any one else, understood the extreme importance of theory, particularly for a party like ours to which has been assigned the role of vanguard of the international proletariat and which must work in a most complicated internal and international situation. (F.L. 27.)

This new form of organisation of the proletariat is the Soviets. (F.L. 54.)

_a new type of state._ (F.L. 55.)

The Soviet power is the most international of all state organisations in class society, for by extirpating every kind of national oppression and basing itself on the cooperation of the toiling masses of the various nationalities, it facilitates the unification of these masses into a single union of the states.

The Soviet power by its very structure facilitates the vanguard of these masses, that is, the proletariat—the most compact and most class conscious nucleus of the soviets. (F.L. 55-56.)

The Soviet power combines the legislative and executive functions in a single state body _ (F.L. 56.)
Only the soviet state organisation can definitely destroy at one blow the old, that is, the bourgeois administrative and judicial apparatus. (Lenin) (F.L. 56.)

The task of strategic leadership is.

First: The concentration of the main forces of the revolution at the decisive moment at the most vulnerable point of the enemy, when the revolution has already become ripe, when the offensive is in full swing, when insurrection knocks at the door and when the moving up of reserves to the front line holds success or failure in the balance. (F.L. 92.)

Second the selection of the moment for striking the decisive blow. (F.L. 93.)

Third a course having been mapped out, it must be pursued no matter what difficulties and complications may be encountered on the road. (F.L. 94.)

Fourth manoeuvering to effect a correct retreat when the enemy is strong. (F.L. 94.)

"What is needed is the ability to find at any moment that particular link in the chain which must be grasped with all one's might to gain control of the whole chain and pass without a hitch to the next link." (Lenin) (F.L. 100.)

The Party, says Stalin, is

a militant party, a revolutionary party, bold enough to lead the proletarians to the struggle for power, with sufficient experience to be able to cope with the complicated problems that arise in a revolutionary situation, yet sufficiently flexible to steer clear of any submerged rocks on the way to its goal.

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

This new party is the party of Leninism. (F.L. 105.)

The Party must first of all constitute the vanguard of working class. (105 F.L.)

The Party must take its stand at the head of the working class, it must see ahead of the working class and lead the proletariat and not trail behind it.—F.L. 106.)

Every army at war must have an experienced staff, if it is to avoid certain defeat. All the more reason, therefore, why the proletariat must have such a general staff if it is to prevent itself from being routed by its accursed enemies. But where is this general staff? Only the revolutionary party of the proletariat can serve as this general staff. A working class without a revolutionary party is like an army without a general staff. The Party is the military staff of the proletariat.

But the Party cannot be merely a vanguard. It must at the same time be the vanguard of the class. (F.L. 106-107)

The Party is not only the vanguard of the working class. If it really
desires to lead the struggle of the class it must at the same time be the organized detachment of its class. (F.L. 108.)

it must imbue the millions of unorganized non-Party workers with the spirit of discipline and method in fighting, with the spirit of organization and perseverance. The Party is the organized detachment of the working class. (F.L. 108, 109.)

The disciplined Party, says Lenin, will not enroll.

every “professor” and “student” every “sympathiser,” and “striker.” (F.L. 109)

But the Party is not merely the sum total of Party organisations. The Party at the same time represents a single system of these organisations, their formal unification into a single whole, permitting of higher and lower organs of leadership, of the submission of the minority to the majority, where decisions on questions of practice are obligatory upon all members of the Party. Unless these conditions are fulfilled the Party is unable to form a single organised whole capable of exercising a systematic and organised leadership of the struggle of the working class.

“Formerly,” says Lenin, “our Party was not a formally organised whole, but only the sum of the groups constituting its part. Consequently, ideological influence was the only bond between these groups. Now, however, we have become an organised Party which implies the creation of a power, a conversion of the authority of ideas into the authority of power, the subordination of the lower bodies of the Party to the higher bodies.” (Ibid.)

The principle of the minority submitting to the majority, the principle of leading Party work from a centre, has been a subject of repeated attacks by wavering elements who accuse us of “bureaucracy,” “formalism,” etc. It hardly needs to be proved that systematic Party work as a whole and the leadership of the struggle of the working class would have been impossible without the enforcement of these principles. On the organisational question Leninism stands for the strict enforcement of these principles. (F.L. 110, 111.)

The Party Line

The question then arises who is to determine the line, the general direction along which the work of all these organisations is to be conducted? Where is that central organisation with the necessary experience to work out such a general line and also able, because of its authority, to prevail upon all these organisations to carry out this line, so as to attain unity of direction and preclude the possibility of working at cross purposes.

This organisation is the Party of the proletariat. (F.L. 113.)

the Party, as the meeting ground of the best members of the working class, is the best school for training leaders of the working class capable of directing every form of organisation of their class. The
Party is the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat. (F.L. 113.)

This does not mean, of course, that non-Party organisations like trade unions, co-operatives, etc., must be formally subordinated to Party leadership. It means simply that the members of the Party who belong to these organisations and doubtless exercise influence in them, should do all they can to persuade these non-Party organisations to draw nearer to the Party of the proletariat in their work and voluntarily accept its political guidance.

That is why Lenin says "the Party is the highest form of class association of proletarians" whose political leadership ought to extend to every other form of organisation of the proletariat.

That is why the opportunist theory of the "independence" and "neutrality" of the non-party organisations (which theory is the progenitor of independent parliamentarians and publicists who are isolated from the Party, and of narrow-minded trade unionists and officials of co-operatives whose psychology has warped into that of petty shopkeepers) is wholly incompatible with the theory and practice of Leninism. (F.L. 113, 114.)

The Party is not only the highest form of class association of the proletarians, it is at the same time a weapon in the hands of the proletariat for the conquest of the dictatorship where that has not yet been achieved, for the consolidation and extension of the dictatorship where it has already been achieved. The Party would not rank so high in importance and it could not overshadow all other forms of organisation of the proletariat if the latter were not face to face with the question of power, if the existence of imperialism, the inevitability of wars and the presence of a crisis did not demand the concentration of all the forces of the proletariat on one point and the gathering together of all the threads of the revolutionary movement to repose them in one hand, to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working class needs the Party first of all as its general staff, which it must have to effect a successful revolution. (F.L. 114, 115.)

The proletariat needs the Party not only to achieve the dictatorship, it needs still more to maintain and extend its dictatorship in order to attain complete victory for Socialism. (F.L. 115.)

The proletariat needs the Party for the achieving and maintenance of the dictatorship. The Party is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

From this it follows that when classes disappear and the dictatorship of the proletariat will die out, the Party will also die out. (F.L. 116.)

Achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat are impossible without a party strong in its cohesion and iron discipline. But iron discipline in the Party is impossible without unity of will and without absolute and complete unity of action on the part of all members of the Party. This does not mean of course that there never will any conflict of opinion within the Party. (F.L. 116.)
But after a discussion has been closed, after criticism has run its course and a decision has been made, unity of will and unity of action become indispensable conditions without which Party unity and iron discipline in the Party are inconceivable. (F.L. 117)

The same thing applies, but to a greater degree, to discipline in the Party after the establishment of the dictatorship.

It follows that the existence of factions is incompatible with Party unity and with iron discipline the parties of the Communist International cannot afford to be "liberal" or to permit the formation of factions. The Party is synonymous with unity of will, which leaves no room for any factionalism or division of Party control. (F.L. 117, 118.)

The Party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements. (F.L. 118.)

If the proletarian parties are to develop and become strong, they must purge themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists, social-chauvinists, and social-pacifists.

it may even be useful to remove certain excellent Communists who might and who do waver in the direction of desiring to maintain "unity" with the reformists. (F.L. 120.)

Hence, in its final analysis Communism is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship by a class, or rather the "best members of" a class. The control, absolute control, is in the Party. The Party is admittedly a small group of gangsters who have seized power and will retain power by force, coercion and through its armed workers; that is a group that it arms for its own preservation and its Leader's protection. The People have nothing to say about it.

These witnesses testify that their system cannot be maintained except on an international scale, and therefore all governments must be overthrown by force.

Article 2 of the so-called Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

The Soviets of Working People's Deputies, which grew and attained strength as a result of the overthrow of the landlords and capitalists and the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat, constitute the political foundation of the U.S.S.R.

ARTICLE 12

In the U.S.S.R. work is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle. "He who does not work, neither shall he eat."

The principle applied in the U.S.S.R. is that of socialism. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." (pp. 15, 16.)
The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the vanguard.

The flyleaf of the Constitution bears in red letters the words, "Workers of all Countries, Unite!"

The preamble to the Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism.

The Application for Membership contains the preamble.

The Membership Card of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. under "Rights and Duties of Party Members" provides that the members shall "strive to master the program and policies of the Party, the principles of Marxism-Leninism."

Under Communism the state—the party—the vanguard—the leader—owns the People.

Under our Constitution the People own the state.

It is time to teach our children that vital, simple distinction.

---

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

BY SYLVESTER GARVIN

Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen of the Convention, I don’t know of any particular reason why the Legislative Committee should make any additional report other than the splendid one that Dick Ott made last spring upon the expiration of the last session. However, the Legislative Committee met yesterday afternoon and last evening together with the Legislative Committee of the Superior Court Judges Association, and I think we had one of the best meetings that we have had for a long time.

We are going to recommend to the Board of Governors that any member of the Bar that intends or expects the Legislative Committee in the future to consider any legislation that it will have to be filed and presented prior to December 1, on the preceding month to which the Legislature convenes. The practice—and the Legislative Com-