

THE

WORKERS OF THE WORLD - UNITE!



Communist

GERMANY — CHIEF WAR-MONGER

LLOYD GEORGE — "SAVIOR" OF
BRITISH CAPITALISM - R. Palme Dutt

THE SITUATION IN GERMANY, Etc., Etc.

THE UNITED FRONT

International

VOLUME XII

7

APRIL 5th, 1935

THREEPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 7

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. Germany as the Chief Instigator of War in Europe. 283
2. For the United Front, for the Unity of the Trade Union Movement. 289
3. Text of the Appeal of the R.I.L.U. to the Bureau of the International Trade Union Federation. 290
4. Comintern People. 291
5. Lloyd George as the "Saviour" of the British Bourgeoisie. By R. Palme Dutt. 294
6. The New Programme of the German "Revolutionary Socialists." By F. David. 300

THE STRUGGLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES FOR THE UNITED FRONT.

7. (a) The Struggle of the Unemployed in Britain.
By R. McIlhone. 306
8. (b) Intensify the Struggle for the United Front of the Proletariat. By V. Muller. 310
9. (c) The Fight for the United Front in Switzerland.
By Karolski. 321

BOOK REVIEW.

10. The "Communist" — the Monthly Theoretical Political Organ of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A. By I. M. 328
-
-

GERMANY AS THE CHIEF INSTIGATOR OF WAR IN EUROPE

A NEW world bloodbath is the outlook for the most immediate historical period.

The continuation of the crisis in the capitalist countries and the growth of fascism have intensified the danger of an anti-Soviet war and imperialist conflicts. In his report to the Seventh Congress of Soviets, Comrade Molotov emphasised that as far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, the danger of war had increased:

"It must not be forgotten that there is now in Europe a ruling Party which openly proclaims the seizure of territory in the Soviet Union as its historic task. To fail to see the approach of a new war means to close one's eyes to the chief danger."

The Nationalist-Socialist Party, which represents the interests of monopolist capital in Germany, has transformed Germany into the main centre of the war danger in Europe.

What is the meaning of the law regarding the introduction of conscription passed by the Hitler government on March 16? It means, firstly, that a most important step has been taken in the PRACTICAL PREPARATION OF WAR. Fascist Germany has all along been preparing for war and has established a big army. As long as this army was an "illegal" army, it could not prepare for war as it would have liked, since this army was not, for instance, in a position to conduct manoeuvres on a big scale in which whole army corps, air flotillas and big arrays of tanks could participate. Secondly, the law of March 16 opens up a new phase in the armaments race in Europe, **FASCIST GERMANY WILL BECOME THE STRONGEST IMPERIALIST MILITARY POWER ON THE CONTINENT**. Thus the conscription law is a turning point in the change of the relationships between the military imperialist forces on the European continent.

Thirdly,—and this is the main significance of the law of March 16—the legalisation of German armaments puts the question of war directly on the order of the day. The Versailles Treaty consisted of three principal parts—reparations, disarmament and territorial annexations. In 1931 reparations were "temporarily" stopped by Hoover, and will naturally never again be renewed. The law of March 16 finally puts an end to Section 5 of the Versailles Treaty, which deals with the limitation of German armaments. The revision of the third and last part of the Versailles Treaty, the question of the partition of Europe, has now been placed on the order of the day by German fascism, which is desirous of bringing this repartition about mainly by coming to an arrangement with the imperialist countries at the expense of the Soviet Union. A counter-revolutionary war

of the imperialists against the Soviet Union has been placed on the order of the day. Fascist Germany has assumed the rôle of the chief incendiary of war in Europe with Japan, the main instigator of war in the Far East as its ally, and fascist Poland in tow, while British imperialism, stands behind them all.

Germany is moving towards war and is trying to kindle the flames of war by all means at its disposal. The "Third Empire" is a synonym for war. Its entire policy, beginning from the first days of its existence, has been directed towards the preparation of war, towards a feverish search for a way out of the crisis by lighting up the flames of a world conflagration.

When the German bourgeoisie established their open terrorist dictatorship, they gave it the responsible task of crushing the revolutionary movement in Germany so as to accelerate the preparation of war. This task has permeated all parts of the home and foreign policy of the "Third Empire."

German fascism speeded up the development of the war industry, at the expense of a wide attack on the standard of living of the working class and of the majority of the peasants. All methods of draining the internal resources of the country as well as open inflation were used to finance the war industries. Monopolist capital is perfectly well aware that it can only conduct such an economic policy for a limited space of time. It regards this policy only as the prerequisite for re-shaping the map of Europe by armed force, at an accelerated pace. The conquest of territory, the policy of annexations and plunder, is the path taken by the "Third Empire," following January 30, 1933.

At the present moment, however, it is not only a question of plans and tendencies, but of the absolutely concrete plans which are to be carried out at a rapid pace. Fascist Germany is entering the great road of international politics with the banner of war as its immediate outlook. The recent hypocritical pacifist declarations of the leaders of the Third Empire, their declarations regarding Germany's moral right to equality, were only the screen behind which an outbreak of war was being feverishly prepared. This screen and all the stage attributes of German foreign policy are beginning to be thrust aside, and national socialist Germany considers that the moment has matured when the mask can be torn off and it can act with open vizor.

For two years Germany has been frantically carrying on the policy of armaments, the policy of

preparing war economically, ideologically, organisationally and technically. The whole of German industry has been militarised at the present time. Hundreds of factories are producing tanks, military aeroplanes, heavy artillery, machine guns, and shells. The factories of the German chemical trust, i.e., the "Farbenindustrie," are intensively producing weapons for chemical warfare. The country is being covered with aerodromes, especially underground ones. Cannon fodder is being hurriedly trained in the labour service camps and in other military institutions. Parallel with this, "grenz-beteurungs-gurtel" organisations have been formed on all the frontiers of Germany, having the very concrete aims of preparing diversional groups with definite spheres of action, of verifying the reliability of the population in the border zones, of helping the intelligence service of the General Staff, and of establishing contacts with the national socialist organisations abroad. At the same time, intense work is being carried on in all the nationalist socialist organisations in Germany with a view to bringing ideological influence to bear on the youth, especially the "Hitler Youth." The backbone of this fascist propaganda consists of the thesis that Germany's vital problems cannot be solved within the confines of successes at home, and that the centre of gravity lies in the sphere of an active foreign policy.

By the beginning of 1935, the German bourgeoisie came to the conclusion that the preparatory work was finished. Germany had already a big first class army, and about a million men could be mobilised in a very short space of time. Commissioned and non-commissioned officers have already been trained, these comprising the entire personnel of the Reichswehr and the police force which has swelled to the size of a real army, and reserves of war munitions have already been accumulated. The result of this preparatory work carried out in full view of the whole world, was the decision of the German government to proceed to speed up the open preparations of war.

The first sign of the new tactics was the announcement of Goering that a Ministry of Military Aviation had been formed, and that Germany had begun to produce air armaments openly, including bombing planes. The decisive act of these tactics, however, was the bomb which exploded on March 16, when the German government announced the introduction of conscription.

There can be no doubt that a definite rôle in speeding up the pace at which these war preparations are taking place is being played by the difficulties arising from the lengthy period, during which the intense war construction is being financed and by the need to strengthen the inner-political situation. These considerations, however,

do not exhaust the details of the last German step which has finally removed the mask from the face of the "Third Empire." The international situation, which had been used to the full by the national socialist government, played a more important rôle in this acceleration of the pace.

* * *

What is the international situation at the present time?

Six years have passed since the beginning of the world economic crisis, two-thirds of a normal industrial cycle, but the level of production in the capitalist countries continues to be 30 per cent. lower than in 1929. More than two and a half years have gone by since the lowest point was reached in the decline of production, whereas, at ordinary times, such a period would have been sufficient to reach the phase of prosperity. None the less, the capitalist countries are in the phase of profound depression. At the beginning of 1935, according to the very reduced figures provided by official statistics, there were over 23,000,000 unemployed, the figure being on the level of the beginning of 1924. The special character of the present depression as a depression of a special kind, which will not lead to a new advance and prosperity in industry, is becoming ever more evident.

"The growing uncertainty of the bourgeoisie as to the possibility of finding a way out of the crisis only by the intensified exploitation of the toilers of their own countries, has led the imperialists to put their stake on war." (Theses of the Thirteenth Plenum, E.C.C.I.)

At the same time, the Soviet Union has finished the first two years of the second Five-Year Plan with exceptional success. The figures for the production of iron and steel give an especially clear picture of the extent of Soviet industry, while the abolition of the ration system for bread shows the success attained by collectivisation in the villages. The population is being increasingly supplied with prime necessities and articles of wide consumption on the basis of the exceptional successes being achieved by heavy industry and by collectivisation in the villages. The fundamental contradiction of our era, namely, the contradiction between the two systems, between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union, has attained a degree of exceptional intensity. EVERY YEAR CHANGES THE RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES BETWEEN THE TWO SYSTEMS IN FAVOUR OF THE SOVIET UNION, AND THIS IS WHY THE CAPITALIST WORLD IS SPEEDING UP THE PACE OF ITS PREPARATIONS FOR COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY WAR AGAINST THE LAND OF THE SOVIETS. The danger of counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union is coming more and more to the forefront, while at the same time the contradictions leading to war between the imperialists are growing sharper.

In proceeding to carry out their aggressive plans, the German bourgeoisie took as their point

of departure the following basic prerequisites: German monopolist capital was quite certain that an anti-Soviet policy was the battering ram which would enable it to finally smash the Versailles Treaty, and to open up for itself the path of aggression and territorial conquests.

In drawing up its strategic plan, German fascism at the same time made use of the deep contradictions which divide capitalist Europe.

France has lost its main post-war ally, Poland, in the recent period, and its Italian flank is not secured. Under such circumstances, France has very limited powers of manoeuvring. Italy, fearing German aggression in the direction of Austria, is at the same time not interested in the defeat of Germany, because this would strengthen France and would hinder the carrying out of Italy's imperialist plans in the Mediterranean. Italy is therefore not above switching German expansion over to the direction least detrimental to Rome. Poland, which at first drew nearer to Germany out of fear of becoming an object of the future negotiations between the great powers, has now fallen into the wake of Germany, and is trying to co-ordinate its old plans of annexation in the East with the strivings of German imperialism.

The decisive factor, however, in the calculations of the "Third Empire," is GREAT BRITAIN. The reasoning of German diplomacy is as follows: England's starting point is that Germany has become a serious military and political force, which is frantically rushing on to the broad road of aggression. Great Britain is therefore interested in guiding this aggression in a direction corresponding to the interests of British imperialism. War against the Soviet Union fully corresponds to the anti-Soviet strivings of Great Britain, and opens up the prospect of satisfying the German appetite at the expense of Soviet territory. England is further trying to bring about a balance of power in Europe which would be advantageous to itself, and would make Great Britain the super arbitrator between Germany and France. All these points taken together were bound to spur Great Britain on to support Germany in the sphere of armaments and to render it easier for the latter to carry out its Eastern annexationist plan.

The foreign policy of the "Third Empire" was and is being built on these premises, and corresponds completely to Hitler's old conception, now adopted by the German bourgeoisie. The further development of events has raised the hope of the national socialist government that its line corresponds to the actual state of affairs. During the first stage of Germany's foreign political activity, Great Britain brought pressure to bear on France. By claiming that peace must be maintained by mak-

ing concessions to Germany, British diplomacy assured the rear of the "Third Empire," while at the same time encouraging all the latter's activity as regards the preparation of war. Great Britain made it possible for Germany to re-arm itself and to strengthen its international position, masking this policy by hypocritical announcements as to the necessity for the limitation of armaments and the impermissibility of foreign political complications.

On February 3rd, Simon and Laval signed a protocol in London, in which it was declared that the problem of German armaments could only be solved as one of the elements of the general system of safety in Europe. While the visit of Simon to Berlin was being prepared, very influential circles in Great Britain made it clear to Alfred Rosenberg and Ribbentrop (who at the present time is Germany's chief diplomat, in spite of the fact that he possesses no diplomatic rank) that the position of Great Britain would be made considerably easier if Germany were to face the various parties involved with an accomplished fact. This hint was accepted by Berlin, and the German government announced the introduction of conscription, a state of affairs not at all unexpected as far as England was concerned. At the present time the British press is expressing its astonishment and even indignation, and the British ambassador has lodged a "protest" with the German government. At bottom, however, this protest represents serious support for Germany, and it is no accident that it has elicited dissatisfaction in Paris.

At the present moment the main theses of the policy of influential circles of the British bourgeoisie, whose support German fascism hopes to secure, have become sufficiently clear and definite. GREAT BRITAIN IS AFRAID OF THE FURTHER STRENGTHENING OF THE U.S.S.R., AND IS PLAYING THE RÔLE OF THE CHIEF INSPIRER OF A COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY WAR AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION. At the same time, of course, British imperialism fears German armaments and particularly fears the danger of an air attack on England in the future, which explains the efforts of Great Britain to secure the conclusion of an Air Convention. But the calculations of the British bourgeoisie are that an anti-Soviet war will distract the forces and attention of Germany in a different direction for a long time.

British diplomacy should, according to the ideas of the most influential circles of the British bourgeoisie, carry through its favourite manoeuvre which led to the war of 1914. On this occasion, however, a definite factor in its policy is the urge to strike a blow at the Soviet Union by encouraging the aggressive plans of Germany. The anti-Soviet policy of the British bourgeoisie, who are for the time being supporting Germany on

the question of armaments, meets (as we shall show later) with the unchanging support of the Labourites, who, in the new conditions, are continuing the traditional treacherous policy of the Second International.

Thus German imperialism, with the support of Great Britain and taking advantage of the complacency of France and the good wishes of Italy, is preparing to take serious action. What is more, German fascism is firmly counting on its ally, Japan, whose methods are being applied with great success by Berlin diplomacy. It is difficult to say whether there is a MILITARY TREATY connecting these countries, preserved in the secret safes of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Tokio, Berlin and Warsaw. But in any case there can be no doubt that Germany, Japan and Poland are completely in unison in respect to a joint aggressive policy, which is supported by close military and technical co-operation, transparently masked under the guise of so-called cultural connections.

Germany, of course, would not object if Japan were to be the first to attack the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, if Japan dallies too long and does not make up its mind to attack the Soviet Union, having in view the menace of such a gamble as far as Japanese imperialism is concerned, Germany will be the first, together with Poland, to act as the aggressor, calculating that the unleashing of war in the West will incite the Japanese imperialists to attempt to carry out their annexationist plans in the East.

It does not essentially follow that German imperialism, spurred on by the instability of its internal basis to take the path of foreign political gambles, will under all circumstances, wait for an anti-Soviet situation to mature. It may make an attempt to bring about this situation with the aid of an unexpected explosion. It would be a gross mistake to consider that war will only begin when the outlines of the future fronts are finally marked out. It is most probable that these lines will take shape in a situation when war has already broken out. Fascist Germany is rushing along the broad road of territorial conquests, supported by British imperialism, and may try to bring about the crystallisation of an anti-Soviet coalition, with the help of a war explosion.

An anti-Soviet war, of course, does not exhaust the far-reaching plans of the "Third Empire," which regards such a war merely as the first stage to be followed by the conquest of hegemony in Europe, and the operation of the bloody war dreams of German imperialism on the eve of 1914.

The strategic plan of German imperialism provides for a number of STAGES, on the first stage of the fulfilment of which German fascism has already entered. The "Third Empire" will more

likely select as the object of its first blows those territorial regions which are of an "intermediate" character. There can be no doubt that the problem of Memel will rise with the greatest sharpness in the near future. British diplomacy is trying to satisfy Germany in this direction on the basis of a compact of the powers. If this is not done, the national socialists will very likely stage an "uprising" in one form or another in Memel, and thus seize this region.

After this operation there will be a new one in a different direction which it is difficult to guess in advance. The object of the aggression of German imperialism may be Austria, Danzig and even Czecho-Slovakian territory. Parallel with this, the "Third Empire," working hand in glove with Poland, will consolidate its positions in the Baltic countries, and prove to the bourgeoisie of the Baltic countries that they have no alternative but to abandon their independence and follow in the wake of Germany.

All the possible lines of German aggression are, however, of a PRELIMINARY character. The chief goal of the annexationist policy of the "Third Empire" is Soviet territory, the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. being in the forefront of the entire foreign policy of national socialist Germany. German fascism, Japanese imperialism and certain sections of the British bourgeoisie, as well as all their allies, are carrying on a complicated game, and leave the point that a war undertaken by them will be fatal not only for the imperialists who instigate it, but also for world capitalism out of account.

The bourgeoisie must bear one extremely important consideration in mind. A WAR WHICH BREAKS OUT IN ONE SECTION OF THE GLOBE CANNOT BE ISOLATED. The war conflagration will not be restricted by geographical boundaries. Not a single capitalist country will surrender its positions or let slip a chance to strengthen them.

"There can hardly be any doubt that such a war would be a very dangerous war for the bourgeoisie. It would be a very dangerous war, not only because the peoples of the U.S.S.R. would fight to the very death to preserve the gains of the revolution; it would be a very dangerous war for the bourgeoisie also because such a war will be waged not only at the fronts, but also in the rear of the enemy. The bourgeoisie need have no doubt that the numerous friends of the working class of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and in Asia will be sure to strike a blow in the rear at their oppressors who commenced a criminal war against the fatherland of the working class of all countries. And let not Messieurs the bourgeoisie blame us if on the morrow of the outbreak of such a war they will miss certain of the governments that are near and dear to them and who are to-day happily ruling 'by the grace of god.'" (Report of the work of the C.P.S.U. at the Seventeenth Party Congress.)

The day when German fascism declares war will be the beginning of the end of fascism and capitalism in Germany. The oncoming war will be a

war between two systems, between two classes, and will be waged not only on the borders, but in each town, in each little village. The world proletariat will be victorious in this war.

* * *

The bourgeoisie wish to postpone the doom of capitalism by means of a counter-revolutionary drive against the land of victorious socialism. The question of war, of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, has been directly placed on the order of the day. The task of rallying the widest masses against war, and for peace is advanced to the centre of the activity of the Communist Parties by the whole course of events.

The task facing the Communist Parties in all countries, and especially in Great Britain, Germany, Japan and Poland is to transform the ardent longing of the masses of the people for peace into a mass movement, into a gigantic force with which the warmongers and those who inspire them will have to reckon. The Communists must be the initiators and tireless fighters for the united front of the working class, for the broad people's front of all the toilers against war.

The masses of the workers in Great Britain have shown by all their recent activity that they are ready to carry on an active struggle for peace against a new world war, and against a counter-revolutionary onslaught on the land of the Soviets. At the same time the Labour Party, which is followed by the majority of the British working class, supports the policy of the "national government." In the House of Commons on March 21, there was a debate on the instructions given to the Foreign Minister, Sir John Simon, regarding his negotiations with Hitler in Berlin. Sir Herbert Samuel, the leader of the Liberals, who spoke after Lansbury, the leader of the Labour Party, declared that Simon would go to Berlin as the representative of the "whole nation" with the support of all parties. And it should be borne in mind that when indicating the circle of questions raised in the London communiqué regarding the Anglo-French agreement, and to be discussed in Berlin, Sir John Simon demonstratively kept silent about the Eastern Pact. This forgetfulness on Sir John Simon's part is very instructive. It throws some light on the conversations that have been carried on between Hitler and Simon, and about which, it must be assumed, Simon will forget to inform the House of Commons in his report on the visit to Berlin. The *Daily Herald* has been advocating the "honest recognition of the full equal rights of Germany" all along, camouflaging its support of German armaments and of the war preparations being made by German fascism.

The Communist Party of Great Britain, which has obtained considerable success recently in the

organisation of mass united front actions, must rally the widest masses of the workers in Great Britain against the war policy of British imperialism. The Party must steadily explain the real nature of the policy being pursued by the Labour Party and must organise the resistance of wide masses of workers against this policy.

The Communist Party of Germany, which is carrying on a heroic struggle in the conditions of the brutal terror of the fascist hangmen, is raising high the banner of proletarian internationalism. The fascists are unloosening a wave of frenzied chauvinism, and now already are trying to evoke sentiments, which recall the days of August, 1914.

The fascists are clearly trying to find a common language with the majority of the Prague C.C. of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany. For the first time since the fascist dictatorship and the National-socialist movement came into being, the signing of the Versailles Treaty is explained in the "appeal to the German people" regarding the introduction of conscription, not as a "Marxist" stab in the back of the German people (the notorious "Dolchstoß" argument), but by the claim that "the German people, its government and parties at that time were imbued with a viewpoint which was in full accord with the pacifist-democratic ideas of the League of Nations and its founders." There is no other explanation for this than that it is an attempt to recruit "honest German patriots" from among the social-democratic leaders. It will not be superfluous now to call to mind the following facts: The call issued by the Central Board of the German trade unions on May 1st, 1933, to celebrate May 1st under the banner of National-Socialism, the speech made by Wels in the Reichstag on March 17th, 1933, and the unanimous vote of the Social-Democratic fraction in favour of Hitler's foreign policy. Also we recall the policy pursued by Wels and his friends while in emigration, taking a line which has the "reformation" of the fascist dictatorship in view, coupled with the recent refusal of the Prague C.C. to accept the united front proposal made by the Communist Party for a struggle to achieve the free election of the factory committees.

Following the advice given by Hitler and Goebels (see the chapters about propaganda in the books *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle) and *Kampf um Berlin* (The Fight for Berlin)) the fascist newspapers in the barefaced provocation insinuations they are making, are now making use of the methods used by the Intelligence Service in the days of the imperialist war.

On March 9th, the *Völkischer Beobachter* (the central newspaper of the fascist party and the government) published a brazen fascist forgery about an alleged session of the Political

Bureau of the C.P.S.U., when discussion allegedly took place regarding war, the world revolution, and about "the creation of the impression that Communism had liquidated itself," etc. There is no need to confute this gross fabricated forgery. Everybody is aware of the struggle of the U.S.S.R. for peace, while as regards the proletarian revolution, the fascist journal and those who manage it must get it firmly into their heads, that a war undertaken by fascist Germany will inevitably end by the German proletariat and the toiling masses settling accounts with the fascist hangmen.

The fascists are resorting to all measures to raise a big wave of chauvinism. The task facing the Communist Party of Germany is to struggle against this dark wave, and to prove to the broadest masses of toilers that "liberation from the chains of Versailles" by Hitler means war, that this "liberation" will only serve the interests of the German monopolist bourgeoisie, and that it is a question of trying to achieve a "mighty Germany" by blood and iron and of dismembering the Soviet Union. The difficult struggle carried on by the Communist Party of Germany will meet with the support of the working class throughout the world.

The struggle against chauvinism now is one of the most important tasks facing the Communist Parties in all capitalist countries. As against the ferocious chauvinist campaign being inflamed by the fascists and the bourgeoisie, the Parties must counterpose proletarian internationalism, and the fraternal solidarity of the peoples. A number of Parties have recently prepared and adopted programmes of social and national liberation. These programmes must be popularised among the widest masses of the toiling population, and be

made into powerful weapons in our agitation against chauvinism.

In addition to the struggle against chauvinism and to the organisation of the struggle for peace and against the new world war which is on the order of the day, a considerable place in the work of the Communist Parties must be occupied by the explanation of the direct and real conditions in which war is engendered, and the situation in which the revolutionary working class organisations will find themselves when war begins. This must be done now, so as to prepare the ground for a successful revolutionary struggle during the war. Our struggle against war before it begins and our struggle during the war when it has already begun are indissolubly connected with each other.

"The great historical task facing international Communism is to mobilise the broad masses against war even before war has begun, and thereby hasten the doom of capitalism. Only a Bolshevik struggle before the outbreak of war for the triumph of the revolution can assure the victory of a revolution that breaks out in connection with war." (Theses of the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

The bourgeoisie are seeking a way out of the crisis through war, and primarily war against the Soviet Union. We Communists, the vanguard of the working class and of all the toilers, are burning agitators and fighters for peace. But if the arrant bandits of British imperialism and their friends in Europe and Asia ignite a world war conflagration, we shall exert our every effort to the last drop of our blood, so that this monstrous crime will be their last, so that the war of plunder, the criminal war, will be converted into a civil war in which the proletariat are victors, a civil war which will liberate mankind from wars and from fascist barbarism and capitalist oppression.

THE FEBRUARY STRUGGLE IN AUSTRIA AND ITS LESSONS	- - -	By Bela Kun	96 pages, 6d.
THE MOST BURNING QUESTION — UNITY OF ACTION	- - -	By Bela Kun	64 pages, 2d.
FROM THE FIRST WORLD WAR TO THE SECOND	- - -	By Nemo	76 pages, 2d.

WORKERS BOOKSHOP, CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.

FOR THE UNITED FRONT, FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

THROUGHOUT the world the working masses are watching with the greatest anxiety the Bacchanalia of the fascist hooligans who are converting the factories and mills into barracks, are watching the activities of the grasping herd of capitalists who are trying to throw all the burdens of the crisis on to the toilers. Two years of the transition of the economic crisis into a depression have not only not improved the material conditions of the toilers, but on the contrary have turned whole sections of the proletariat into serfs in bondage to the brutal fascist dictatorship. The bourgeoisie are utilising the split in the working class to take away from the workers their means of defence, namely, the right to strike and organisation. The fascist gangs are smashing up the trade unions which were founded on the hard-earned money of the workers and built up by a whole series of proletarian generations.

All the measures of international capitalism are directed primarily towards bringing about a reduction in the standard of living of the toiling masses at frantic speed, and towards preparing for a new imperialist slaughter with a view to a new redivision of the globe. With a cynicism as yet unaparalleled, German fascism is trampling down the last barriers on the path towards the preparations of a robber war directed primarily against the Soviet Union. The whole world smells the suffocating smoke rising from the camp of the fascist bandits.

The hour for bringing about the united front of the proletariat and the unity of the trade union movement is more than ripe. "The working class has sufficient forces in order to repulse an attack, to protect its interests and prevent a new world slaughter." The Red Trade Union International bases itself on this undoubted premise in making the proposal to the leaders of the Amsterdam International that joint demonstrations be held on May First, and that a start be made concretely in respect to the restoration of the free trade unions in Germany, and of the unity of the trade unions in France and Spain. In order to beat back the onslaught of capitalism and fascism, what is needed is the united efforts of the organisations of the proletariat, what is required is the unification of the split trade union movement.

The establishment of the united front in France and Spain, in Austria and the Saar, has already shown to the very broadest masses of the workers what a force is represented by the united action of the working class, and what could be achieved

in the struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive, if the united front of the proletariat were carried out in good time and if all who participate in it carry on the struggle to the finish. This is why we are aware in advance that the appeal made by the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. to the Amsterdam International, which is the most important document issued in the international trade union movement during recent years, will meet with full approval and will arouse a mighty echo among all the workers organised in the trade unions.

The Red Trade Union International was formed 15 years ago to do away with the split in the working-class movement caused by the policy of class collaboration pursued in the Amsterdam International. It should not be forgotten that the R.I.L.U. was formed only four years after the October Revolution, during which period Communists throughout the world exerted tremendous efforts to transform the trade unions into genuine weapons of struggle for the class interests of the workers. Long before the foundation of the R.I.L.U., the 2nd Congress of the Communist International in 1920 demanded that the Communists in all countries should

"enter the trade unions in order to make them into conscious organs of struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and for Communism . . . Any voluntary abandonment of the trade union movement, any artificial attempt to form special unions unless this is rendered essential by exceptional acts of violence on the part of the trade union bureaucracy . . . or by their narrow aristocratic policy of preventing the broad masses of unskilled workers from becoming members of the organisation—is a tremendous danger for the Communist movement."

Only the mass expulsion of revolutionary elements and of whole trade union organisations, only the splitting policy of class collaboration pursued by the reformist leaders of the trade unions, led to the establishment of Red trade unions and to the formation of the R.I.L.U.

The R.I.L.U. was formed in order to ensure that the trade unions would be converted from bodies which shirked and hindered the struggle against the capitalists into bodies fighting for the defence of the everyday interests of the masses, and into levers for the destruction of wage slavery. The entire history of the R.I.L.U. is a history of the struggle to bring about the unity of the trade union organisations so as to carry on active class struggle.

In face of the offensive of capital and fascism, the masses of the workers in the trade unions, and the trade union organisations in the localities are

themselves proceeding to bring about the unity of the T.U. movement. In France three-quarters of the railwaymen organised in both trade unions have united. In Spain, the unity of action of the Asturian miners, rendered firm by the blood shed in the heroic October battles, has led to the immediate unification of the miners' unions in Asturias. The R.I.L.U. has declared its readiness to give full

support to all such efforts made to bring about the unity of the trade union movement. The R.I.L.U. has declared its readiness to discuss any proposals made in this direction that come from the leaders of the Amsterdam Trade Union International.

FOR THE UNITED WORKING-CLASS FRONT!

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT!

FOR WORLD TRADE UNION UNITY!

To the Bureau of the International Trade Union Federation

Paris.

Dear Sirs,

The bourgeoisie, taking advantage of the split in the trade union movement, succeeded during the five years of the crisis in depriving the workers of capitalist countries, completely or partially, of their political rights and economic achievements. The condition of the working class in all the capitalist and colonial countries is ever worsening and becoming more and more insufferable. The toilers are bearing the burden of the crisis. In a number of countries (Germany, Austria and Spain) Fascism achieved a temporary victory and did away with all the legal workers' organisations, workers' press and the institutions built by the working class. Fascism is threatening the labour movement of other countries. At the same time the relations between the different countries are becoming more and more strained. German Fascism is openly preparing for aggressive wars. Japanese imperialism is continuing its aggressive actions in the Far East, seizing one Chinese province after another. Italian imperialism is sending its troops to Abyssinia. At any moment some local conflict can give rise to a new world butchery which will bring unheard-of calamities to toiling mankind.

The working class has sufficient forces in order to repulse an attack to protect its interests and to prevent a new world slaughter. But this necessitates the joint efforts of the working class in the struggle against the common enemy, this makes it necessary that all the trade union organisations come out together, in a united front, against the bourgeoisie and for the achievement of the immediate and general aims of the labour movement; this makes it necessary that the unity of the split trade union movement be restored.

If the trade union organisations of the world would on May First this year come out shoulder to shoulder in united ranks against Fascism, the offensive of capital and war danger, such action

would be of enormous significance. It would be of particular importance to carry out successfully in the near future an amalgamation of the trade unions of France and Spain, where serious steps have already been taken in this direction, and to restore by joint action the free trade unions in Germany, whose mass character is necessary for resistance to the attacks of the capitalists and for the overthrow of the fascist régime.

Considering this, the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions proposes that a conference be organised of the representatives of the Red International of Labour Unions and of the International Trade Union Federation for the discussion of the following questions:

(1) Joint actions of the trade unions affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions and to the International Trade Union Federation on May First, against Fascism, the offensive of capital and against war.

(2) Assistance in the amalgamation of the trade unions in France and Spain.

(3) Assistance in the restoration of the free trade unions in Germany.

We believe at the same time that it would be of great importance to discuss at this conference the question which is of vital significance to the working class of the world, namely, THE FORMS, METHODS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RESTORATION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY.

It is understood that we are ready to discuss any proposals of yours concerning the agenda of this conference. We authorise comrades Racamond and Monmousseau to lead negotiations with you on this question.

Sincerely yours,

EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE RED INTERNATIONAL
OF LABOUR UNIONS.

March 7th, 1935.

COMINTERN PEOPLE

**Und als die Richter ihr Geschäft begannen
Stand einer von den Kommunisten auf
Stand einer auf mit lacheldner Gebärde
Und sprach vom Tag, der einmal Kommen werde,
Den blutenden fünf Sechsteln dieser Erde.*
(Erich Weinert . . . Dimitrov.)**

FEBRUARY 27th marked the completion of a year since the liberation of George Dimitrov, one of the old leaders of the Communist International, a great proletarian revolutionary, who embodied in his single-handed fight at the Leipzig trial against all the forces of loathsome German fascism, all the majesty of the working class which is marching irresistibly to the victory of socialism throughout the world.

March 3rd marked the completion of two years since the fascist dungeons have held our Teddy,† Ernst Thaelmann, one of the leaders of the Communist International, born of the flesh and blood of the working class of Germany, one whose name has brought tremors of fear to the German bourgeoisie, and who lives in the hearts of millions of German toilers as the symbol of their liberation from the detested oppression of fascism and capitalism.

On February 8th, hangman Horthy's judges passed a sentence of life-long imprisonment on Mathias Rakosi, former secretary of the Communist International, one of the glorious leaders of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary, one who for ten years has steadfastly withstood the mockery of the fascist jailers.

These are Comintern people. They are the incarnation of the programme of the Communist International. They represent a generation of leaders of the working class movement, before whose eyes the old social-democracy has rotted and disintegrated, leaders who have grown and become steeled by the teachings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, and who have been trained by the Communist International under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. They represent a generation of leaders of the working class in the epoch of the proletarian revolution.

For fifteen years the social-democratic leaders have tried to convince the workers that Communism means only the C.P.S.U., that there are no Communists in Western Europe who are leaders

of the working class movement, and that the whole of the history and all the traditions of the international working class movement, are embodied in the leadership of the Second International.

Who is inspired nowadays by the names of Vandervelde and Kautsky, Hilferding and the Danish Royal Minister, Stauning? Who gives a thought to the leaders of German social-democracy? Where are the masses among whom the names of these people arouse enthusiasm for the struggle against fascism, for the downtrodden rights of the working class, won by the sweat and blood of generations of workers? The catastrophic bankruptcy of these people is the bankruptcy of the policy of social-democracy, the bankruptcy of the programme of the Second International. By their treachery on August 4th, 1914, by their tactics of the "lesser evil" before the advent of the fascist dictatorship, by the whole of their policy during the fifteen years that have elapsed since the war, the social-democratic leaders prepared the ground for the unrestricted terror and unbridled chauvinistic agitation of fascism, and even now, as an offset to the "madness of the brave" in Asturias and at the barricades of Vienna, they bring forward the despicable legend about a "counter-revolutionary situation." The Communist International has hammered out DIMITROV, THAELMANN and RAKOSI; ITIKAW (leader of the C.P. of Japan, who gave an example of how a proletarian revolutionary should behave in court, and was sentenced to penal servitude for life), and LO-DIN-SHEN (one of the leaders of the Canton Commune, member of the C.C. of the C.P. of China, behaved in an exceptionally manly fashion, when in court, transforming it into a tribune for the struggle against Japanese imperialism, and the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang, was executed in 1934), developed PROLETARIAN HEROISM ON A MASS SCALE, and created a phalanx of fearless proletarian revolutionaries who marched to the gallows singing the "International"—JOHN SCHER and LUTGENS in Germany, SALLAI and FURST in Hungary, as well as IVATA and NOVO (members of the C.C. of the C.P. of Japan, tortured in the Japanese police dens), and VAN KUN LYAO and SYN DZI MUN (outstanding leaders of the Soviet movement in China

*And when the judges proceeded to the case,
One of the Communists stood up,
Stood up with smiling face
And spoke of the day which one day would be
When over the bloodstained five-sixths of the globe—

† This was Comrade Thaelmann's nickname.—Ed.

who died a gallant death in the heroic struggle against imperialist intervention and Kuomintang counter-revolution). These iron cadres are invincible, because their strength lies in their **INSEPARABLE AND ORGANIC CONTACTS WITH THE MASSES**, in their **STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM**, which is victorious to-day in the mighty land of the Soviets and tomorrow will unfurl its red banner "over the blood-stained five-sixths of the globe."

GEORGE DIMITROV . . . From a young typesetter, reading Chernyshevsky's book *What Is To Be Done?* in secret—to Marx, Lenin and Stalin, to the historic tribune at Leipzig:

"I am a soldier of the proletarian revolution; I am a soldier of the Communist International and will remain so to my last breath." . . .

These words uttered by Dimitrov, who at the Leipzig trial became transformed from accused into the menacing accuser of the German bourgeoisie and fascism, were a signal for the entire working class in Germany, caught unawares by the extent of the fascist terror, to raise the revolutionary struggle anew against fascism. The Leipzig trial was of tremendous importance in encouraging the Communist Party of Germany and the German workers. We need but call to mind the first open demonstrations against fascism which were elicited by the Leipzig trial, the thousands of workers' letters of greeting to Dimitrov, the thousands of radio-listeners-in who scattered throughout the whole of proletarian Germany, the joyful news of the international campaign against fascism evoked by the trial of Dimitrov. Or the working class witnesses, tortured by fascist Storm-Troopers, who, when in court, looked into the eyes of Dimitrov with the greatest moral satisfaction, bringing down on to their heads the wrath of the fascist judge who demanded that they should look at him and not at Dimitrov, because Dimitrov "hypnotised them."

The Leipzig trial was a tremendous blow at the prestige of national socialism. The devastating personal confrontation with the real incendiary of the Reichstag—the "frantic captain" Herman Goering—and later the verdict of acquittal, meant that the first doubts had crept into the ranks of the uneasy petty-bourgeoisie as to who had really set fire to the Reichstag. It was in this already that the first oppositional sentiments found their expression, to burst out openly only a year later—on June 30th, 1934.

The defeat of fascism at Leipzig was a victory for the entire international proletariat. It was the **STARTING POINT FOR THE UNITED DEVELOPMENT OF A WIDE CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROLETARIAN UNITED FRONT, THE PROTEST OF THE WHOLE OF THE PEOPLE AGAINST FASCISM**. A very wide united anti-fascist front came into being without the formal signing of a

pact. This united front was cemented by the unforgettable days when Dimitrov made his historic defence. For the whole world, literally the whole world, followed every stage of this dramatic single-handed struggle against fascism with strained attention.

It was the first practical reply to the doctrine of passivity preached by the social-democratic leaders under the flag of the "epoch of reaction." **IT WAS A WHOLE STAGE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM**. And the very fact that the Leipzig trial was **PART OF THE CLASS FRONT** opened up tremendous possibilities for the mobilisation of the masses at home and abroad in defence of Ernst Thaelmann.

ERNST THAELMANN . . . There was probably no leader of any Communist Party in capitalist countries on whom the fury of the bourgeoisie and their social-democratic lackeys would have burst so fiercely as on Ernst Thaelmann. For Thaelmann is the German proletariat itself. Everybody has seen how he has become transformed from the leader of the transport workers of Hamburg, not only into the leader of the **C.P.G.**, but also into the leader of the **ENTIRE WORKING CLASS OF GERMANY**. When Thaelmann spoke at the third Congress of the Communist International in 1921, on the question of strike tactics, Lenin immediately directed attention to his enormous strike experience. And when Lenin then criticised the German Communist Party for the March rising, Thaelmann did not lose heart, but on the contrary, he immediately **TOOK HEART**, and in later years often told his friends that **THIS WAS THE TURNING POINT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIS POLITICAL LIFE**. Ernst Thaelmann is the embodiment of the Bolshevisation of the German Communist Party, of the growing fighting capacity of the German working class. His great love for the **C.P.S.U.**, his loyalty to the Communist International, his irreconcilable struggle against deviations, his passionate ideological attacks on social-democratic theories that had crept into the Party, constitute a tremendous historical heritage for the Communist Party of Germany, a mighty weapon for its further Bolshevisation.

The fact that the German Communist Party has formed mass underground organisations, and is carrying on a heroic struggle against fascism, and now understands its weaknesses which arise primarily from an underestimation of the united front, is also to a considerable degree the result of the whole of the preceding work of Thaelmann, who, while refusing to make any concessions to social-democratic theories, always sought to make contacts with the social-democratic workers and insistently and systematically inculcated the idea of the united front in the minds of the Communists. The German workers still remember the twenty-

one questions put to him by the social-democratic workers and his reply to them. The entire international proletariat still remembers the speech made by Thaelmann in Paris in connection with the fifteenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, a speech permeated with a powerful feeling for internationalism and the united proletarian front.

The fascist dictatorship is preparing the trial of Ernst Thaelmann. The fascist cut-throats are subjecting him to cruel tortures. But neither tortures, nor lies, nor forged documents, nor the testimony of the fascist spies—Grabis, Kraus and Lass—can shake the iron determination of the leader of proletarian Germany. These efforts are doomed to produce a similarly miserable fiasco as the trial of George Dimitrov in Leipzig.

MATHIAS RAKOSI . . . After ten years of torture in the clutches of the Budapest secret police, he displayed his old courage in the speech he delivered before the court, in which he indicted the fascist "patriots" who betrayed military plans to the Roumanian interventionists against Soviet Hungary. Always the same heroic defence of the proletarian dictatorship and of all the measures it took.

SUCH ARE COMINTERN PEOPLE. They have arisen from the midst of the working class. They were engendered by the epoch of great class battles and mass proletarian heroism. They were and are inspired by the mighty example of the Bolshevik cohorts of Lenin and Stalin, by faith in the revolutionary, fighting powers of the masses, and a mighty confidence in the approach of the victory of the proletarian cause throughout the world. "Hurry and cut off my head," declared the rank-and-file Communist Fiete Schulz, a few days ago in the fascist court of Hamburg, "otherwise Communism will be here before you have time to look around . . ." In these innumerable examples of mass proletarian heroism we lose sight of the isolated helpless figures like Ernst Torgler, petit-bourgeois who have by chance found their way into the working class movement, who are thrown into a palsy of fear by the gown of a fascist judge, the personification of "law and order," and for whom the highest good is their own petit-bourgeois well-being.

Two years of fascist dictatorship have passed in Germany. During this period it has succeeded in dealing a number of hard blows at the German working class. It has deprived the workers of the

last vestiges of political rights, and has converted the youth of the working class into the bondmen and serfs of German capitalism and the fascist state, even depriving them of the right of labour and to move freely from place to place. But national socialism has not succeeded in destroying the Communist Party, in breaking the iron steadfastness of its leaders, in destroying the will of the toiling masses to offer resistance, and consequently has proved incapable of ensuring a capitalist way out of the crisis for the German bourgeoisie and a new era of prosperity for German capitalism.

The example of the great struggle carried on by Dimitrov, Thaelmann, Rakosi, Scher, Lutgens and all the innumerable heroes in the army of international Communism, must inspire the Communists of the whole world and the working class of the whole world, to bring about as quickly as possible the united front for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, and directed against the new military gambles of imperialism, and the capitalist offensive. It must inspire all the toilers, all honest opponents of fascist barbarism, to join the mighty anti-fascist front of all the people—

FOR THE LIBERATION OF THAELMANN,
FOR THE LIBERATION OF RAKOSI,
FOR THE LIBERATION OF ALL THE PRISONERS OF
FASCISM.

Let everyone remember the first words uttered by George Dimitrov as he stepped out of the fascist aeroplane at the Moscow aerodrome:

"Anti-fascist public opinion should not be satisfied . . . The struggle for the liberation of the leader of the German revolutionary workers—Thaelmann—the struggle for the liberation of the other prisoners of fascism . . . is a matter of honour for the international anti-fascist movement."

The struggle against fascism is a hard one. But it provides the fullest confidence in victory, demanding that all the efforts of the united front of the working class and of the entire anti-fascist movement be strained, that a correct Bolshevik policy be pursued, and that Bolshevik reliability and discipline be maintained.

These Comintern people set us an example of this iron self-restraint and discipline. Only the Communist International could bring forward such people. And only under the leadership of the Communist International is a new and free life for the toilers being built on the ruins of decayed capitalism and its loathsome fascist régime.

LLOYD GEORGE AS THE "SAVIOUR" OF THE BRITISH BOURGEOISIE*

By R. PALME DUTT.

SINCE the close of the first round of wars and revolutions, Lloyd George, the outstanding and ablest leader of the British bourgeoisie and the sole surviving front-rank statesman of the war epoch, has been in political eclipse. To-day, on the eve of the second round of wars and revolutions, he is once again in the political forefront. This portent is a sign of the times, both for the world situation and for the inner situation in Britain.

During the critical years 1916-1922 Lloyd George was the undisputed dictator of British politics. In the hour of danger the entire bourgeoisie turned aside from their traditionally trained upper-class statesmen, the Balfours and Asquiths, to the "demagogue-adventurer," whom they had denounced and reviled, for their salvation. Lloyd George's war-dictatorship was the dictatorship of the most reckless, aggressive chauvinist elements of the finance-capital, of the "war millionaires." By an audacious combination of ruthlessness, cunning and manoeuvre, he steered the ship of British Imperialism to its disastrous victory in the war, to an unparalleled expansion of the Empire, and then through the revolutionary rapids of the post-war years, of the revolutionary wave in India, Ireland, Egypt and in Britain. But in 1921 began the chronic economic stagnation of British capitalism, which has continued unbroken since with only minor ups and downs on a low level.

Lloyd George's star waned. Once the hour of immediate menace, of the war-crisis and of the revolutionary wave, was passed, the bourgeoisie thrust aside the "adventurer" and his too "dangerous" policies and sought to return to "normal" conditions. By the "palace-revolution" of the Carlton Club meeting on October, 1922, Lloyd George and his coalition system was displaced; Conservatism took the reins under the leadership of a Bonar Law and a Baldwin. "Tranquillity" was the watchword of the new phase. For twelve years Lloyd George, despite repeated attempts to come again into the forefront, notably in 1929, when he brought forward his Reconstruction Plan, has remained in compulsory retirement, although

still exercising a considerable influence on policy, especially on international policy.

A Planned Move to Bring Lloyd George to the Forefront Again.

To-day, Lloyd George is once again brought to the front amid the almost universal acclamation of the bourgeois party leaders and press. His announcement in December, 1934, of a new programme to counter unemployment and the economic crisis, although the actual details published were meagre and far from novel, was nevertheless hailed by the entire capitalist press from left to right, and indeed Labour to Fascist, as a political event of the first magnitude and of the highest promise. His campaign, opened in January, 1935, was met with warm welcomes from every party leader, including those from the Ministers of the National Government and the governmental press; and reports were widely current of projects, and even negotiations, for the reconstruction of the National Government to include Lloyd George. In the beginning of March the National Government directly approached Lloyd George, requesting him to submit to them his proposals which would receive careful attention.

From all this carefully organised publicity and semi-official reception it is abundantly clear that the present campaign of Lloyd George, unlike the unsuccessful campaign of 1929, cannot be regarded as merely a campaign of an individual leader and his group to regain power, but takes on rather the character of **A PLANNED MOVE OF THE MAIN BOURGEOIS FORCES TO BRING LLOYD GEORGE TO THE FRONT AT THE PRESENT MOMENT AS A NEW POLITICAL FACTOR, OR AS THE INSTRUMENT OF A NEW TURN IN POLICY.**

What underlies this new situation? Why does the bourgeoisie show signs of turning again to Lloyd George after twelve years of neglect?

Underlying this situation is the **INCREASING BANKRUPTCY OF POLICY OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.** But this in turn is the reflection of the worsening of the economic situation, the change in the relation of class forces and advance of working class militancy, and the new situation in the sphere of foreign policy.

The National Government was formed in 1931 to meet the situation of the financial crisis of that year, the discrediting of the second Labour Government, and the heavy programme of cuts which it was necessary to carry through against the working class. By the device of the "national"

* This article was written on March 5, before the publication of the actual Lloyd George Programme, and before the outcome of the negotiations between the National government and Lloyd George. The analysis of forces can accordingly only be provisional, and will require further working out on the basis of subsequent developments.

façade supposedly above parties, with the nominal leading rôle of the former Labour Party leaders, MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas, the bourgeois front was able to take advantage of the discontent of the workers with the Labour Government, to inflict a heavy defeat on the Labour Party, and to establish a strong government of capitalist concentration. The National Government had a considerable measure of success in its immediate objectives. It carried through the cuts to balance the budget. By this worsening of the workers' standards, by the depreciation of the pound and by the imposition of a tariff system, it was able to give a temporary stimulus to British economy. In Britain during 1933-4 the recovery was felt more powerfully than in any other capitalist country, although in fact on a continuing low level, below pre-war, and solving none of the basic problems. At the same time the dictatorship against the workers was strengthened by a series of administrative and legislative measures, especially the Sedition Act and the Unemployment Act; while the workers' struggle was heavily weakened by the effect of the open treachery of the main Labour Party leaders and the passivity of the remainder.

The Worsening Position of the "National" Government.

Nevertheless, by the end of 1934, and still more by the beginning of 1935, it was clear that the rôle of the National Government was becoming exhausted.

First, the economic situation began to show new signs of worsening. The stimulus through tariffs and currency depreciation was losing its effect; the home market, in the words of the Minister of Trade, Runciman, was "saturated." The foreign trade situation in 1934 showed a large increase in the adverse balance by £27 millions, and a return to a net deficit in the balance of payments. The minor "boom" for profits and security prices, set in motion by the upward movement of 1933-34, was reaching an end in a series of speculation scandals (pepper, tin, etc.) which reflected directly on the National Government. The pound began a new fall. The Unemployment figures for January rose steeply by a quarter of a million to 2,325,000 or only 63,000 below January, 1934.

Second, the dissatisfaction of an increasing proportion of the bourgeoisie at the lack of positive policy of the Government grew marked. This reflected itself in the growing Conservative revolt against the MacDonald-Baldwin combination and demand for a pure Conservative Government. The most aggressive expression of this was the right-wing Conservative revolt, directed immediately on the issue of India and of armaments. This opposition nearly obtained a majority at the Bristol conference of the Conservative Party in October,

1934. It mustered 79 Conservative M.P.s to vote against the Government over the India Bill in January, 1935. At the Wavertree by-election in February, 10,575 voted for the Right Conservative candidate, against 13,771 for the Government candidate, even at the cost of letting the Labour candidate in. The demand for reconstruction of the National Government was general in the governmental ranks, even though this demand covered many different tendencies.

Third, and most important, the wave of working-class struggle began to rise anew in 1934. This had shown itself already in the response to the National March and Congress in the beginning of the year, supported by a wide proportion of local labour bodies, despite official bans. It showed itself further in the active mass struggle against Fascism, notably in the episodes of Olympia and Hyde Park on September 9th, 1934. At the same time the workers began once again to stream to voting Labour. The local elections in November, 1934, revealed a powerful sweep to Labour, returning Labour majorities in many of the principal towns, including, for the first time, London.

The rising working-class struggle reached a new high point in the beginning of 1935 with the battle against the Unemployment Act and the enforced retreat of the Government. The newly appointed bureaucratic Unemployment Assistance Board established under the Act took over control on January 7th, and proceeded to enforce new scales of relief which meant wholesale cuts for the unemployed. The response was an overwhelming mass movement of resistance, especially in South Wales, the North-East Coast and Scotland. This mass struggle was directly led by the new united front leadership, represented by the Communist Party, the Independent Labour Party and the National Unemployed Workers' Movement. Within less than a month, on February 5th, the Government was compelled to suspend the new scales. An attempt to delay this suspension for one week was immediately defeated by a further wave of struggle, centring round Sheffield, and the Government was compelled to retreat again. By the day of this second retreat the confusion of the Government was such that the Prime Minister was compelled to answer in Parliament that he was vainly endeavouring to establish contact with his own Minister of Labour in order to discover what was the line of the Government.

The effect of this retreat of the Government before the united front mass struggle, combined with the signs of the worsening economic situation and political uncertainty, produced a wave of demoralisation and semi-panic in bourgeois and governmental circles. A survey of the governmental press during this period reveals a con-

tinuous exhortation against "panic." On February 11th *The Times'* editorial "Revision without Panic" noted that:

"The impression of lack of cohesion, lack of decision and lack of calm is unfortunate,"

and went on to insist that the consequences of the situation must be faced "without panic." On February 13th *The Times'* editorial returned to the theme:

"The breakdown of the regulations suggests the need for fresh resolutions rather than panic. Nevertheless, panic has raised its head."

On February 14th *The Times'* editorial noted the effect of the situation—

"to fray people's nerves and to weaken confidence. Rumours were set going which in an exaggerated form were circulated very widely on the Continent."

On February 15th *The Times'* editorial returned to the theme of

"recent signs of a decline of confidence in the continuation of industrial recovery and of British credit . . . The fall in British Government securities and on the Stock Exchange reflects nervousness at home and abroad."

And on February 21st Baldwin spoke of "the curious state of hysteria and panic" which had developed:

"The 'curious state of hysteria and panic,' as Mr. Baldwin called it on Thursday (February 21), which reached its height about a fortnight ago both in the City and at Westminster, seems for the time being at all events to have been allayed. (*Times*, 23.2.35.)

It is against this background of worsening of the situation from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, weakening of the National Government and advance of the workers' united front of mass struggle, that the significance of the Lloyd George campaign must be judged.

Two Stages in the "Lloyd George" Campaign.

The Lloyd George campaign so far falls into two sharply defined stages: the first, before the new phase of intensified mass struggle had developed; the second, after it.

The first announcement of the Lloyd George campaign took place in December, 1934. At that time the principal outward sign of the profound mass stirring against the National Government which was developing had shown itself in the overwhelming electoral sweep to Labour at the local elections in November, and the consequent prospect of a sweeping Labour victory at the future General Election. Under these conditions Lloyd George ADDRESSED HIMSELF IN THE FIRST PLACE DIRECTLY TO THE LABOUR PARTY. The first announcement of his campaign appeared, not in the general press, but in exclusive interviews to the *Daily Herald* and to the *News-Chronicle*, that is, to the Labour and Liberal organs. The interview was prominently featured over the entire front page of the *Daily Herald* of December 15th. He based

his stand on the familiar "New Deal" type of analysis of the "breakdown" of the existing economic system (so also his speech in the House of Commons on December 13th, "The whole machinery of wealth production and of wealth distribution has broken down"):

"There is something desperately wrong with a system which cannot adequately feed, clothe, house or even provide employment for a large proportion of its workers. And I'm going to spend the last years of my life in a big effort to alter it."

"The General Election will show an immense upheaval in favour of a complete overhaul of our economic system."

He proclaimed that he had prepared a "Plan" in consultation with "a group of eminent economists, business men and financiers," to be "published early in the New Year." The only specific point mentioned was state control of the Bank of England:

"National control of the Bank of England as the key to economic recovery and reconstruction is a foremost point in my programme. The Bank of England must become a real State Bank."

While the "Plan" remained vague, the appeal to the Labour Party for a future "Left Government" was direct:

"I am free and independent, tied to no party, but I am ready to co-operate with anybody to get something done. . . . Labour will win a big victory at the next General Election . . . Here is as much as any Government of the Left can do in five years—why can't we get together to do it?"

The rôle of Lloyd George up to this point is simple and transparent. A sweeping Labour victory is in prospect at the future General Election. Lloyd George comes forward on behalf of the bourgeoisie to offer to form a Left Bloc Government, or Liberal-Labour Coalition, i.e., to guide the prospective Labour majority in the interests of the bourgeoisie. This proposal at the outset receives a high degree of welcome from the official Labour leadership, who fear nothing more than the exposure of having to form a Labour Government on the basis of an absolute Labour majority. The *Daily Herald* editorial on December 15th noted that his demand for a "drastic overhauling and reconstruction of the economic organisation of the country" was "all to the good":

"The main thing is that so far as can be seen Mr. Lloyd George on one essential is in full accord with the Labour Party."

The leader of the Labour Party, Lansbury, in a speech at Mitcham on December 15th, declared:

"If Mr. Lloyd George and his friends want to help re-plan, help us to reorganise British industry and get back the land and the mineral wealth of the country into the hands of the whole nation, we shall welcome their help." "Re-plan," "reorganise," "overhaul," "reconstruct" (plus land nationalisation and statification of the Bank of England)—this is the typical Liberal line put forward, with which the Labour Party declares

itself in full accord and ready to co-operate with Lloyd George on this basis.

BUT THIS INITIAL FLIRTATION OF LLOYD GEORGE AND THE LABOUR PARTY WAS DESTINED TO RECEIVE A SHARP SHOCK. On the one hand, it aroused an immediate outcry from the membership of the Labour Party. On the other hand, the mass struggle developed to its new high stage in January, revealing that the Labour Party leadership was losing control, and that the new united front leadership, centring around the Communist Party, was directly leading the advancing mass struggle.

L.I.G. Decides to Concentrate on Building the Bourgeois "National" Front.

At once a sharp change in the situation took place. On the one side, the Labour Party leadership was compelled to adapt itself to the rising mass struggle, adopted more "left" language against the National Government, and proceeded to issue declarations more or less repudiating Lloyd George. On the other side, Lloyd George, recognising with extreme agility that the task of saving capitalism would now be likely to require sterner measures than a simple collaboration with the Labour Party, whose hold on the workers could no longer be relied on, and that the decisive future issue might become THE CONCENTRATION OF THE BOURGEOISIE "NATIONAL" FRONT AGAINST THE MASS STRUGGLE, proceeded immediately to change his tone and turned his emphasis on to the necessity of "strong" "energetic" government, in phrases which won especially the applause of the younger Conservatives.

The opening speech of his campaign, at Bangor on January 17th, revealed this sharp change, and was in considerable contrast to the original announcement in December.

The Bangor speech advocated (1) "national unity for action"; (2) a much stronger line" in foreign policy; (3) "ruthless" use of tariffs to extract economic advantages from other countries; (4) compulsory industrial reorganisation; (5) agricultural development and re-settlement; (6) a public works programme; (7) utilisation of "the immense opportunities offered by our colonial empire"; (8) a "Prosperity Loan" to finance the programme; (9) War-Cabinet principle ("I would restore the principle of the old War-Cabinet"), or Cabinet of Five with full powers.

The proposed nationalisation or statification of the Bank of England disappeared into a much modified form, that "steps should be taken to bring the bank into closer touch with the business activities of the country. The directorate of the bank must be chosen on this basis." An explicit warning was added against the nationalisation of the joint-stock banks.

The proposal for a Left Bloc Government also disappeared and was replaced by advocacy of "a National Government." This was made explicit by the statement of his Birmingham speech on January 26th:

"I will support a National Government as long as it grapples effectively with the national emergency."

In subsequent statements Lloyd George expressed his admiration, not only for the Roosevelt example, but also for the Hitler example, communicating an interview on these lines to the German press.

This line aroused the enthusiastic support of almost the entire bourgeoisie, and even sympathetic references of Government Ministers. Churchill, leader of the Right Conservatives, found the speech "virile and sober." Ramsay Muir, President of the National Liberal Federation, found it "a sound and bold lead." Sir Robert Horne, addressing a Glasgow Unionist meeting, declared that Lloyd George "had sensed what the nation wanted." Sir Herbert Samuel declared that all the Liberal leaders gave it a "cordial welcome." Sir Austen Chamberlain, representative of the older Conservative leaders, "welcomed the contribution" and paid tribute to Lloyd George's "indomitable courage and infinite resource." The *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* were loud in their praise. *The Times* wrote:

"He wants a reconstituted National Government to fight the next General Election, and he wants greater driving force and cohesion imparted to policy. There can be no quarrel in principle with either of these ambitions."

The Fascist *Blackshirt*, in a welcoming article ("Whither Lloyd George? Will He March in the Spirit of the Modern Age?"), found in his programme "the first steps on the road towards fascist conclusions."

From the side of the Government, despite a critical speech by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Neville Chamberlain (who found the proposals "lacking either in novelty or precision," but promised that they would be "examined with an open mind by the Government"), moves were made for a reconstruction of the National Government to include Lloyd George. According to the governmental *Observer* (3/2/35) "a numerical majority of Ministers are in favour of including Mr. Lloyd George if his adhesion can be obtained on tolerable terms." Some preliminary negotiations were attempted during February, but were reported to have broken down on the opposition of Lloyd George to MacDonald as Prime Minister and on the hostility between Lloyd George and Neville Chamberlain. On March 1st MacDonald directly approached Lloyd George by letter, requesting him to submit his proposals, which "will be considered immediately and carefully by the

Cabinet"; Lloyd George replied that, after suitable revision, he would forward his proposals.

What, then, must be our judgment of the Lloyd George campaign and its significance, as it has so far developed?

The general situation underlying the campaign is, as we have seen, characterised by (1) worsening of the economic situation; (2) bankruptcy and weakening of the National Government; (3) critical stage of the problems of foreign policy and of the menace of war; (4) rise of mass discontent and mass struggle, developing beyond the forms of the Labour Party; (5) general demand of the bourgeoisie for new and more active measures of policy. It is evident that high hopes are placed by the bourgeoisie on Lloyd George as the leader to give the new line needed at the present stage.

Main Lines of the Lloyd George Programme.

What can Lloyd George offer to meet this situation?

As we have already stated, his programme still remains unpublished. From the summary indications in his speeches, especially the Bangor speech, it is possible to draw together the following basic characteristics:—

First, on the political side, INTENSIFICATION OF THE CAPITALIST DICTATORSHIP ON THE WAR-MODEL—"the principal of the old War-Cabinet. This is combined with the appeal to "NATIONAL UNITY," under cover of extreme social-demagogic propaganda about the "breakdown" of the old régime, war on "Mammon," the need for "action . . . vision . . . vigour," etc.

Second, on the economic side, advance to a "forward" policy and considerable PUBLIC SPENDING PROGRAMME ("a few hundreds of millions"), financed by loan, on public works, roads, canals, railways, electricity, water supply, etc., absorbing a proportion of the unemployed. The rate of wages is not indicated, but the slogan "substitute wages for doles" (speech at Pwllheli on January 20th) suggests the same principles as with the similar policies of Roosevelt and Hitler, to establish a low basic rate for all unemployed workers, drawn on to this work, in place of trade union rates. (Whether this policy does not imply an extension of INFLATION is left undiscussed, but the attack on the gold standard is prominent.)

Third, extension of the system of STATE-CONTROLLED CAPITALISM through compulsory reorganisation of the basic industries, a statutory National Development Board, increasing state control of investment and credit, etc., all on the basis of the existing monopoly capitalist ownership, but with increasing use of the state machine for the benefit of the trusts, for state financial guarantees, etc.

Fourth, AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT—to place one

million unemployed industrial workers on the land and double the proportion of home-grown food supplies. The parallel here to the Roosevelt and Hitler policies is obvious, and the war significance is of especial importance.

Fifth, "ruthless" use of TARIFFS to extract trade concessions, and development of the COLONIAL EMPIRE.

Sixth, in the sphere of foreign policy, "A STRONG POLICY, WHICH MEANS A BOLD, FIRM AND DECISIVE LEAD BY GREAT BRITAIN."

It is evident that we have here an attempt to develop the policy of the National Government to more active and aggressive forms. While the old capitalist-reconstruction programme of Lloyd George and of the Liberal Yellow Book, and also of the Labour official programme, are in part incorporated, new characteristics are markedly visible (the emphasis on a war-dictatorship, on "ruthless" use of tariffs, on intensified exploitation of the colonial empire, on "national unity," on a "strong policy," etc.). These new characteristics reveal the strong influence of the Roosevelt and Hitler models. We have here a characteristic ADAPTATION IN MODIFIED FORMS, PARTLY OF THE ROOSEVELT "NEW DEAL" AND PARTLY OF A "NATIONAL-SOCIALIST" TYPE OF PROGRAMME, TO THE PRESENT STAGE AND REQUIREMENTS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM.

On a first survey the closest analogy might appear to be the Rooseveltian "New Deal" as the largely avowed model. Nevertheless, there are important differences. The core of the propaganda and professed aim of the Roosevelt programme in its first period was the insistence on the necessity of raising wages, of raising working-class standards, as the condition of the solution of the crisis. This conception is completely absent from the Lloyd George programme.*

Indeed, the whole social aspect, the insistence on social reform, the formal insistence on the rights of labour organisations, all the "liberal" aspects of the Roosevelt propaganda, are almost entirely absent from the Lloyd George programme (save for cursory references to housing, possible raising of the school age and lowering of the pension age). On the other hand, the openly aggressive "national" chauvinist imperialist tone is far more

* The naïveté of Lloyd George's conception and approach on this issue, and the absence of any theoretical basis, even of the type of the theorisings of the Rooseveltian Brain Trust, was strikingly illustrated in Lloyd George's answer to a questioner at one of his meetings, who asked whether the glut of commodities could be absorbed within the existing wage-system. He replied (*Times*, 21.1.25):

"If you had a system by which everyone was put to work, and all those who were at work had a fair remuneration for their services, in wages or profits, the question of distribution would be more or less solved."

The illiterate simplicity of this "economic theory" is worthy of Hitler.

emphasised from the outset. In many respects the influence of the Hitler type of policies may be more strongly traced (especially in the proposals to deal with the unemployed by putting them at low rates on public works or enforcing settlement on the land).

Lloyd George's Solidarity With Fascism.

In this connection, it is important to note the close admiration Lloyd George has repeatedly expressed for the Hitler régime, of which he has consistently constituted himself the defender. This has been particularly noticeable when currents of public opinion in England have turned against Hitler-Germany. Thus in the House of Commons debate on November 28th on German rearmament, when Churchill, Austen Chamberlain and others were delivering speeches attacking the growth of militarism in Germany as a menace to British interests, and even professing qualified approval of the Soviet Union as a bulwark of peace, Lloyd George, with a sharp eye to the basic British policy, went out of his way to counter this trend and declare:—

"In a very short time, perhaps in a year or two, the Conservative elements in this country will be looking to Germany as the bulwark against Communism in Europe. She is planted right in the centre of Europe, and if her defence breaks down against the Communists—only two or three years ago a very distinguished German statesman said to me, 'I am not afraid of Nazism, but Communism'—if Germany is seized by the Communists, Europe will follow; because the Germans could make a better job of it than any other country. Do not let us be in a hurry to condemn Germany. We shall be welcoming Germany as our friend."

This is the clearest recognition of CLASS SOLIDARITY WITH FASCISM yet made by any leading British statesman. It is of key importance, not only for clearing up the international policy of Lloyd George, but for his basic inner policy, however it is masked by "liberal" phrases.

No less worth noting in this connection is the open support of official British Fascism for the Lloyd George campaign. Their general policy of denunciation of all "old gang" political leaders here receives a notable exception. The *Blackshirt* writes (18.12.34):

"We must remember that Mr. Lloyd George has never expressed anything but admiration for our Leader, and has never condemned the growing Fascist movement among the youth of the nation. Indeed, after Olympia, when we were faced with an almost united front of abuse and misrepresentation, it was the veteran Lloyd George who wrote a statesmanlike article of encouragement . . .

"In return, let us assure him that the patriotic youth of Britain regard him with at least very different feelings to those they entertain for the elder members of the present government. They have not forgotten his services in the war, and await with interest his contribution to the common task of national reconstruction, which can only be carried through by a return to the wartime spirit of courageous effort under disciplined leadership."

In the same article the programme is analysed as representing "the first steps on the road to Fascist conclusions."

These subsidiary signs, not only of the analogy in political content between the Lloyd George programme and the aims of fascism, but also of the conscious positive relationship of Lloyd George to fascism and of fascism to Lloyd George, are important signposts of the deeper significance of the Lloyd George programme and campaign.

The more closely the Lloyd George programme and campaign is examined, the more clearly its flimsy "progressive" "Left" covering disappears and its essential character and purpose stands revealed as the expression of THE NEXT STAGE OF FASCISATION AND WAR PREPARATION IN BRITAIN.

At the same time, in view of the extreme unpopularity of the National Government and the rising mass discontent, the attempt will be made to realise this programme in the first stage, either through a "Left" form, in co-operation with the Labour Party, or, if the strong hostility of the Labour rank and file makes this impossible, then through some kind of "Centre" combination (the old aim of Lloyd George since the Coalition days of after the war) of a "broad progressive national front" replacing the old party forms. And if the emergency becomes strong enough, e.g., direct development of open war-menace, the attempt will be made once again to draw in the Labour Party.

Will the British bourgeoisie adopt the policy proposed by Lloyd George?

Certain sections of the bourgeoisie are still hesitant, as witness the opposition of Neville Chamberlain on behalf of the Treasury and Montagu Norman. These fear to shake British credit by any large-scale spending policy on the Roosevelt-Hitler style. But as the economic situation begins to worsen, and the existing policy promises no solution of the difficulties, this opposition weakens, and the drive to a more adventurous policy becomes more and more dominant. The growing sharpness of class issues plays also into the hands of the Lloyd George line.

If the economic situation continues to worsen, if the war-menace draws closer, and if the united mass struggle extends—and all these are characteristic of the present situation in Britain—then it is probable that the British bourgeoisie will turn to the type of programme put forward by Lloyd George for salvation, and this programme will represent the next stage in the advance to fascism and to war. Hence the decisive warning for the workers stands out sharply; more than ever the united working-class front against the new capitalist attack preparation, of which Lloyd George, the most dangerous class enemy of the proletariat, stands out once again as the leader and driving force.

THE NEW PROGRAMME OF THE GERMAN "REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS"

By F. DAVID.

The following article by Comrade David, entitled "The New Programme of the German Revolutionary Socialists" is of special interest now to the English reader. The arguments brought forward in this article reply to a considerable degree to the "Socialist Policy" being published in the columns of the "New Leader" by the I.L.P. for submission to the I.L.P. Conference at Derby. Editorial Board.

A GROUP of German social-democrats have published a programme entitled "The Road to Socialist Germany." The introduction to this programme tells us that it was drawn up by "revolutionary socialists" who at one time belonged to the left opposition of German social-democracy, were members of the "socialist labour party," or belonged to the "Prague" Social-democratic C.C., but who, after Hitler's advent to power, made a turn to the left.

The *Zeitschrift für Sozialismus*, a journal published in Prague by the emigrant C.C. of the German social-democratic party has published this programme with a sharp article in reply.

Why has this document appeared just at this moment? What is going on inside German social-democracy, if even some members of the C.C. have decided to align themselves with those who have drawn up this new radical programme?

To answer this question we must visualise a clear picture of the progress of radicalisation going on among the social-democratic masses, and form some idea of the hopes and disillusionment experienced by the C.C. of the social-democratic party since it betook itself to Prague. The first document issued by the so-called Prague C.C. after the social-democratic party in Germany was declared illegal bore the loud title of "Revolution against Hitler!" However, the last thing in the minds of Wels and Hilferding then (as now) was revolution. Six months after the social-democratic party was declared illegal, in the summer of 1934, the representatives of the Prague C.C. came to an agreement with the representatives of Schleicher, Klausener and Gregor Strasser concerning support for a military dictatorship. Such a conference took place in May in Copenhagen. The well-informed *Manchester Guardian* was the first to publish a report concerning certain negotiations being carried on between the Prague C.C. and influential military and civil groups in Germany. The C.C. "refuted" this report, but when the *Manchester Guardian* produced detailed revelations nobody

dared to refute it any longer. The negotiations in Copenhagen circled around the possibility of changing the government by removing or "reforming" the Hitler government. As a concession to the social-democratic leaders, it was proposed to organise "neutral" trade unions instead of the present "Labour Front."

The "Hopes" of the "Prague" C.C. of the German Social Democratic Party.

The Prague C.C., after the events of June 30th, stated unequivocally in a secret letter to its instructors in Germany, that the C.C. had hopes of disagreement between the Army General Staff and monarchist groups on the one hand, and the National Socialist Party on the other. They reckoned upon there being a military dictatorship of the Schleicher type instead of the fascist régime, and were prepared to participate in such a dictatorship, if only it were established:

"Nothing," they state, "can so hasten on developments as the destruction of Hitler's influence over the masses. We must show the masses Hitler's real face, and thus FORCE REACTION TO SEARCH FOR NEW MEANS WITH WHICH TO KEEP THE MASSES ON ITS SIDE."

Monarchist and military circles, runs the letter, do not come out actively against Hitler, for they fear that Hitler would be followed by bolshevism.

"It is essential, therefore," they continue, "that our work should become obvious to wide circles of the population. This is necessary in order to destroy the fear of bolshevism which still predominates, or the fear of the chaos which it is alleged must follow the fall of Hitler."

Not only did the social-democratic leaders believe in the rapid substitution of a military or monarchist dictatorship in place of the Hitler régime: Illusions of this kind were also to be found among the broad masses of social-democratic workers mainly before Hitler became appointed Reichspräsident.

During the last few weeks rumours have been current about a report made to Hitler by the Chief of the Army authorities, General Fritsch, in which a series of "reforms" are alleged to have been demanded. The representative of the Prague C.C. published an article in the *Sozialdemokrat* concerning this report, which most frankly put forward the viewpoint of the C.C.:

"Fritsch is against the totality (monopoly) of National-Socialism. He perfectly correctly admits that the present unity of the nation is deception, that in a moment of danger it will be hopeless to reckon upon the broad masses of the population . . . Modern war is possible only as a people's war. The first thing required for the conduct of war is the industrial population. The present

régime has removed itself farthest from the worker. Fascism gives rise to war, but is not in a position to wage war properly. Therefore, the German supreme military command are against National-Socialism, are against the present régime."

Wels and his friends are hoping that the German bourgeoisie will sooner or later realise the impossibility of waging war while there is a working class in the rear preparing for resistance, and with the masses of the petty bourgeoisie dissatisfied and rebellious. The bourgeoisie will again remember those who played such a big part in calming down the rear during the imperialist war, will remember the leaders of social-democracy and the trade unions. Wels and his friends are ready again to do in the coming war what they did during the imperialist war, but they require corresponding remuneration for doing so.

"The events which are taking place in Germany to-day (the fight between the Fritsch group, the Hitler-Blomberg-Reichnau group, and the Coering-Thyssen group) are of decisive importance for the further development of Germany as a whole. If the Fritsch group is victorious, then the question will be raised of the trade unions, labour service, and the sports and youth organisations; and changes will also take place in several other spheres."

Victory by the Fritsch group is, according to the Prague C.C., to be achieved not in the fight against Hitler, but together with him. The Hitler group is said to occupy a middle position, and the article assures us that:

"As for Hitler himself, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that he will go over to the side of the Fritsch group."

Only one thing is required of Hitler, namely, that he should agree to collaborate with Wels and Leipart, after creating the minimum of essential conditions to this end.

With the appointment of Hitler as Reichspräsident, the illusions among the working masses, which were revived under the influence of social-democratic agitation, regarding the possibility of changes being brought about in the existing régime in Germany without revolution, were fundamentally undermined. And the Prague C.C. is more and more openly counting upon the disagreement among the leaders of the fascist dictatorship. This is the situation that has led to the new programme.

It is not only among the masses of social-democratic workers that there is much ideological ferment, a similar process is going on among the leading workers of the social-democratic party as well. The programme of the "revolutionary socialists" shows that there are not a few among the leading social-democratic party workers who are seeking for new paths. Among them some have become disillusioned in the theory and practice of reformism and are seeking for new paths in order to advance the struggle of the working class of Germany for its emancipation; while others are seeking for ways and means of reinstating the

bankrupt and discredited social-democratic party in the eyes of the masses.

We do not know what subjectively guided one or other of the authors of the new programme. The fact that the document has appeared is, first and foremost, proof (if only indirect) of the move towards communism taking place to-day among the working class of Germany. In reply to the programme of the "revolutionary socialists," the Prague C.C. recognises that the working masses of Germany are inclined against the Weimar democracy and in favour of proletarian dictatorship. The reply blames the authors of the programme for falling victim to these moods of the working masses in the following words:

"They (the authors of the programme) are guided not by the new knowledge they have gained, but by tactical considerations . . . It is quite obvious that they are engaged more in calculating moods than in making the question clear, they take more notice of popular slogans than of a serious investigation of the problems before them—in a word, we are up against opportunist radicalism."

The programme of the "revolutionary socialists" shows, however, the process of radicalisation going on not only among the masses of social-democratic workers, but also among the active workers for social-democracy.

The task facing the Communist Party is to adopt a consistent united front policy and make use of comradely criticism to rally all revolutionary elements for the irreconcilable struggle against the fascist régime, on behalf of the dictatorship of the proletariat and soviet power in Germany.

* * *

Two questions raised by the programme of the "revolutionary socialists" will arouse the most passionate discussion in the deep underground revolutionary movement of Germany, namely, the revolutionary struggle for proletarian dictatorship in the form of soviets, and the creation of a "united revolutionary socialist party."

The Question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the Form of Soviets.

On the first question we find the following in the programme:

"The conquest of political power in Germany, its maintenance and reinforcement is only possible through a severe civil war." "The dictatorship of the proletariat is the indispensable form of rule for conquering the classless, socialist society . . . The fulfilment of this task is impossible in a short space of time; it will be essential even after the proletariat has seized power to wage a prolonged, severe and serious struggle, making the most decisive use of all the means of revolutionary socialist dictatorship."

"The revolutionary state cannot simply take over the apparatus of the bourgeois state . . . This apparatus must be smashed and substituted by a revolutionary state apparatus . . . Power must be exercised by soviets, elected by the toiling masses, which will simultaneously be a legislative and executive power."

The main line in the programme on the question of state power has been taken from the Communists (criticism of bourgeois democracy, proletarian dictatorship, soviets, the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus and the application of force against capitalist rule). However, doubt is cast on these statements by certain circumstances of no little importance.

Those who drew up the programme want, as they declare, to win and to build a soviet republic in Germany. They set forth their views on state construction and the economic policy of the future German soviet republic in detail. It would seem that the programme should use the living example of the soviet government, of the seventeen years' existence of the Soviet Union on everyone of its points. Yet, there are only a few lines in the programme about the Soviet Union, and those are chiefly abusive.

Why do the authors of the programme remain silent about the world historic experience of work and struggle of the Bolshevik Party, which prepared for, and organised, the victorious October Revolution? Are the experiences of the preparations for October of the conquest of Soviet power and of its consolidation by stubborn, consistent warfare on the part of the bolsheviks against the bourgeoisie and menshevism for a period of decades not instructive as examples for the vanguard of the German proletariat?

The success of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. spells more to the heart and brain of the German worker than all the programmes and manifestoes in the world. The road taken by the Russian bolsheviks and that pursued by German social-democracy are two historic examples from which the world proletariat is learning. This comparison has gone deep down into the consciousness of the working masses of Germany and the whole world. Why is it that people who have now arrived at the condemnation of the path taken by German social-democracy, and the recognition of proletariat dictatorship, maintain silence about the road taken by the Russian bolsheviks which led to the proletarian dictatorship?

Any recognition of the need for a revolutionary struggle for proletarian dictatorship in the form of soviets, which does not contain a clearly positive attitude to the revolutionary strategy and tactics of the bolsheviks before and after the October revolution, to the policy of the Soviet government which is victorious over one-sixth part of the world—is so much idle talk. Of course, we cannot ignore the concrete peculiarities of the economic, and cultural character of this struggle in one country or another, but this does not in the slightest degree alter the fact that the working class in

capitalist countries can come to power only by adopting the same kind of measures of revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for soviets, etc., as those used by the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., under the leadership of the bolshevik party.

A more careful examination of the programme will easily convince the reader that the fact that the experience of the Russian bolsheviks has been ignored is far from being accidental. The absolutely correct idea that the working class can only win political power in Germany in the process of a severe civil war is twice repeated in the programme. But then in the passage headed "The Only Road to Power," where a criticism is made of the line pursued by Austrian social-democracy before Dollfuss seized power, and where it deals with the way the socialist parties should carry on the struggle in the so-called democratic countries, all formulations regarding civil war have been entirely avoided. Apparently, in the opinion of the authors of the programme, civil war is necessary only in countries where there is a fascist dictatorship, and in the "democratic" countries it is enough just to scare the bourgeoisie in order to get political power.

The quotations from the programme, given above, on the question of state power do not, therefore, imply that on this basic question the programme has a communist basis—no, it still remains on social-democratic ground. And this is the more so since a social-democratic party existed in Germany, which during the period of the first round of revolutions and wars, when the radicalisation of the mass of its members attained its greatest tension, declared itself in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat and soviets. The quotations given above coincide, in the main, with the corresponding points of the Leipzig programme of the independent social-democratic party of Germany, adopted in the autumn of 1920, and which read as follows:

"The independent social-democratic party stands on the platform of the soviet system . . . The political organisation of the rule of the capitalist state must be destroyed when the proletariat seizes political power. Political workers' soviets will take its place, as the organisation of the rule of the proletariat. Soviets unite the functions of legislation and administration . . . The independent social-democratic party counterposes the proletarian organisation of rule based on the political soviet system to the organisation of rule of the capitalist state. It counterposes the revolutionary congress of soviets to the bourgeois parliament which expresses the will of the bourgeoisie . . . The dictatorship of the proletariat is the revolutionary means of abolishing all classes."

This programme aimed at preventing the masses from passing over to communism, and at serving as a barrier against the passage of social-democratic workers to the Communist Party.

A Programme of Nationalisation.

The "revolutionary socialists" are repeating the demands made by the "independent socialists" as regards the programme of nationalisation as well. Their programme of nationalisation is extremely characteristic. It appears that over the course of a sufficiently indefinite period of time, "until power becomes consolidated externally and internally," 60-70 per cent. of the industrial enterprises are to remain in the hands of the capitalists. According to the census of June 16th, 1933, the number of persons engaged in branches of economy liable to nationalisation, according to the programme of the "revolutionary socialists," is as follows, in round numbers:—

<i>Branch of economy</i>	<i>Number of workers (in thousands)</i>
Mining	440
Iron and metal production	230
Building materials	400
Big enterprises of the chemical industry	100
Gas, Water, Electricity	140
Transport	1,000
Monopolist undertakings (articles of universal consumption)	100
Banks and insurance companies	390
Wholesale trade	470
Total	3,270

This means that out of the 14,574,000 persons engaged in different branches of economy in the towns only 3,470,000 will work in nationalised undertakings. The remaining 11 million will remain in the non-nationalised sector which includes the engineering and electro-technical industries, the production of metal articles, textile industry, etc.

What do these facts show?

The experience of the post-war years, both in Germany and in several other countries, has shown that groups of social-democrats, or even whole social-democratic parties, faced with the radicalisation of the working masses, have declared themselves in favour of proletarian dictatorship and the soviet government. Further developments have shown that the touchstone which tests these declarations is the attitude adopted towards the revolutionary strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party before and after the October revolution.

On the question also of the party, the views of the "revolutionary socialists" have nothing in common with those of Marxism-Leninism. True, these views differ from those of the Prague C.C. George Decker, in the November *Zeitschrift für Sozialismus*, criticises the programme of the revo-

lutionary socialists" because they consider that the party is not simply a collection of malcontents.

"Many of us," he writes, "are sure that one single opinion should dominate on different questions inside one movement. They forget that national-socialism owes its enormous success to the fact that it was able to create singleness of will and purpose without singleness of ideology, so that it was possible for a long time for different ideologies to exist inside the framework of one movement."

According to the opinion of the theoreticians of the Prague C.C., a party does not need singleness of ideology.

The Question of a United Revolutionary Socialist Party.

Unlike these viewpoints, the "revolutionary socialists" propose to create a united revolutionary socialist party, closely interlinked, disciplined, and led from a united centre. This party must for the time being be an organisation of "a narrow circle of well-filtered cadres," which does not organise mass actions. This state of affairs should continue until the spontaneous "destruction of the mass base of fascism." Only after that will the party be transformed into a mass party, and only then should it organise daily resistance, strikes in the factories, and revolutionary action right up to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

The authors of the programme write that salvation does not lie in the late members of the Communist Party joining the social-democratic party and vice versa. They advocate remaining in the old parties and forming therein a "nucleus of ideological re-orientation," to create inside each party "a bridge to the groups of their adherents in the other party." We know full well about the transfer of individuals, groups and even whole organisations from social-democracy to the Communist Party. Of transfers in the other direction nobody has heard anything up to the present. And so, the first piece of practical advice given in the programme is: don't go over to the Communists!

The motive given for the need for forming a new party is that the Communist Party is allegedly bankrupt. How so? asks everyone who reads the programme. The main assertion given in the programme of the "revolutionary socialists" is their criticism of bourgeois democracy, recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, recognition of the soviets and a criticism of reformism, i.e., assertions that they have borrowed in the main (although with a number of reservations which to a considerable degree cut out their revolutionary content) from the German Communist Party, while the authors of the programme assure us that the German Communist Party is "bankrupt."

But the contradiction in which the authors of the programme find themselves arises out of a definite conception. They criticise reformism, and

its programme and tactics, and have borrowed a number of programme points from Communism. At the same time they not only criticise the Communist Party, but declare that

"the history of the German Communist Party is the history of a political movement that developed outside the framework of the labour movement, and not inside it."

The working-class movement of Germany, according to the programme, consists, apparently, of social-democracy. At the same time the programme talks about the bankruptcy of reformism in the following words:

"From the very beginning reformism has been the false road, which led to fatal consequences . . . Reformism did not even fight for bourgeois democracy, for it feared that the masses drawn into the movement for democratic rights would overstep the aims set by the reformist leadership, and would advance to the social revolution, which reformism does not want . . ."

"Economic democracy, advocated by the leaders of the trade unions, had something in common with the ideology of the fascist-corporative system."

It follows from this conception that social-democracy, which allegedly represented the working-class movement in Germany, had been conducting a bad, reformist, policy, the task being to see that it conducted a good policy in the future. In actual fact this amounts to artificially separating ideology from the party that advocates it; communism cannot be separated from the German Communist Party, nor reformism from the Socialist Party of Germany.

What is wrong with the German Communist Party, and is a new revolutionary socialist party necessary? The programme formulates all the "mortal sins" of the Communist Party in one small section. True, these accusations are not particularly original. In its estimate of social-democracy "the German Communist Party adhered to the theory of social-fascism," is the reproach of the programme. Does not the declaration in the programme itself that "economic democracy had something in common with the ideology of the fascist-corporative system" confirm the thesis about social-fascism? Does not the whole section on the rôle of reformism in clearing the way for fascism amount to an almost literal repetition of what the Communist Party of Germany has been telling the working masses hourly and daily for the last sixteen years?

One more entirely "new" argument:

"The German Communist Party," states the programme, "is dependent upon Moscow, which uses the Communist Parties in capitalist countries as advance-posts for their national-bolshevik policy."

Leaving aside all the talk about "national bolshevism" and "dependence upon Moscow," it must be stated as a point of fundamental principle that "never in the past and never in the future can the interests of the Soviet Union contradict or fail to corres-

pond to the interests of the international working class movement, just as the maintenance, consolidation and prosperity of the U.S.S.R.—the base of the world proletarian revolution—is the vital task facing the working class of the whole world."

Finally, the last argument, which again cannot boast of being anything exceptionally novel, is to the effect that the Communist Party is not in favour of a united working class, but splits the working-class movement. Why are the authors themselves in favour of a disciplined, firmly welded party, one built up step by step, and not in favour of a party, built on the lines proposed by Decker, which would be a collection of malcontents without a united ideology? Because a party of the kind recommended by Decker cannot be victorious. For decades German social-democracy was united, but this did not prevent, but, on the contrary, helped, the betrayal of August 4th, 1914. It is sad that the authors of the programme, while recognising that "reformism was on the false road from the very beginning, and this led to fatal consequences," do not ask themselves why German social-democracy took this path, or where are the roots which feed reformism, and do not want to accept the Leninist doctrine concerning the roots of reformism in imperialism. The imperialist bourgeoisie set up a narrow group of workers in the ranks of the working class, whom they place in a more privileged position which reconciles them to capitalism. These strata, led by considerable groups of the labour bureaucracy, play the rôle of agents of the bourgeoisie in the organisations of the working class. They must be removed from these organisations, in order to prevent them from seizing influence and leadership there. Before the conquest of power, the revolutionary party of the proletariat will be able only to unite the majority of the working class, for the reformist agents of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the working class split the organisations of the working class before the revolutionary elements gain decisive influence there.

The proposal to "liquidate all currents" and create a united party implies an attempt to create a third party on the lines of the "independent social-democratic party," which led the workers who supported the "independent social-democratic party" into the Wels-Noske Party, and there pursued the policy of clearing the way for Hitler. The best elements among the "revolutionary socialists" should be perfectly clear on this point.

* * *

Thus, the "revolutionary socialists" recognise the need for a revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviets, but ignore the living experience of the Soviet Union, and are actually against the revolutionary strategy

and tactics of the Bolshevik Party before and after the October revolution; the "revolutionary socialists" criticise reformism, but at the same time attack the Communist Party of Germany, which has led and is now leading a fierce struggle against reformism. The "revolutionary socialists" criticise reformism only as a bad policy on the part of social-democracy (allowing, therefore, that social-democracy can also conduct a good policy). All this shows that the spirit of the programme remains reformist, social-democratic.

It is enough to point further to the interpretation given by the programme of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism. By imperialism the authors of the programme do not understand the epoch of monopolist capitalism. Together with Kautsky and Sternberg, they consider that imperialism is the endeavour on the part of the highly developed industrial capitalist countries to acquire and keep hold of colonial and semi-colonial countries. When characterising the crisis of capitalism, the authors of the programme forget the chief element of this crisis, namely, the existence of the Soviet Union. The programme makes no mention at all of the fact that the world is divided up into two systems, that capitalism has been destroyed on one-sixth part of the globe, and of the importance of this circumstance for world capitalism is not mentioned at all in the programme.

While the authors of the programme of the "revolutionary socialists" have remained on social-democratic ground, yet on several questions, as we have already pointed out, the programme imitates the formulations of Marxism-Leninism. Thus, for example, the programme characterises fascism as "a form of the rule of monopolist capital," considers that reformism is mainly responsible for the advent of fascism to power, and recognises that there are fascist elements in the ideology of reformism.

The "Revolutionary Socialists" and the United Front.

On the question that now occupies the centre of attention of the working masses of Germany, namely, that of the united front,—the "revolutionary socialists" adopt a position in their programme which differs from that of the Prague C.C.. Paul Herz, in his report on the activities of the C.C., did everything possible to warn the workers against the united front, and to this end collected all kinds of "arguments," at the same time sufficiently clearly "hinting" at the real causes of the categorical disinclination to adopt the united front, namely, that the united front with the Communists makes the united front with the Reichswehr impossible.

"Everything," is his attitude, "that might have served to recreate our organised forces has been destroyed, and

so the fear that when Hitler is overthrown the chaos of bolshevism will follow plays a big rôle . . . Joint work between the Communists and social-democrats . . . would only complicate the struggle against the fascist dictatorship."

The programme of the "revolutionary socialists" does not expect to get rid of fascist dictatorship by putting in its place a military or "reformed" dictatorship supported by social-democracy, and therefore ought to give unreserved support to the united front. In several places the programme declares itself in favour of the united front, as follows:

"The road to a united revolutionary socialist party leads through the united front of the different proletarian groups, which must be forged during the course of the struggle."

However, no practical proposals are made in the programme for bringing about the united front of struggle. On the contrary, the organisation of united front committees, and of joint action is postponed until such time as the existing parties, ideologically kindred groups, are able to find a "joint ideological platform." The programme makes the process of discovering and finding "a joint ideological platform" one of the conditions for creating united front bodies, and for launching the struggle in the factories. The organisation of resistance and of strikes in the factories is postponed by the programme until the spontaneous "destruction of the social base of fascism" takes place. This, without doubt, is the chief defect in the programme.

The Communist Party of Germany sees in the programme of the "revolutionary socialists" first and foremost a product of the process of the movement to the "left" that is at present taking place among the mass of the social-democratic workers in Germany and even among the active workers for German social-democracy. **THE COMMUNIST PARTY IS CONVINCED THAT IT WILL BE ABLE IN SPITE OF ALL RESERVATIONS IN THE PROGRAMME AND OTHER OBSTACLES TO SET UP A UNITED FRONT OF STRUGGLE WITH THE "REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS,"** and that the joint struggle against the fascist dictatorship will once and for all smash the lack of confidence of social-democratic workers in the C.P.G. By correctly operating the united front of struggle and making use of patient, comradely criticism, the Communist Party will destroy the hopes of those who want to use the programme of the "revolutionary socialists" for the purpose of throwing up a barrier to prevent the passage of the social-democratic masses to communism. It will convince the best elements among the "revolutionary socialists" in the process of joint struggle of the correctness of the path of Marxism-Leninism, which has been able to win Soviet power, and to gain world-historic victories on one sixth of the earth's surface.

(a) THE STRUGGLES OF THE UNEMPLOYED IN GREAT BRITAIN

By R. McILHONE.

THE National Government do not find it an easy job to put their new Unemployment Act into operation. When the full significance of the Bill was brought home to the mass of the unemployed by the publication of the new relief scales, there was an immediate response to the call of the C.P. for mass demonstrations and actions.

The Communist Party has been warning the unemployed and the working class generally for a whole year as to the real meaning of this new Act, which went on the Statute Book in July, 1934. The great hunger march to London and the National Congress of Action in February, 1934, organised under the leadership of the Communist Party, took place under the slogan of "Smash the Slave Bill," which was then undergoing the initial stages of discussion in the House of Commons.

"The National Government is seeking to enforce a New Unemployment Bill. This Bill in establishing a dictatorship of Whitehall bureaucrats over the unemployed workers, is furthering fascist methods of Government. It extends the Means Test, increases the destitution of the unemployed and conscripts them into industrial camps and training centres." (Congress Resolution.)

In this way already a year ago the Communist Party was warning and mobilising the unemployed against the Bill.

The 1934 Congress of Action issued a united front call to organise mass action and resistance to the Bill. Instead of the leaders of the Labour Party using this opportunity to bring all the workers' forces into the fight against this inimical act, they came out with increased energy against the united front, making their parliamentary speeches in the House of Commons, declaring that "after all, the workers could wait until the general election."

The Labour Party leadership thought they had lulled the mass of the unemployed to sleep with their parliamentary speeches. Therefore, it was a great shock to them, as well as to the National Government, to find these new relief scales, which arose out of the new Act, being met with the development of mass demonstrations all over the country.

The Drive Against the Unemployed.

The new unemployed scheme creates a revolution in the system of unemployment insurance in Great Britain. After the world war, the aftermath of the war and the repercussions of the 1917 revolu-

tions compelled the British capitalist class to introduce the system of contributory unemployment insurance as an antidote to social revolution. But the growing army of unemployed during the world economic crisis began to drain the unemployment funds, the Government being compelled to grant ever greater grants. The Labour Government, taking office during the first days of the crisis, began to study the unemployed question, and appointed the Royal Commission under the chairmanship of Sir George May, whose findings are the basis on which both the Labour Government and the National Government decided and carried out their anti-working-class policy.

Arising out of the May Commission, the Labour Government formulated and passed the infamous Anomalies Act, in which, among other things, it was considered anomalous that married women who had worked and paid into the scheme from its inception should, on their being rendered unemployed, ask for relief, if their husbands were employed. It was considered in these circumstances that the woman was not entitled to relief, as it was the husband's duty to keep her. It is estimated that 240,000 women workers were cut off from benefit in this way. The May Commission was the first place where the idea of the Means Test was generated. The majority of the Labour Cabinet stood for the operation of the Means Test in the financial crisis of 1931, and the National Government have pursued the most ruthless drive with the Means Test throughout the country, cutting off hundreds of thousands of unemployed, forcing fathers and mothers to keep grown-up sons and daughters, and employed sons and daughters to maintain unemployed fathers, throwing the burden still heavier on the employed workers.

The Means Test has made the life of the unemployed family in Great Britain into one long nightmare. The Means Test investigator who visits the unemployed in their homes, takes note of the household effects, examines the household budget, has destroyed the privacy of the unemployed homes, broken up families and virtually sent the young unemployed into the army. Not only did the Labour Party not give a lead to the workers who were ready to fight to the uttermost to end this measure, but as a matter of fact, Labour majorities on Town Councils up and down the

country operated the Means Test with the same results as Conservative Town Councils. The Labour Party pleaded that the Means Test was being "humanely" operated.

It should be clear now to every Labour Party member as to where this policy of "humane" operation of the capitalist measures against the unemployed has led. It has encouraged the reactionary National Government to go ahead with a more ruthless programme of attacks on the standards of the unemployed. Had the whole Labour movement been brought into the fight initiated by the C.P. in February, 1934, against the new Bill, it would never have reached the Statute Book. The absence of a united working class fighting front, the responsibility for which rests on the leaders of the Labour Party and Trade Union Congress, has permitted the Government's plans to go ahead unchecked by serious mass resistance, and only still further emphasises the correctness of the C.P. line to build up with the least delay the united front against the capitalist offensive and against war and fascism.

The Mass Resentment Against the New Relief Scales.

The new relief scales were published in December. The new Unemployment Assistance Board, an independent committee of gentlemen who are paid individually some thousands of pounds per year by the Government, had to take over the administration. The new scales made further appalling cuts in the already too low scales of unemployed relief, the regulations of the Means Test being tightened up more ruthlessly than ever.

The breakout of the mass demonstrations in the country startled the Government by the intensity of the feeling displayed by the masses. The outstanding actions were developing in South Wales. On January 26th there took place a united front conference convened by the Executive Committee of the South Wales miners at which 1,600 delegates were present. At the conference, although the officials refused to put the question to a vote, there was a big measure of support for the proposals from Communist delegates to declare for a one-day protest strike against the Bill.

In all the important towns in the country mass demonstrations were taking place. During the fortnight from January 26th to February 6th, over 600,000 unemployed had gathered in mass protest demonstrations in various parts of the country, 300,000 turning out in South Wales alone.

35,000 unemployed turned out in Sheffield on February 6th, defied the police ban to keep them off the main streets and fought their way to the City Hall, where for three hours they battled with the police, who made 23 arrests. It is characteristic that the unemployed in the city of Sheffield, who

so valiantly fought for the defeat of the Government scales, had to do so against a City Council on which a Labour majority has sat, with a break only of one year, since 1928, the leaders of which are bitter anti-Communists and deadly enemies of the united front. It is no accident either that the chairman of the Sheffield Public Assistance Committee, Mr. Asbury, a member of Sir Stafford Cripps' Socialist League, was a member of the May Royal Commission on Unemployment. The Sheffield demonstration and the movement growing for general strike action in South Wales compelled the government to issue a statement withdrawing the scales—and make an order to continue at the old rates of pay.

The Movement in South Wales.

How did the movement develop in South Wales?

The Communist Party and the Independent Labour Party decided to call for mass demonstrations all over the country for February 24th.

In carrying out the campaign, the South Wales District Committee of the C.P., following upon the South Wales Conference of Action, began to campaign in the T.U. lodges, and among the workers, for protest strike action.

In the Rhondda Valley the C.P. organised three mass indoor meetings which were filled to overflowing by the miners and their wives, to whom the Party put a series of practical proposals for developing the fight further. In the area there exists a Joint Committee of lodges at four pits, representing some 6,000 employed miners. It was decided in these meetings to mandate this Cambrian Combine Joint Committee to prepare for a general one-day strike in the Combine area on February 25th.

On February 23rd the Cambrian Joint Committee met in Tonypany, together with representatives of every working-class organisation, as well as religious and other bodies. The Communist Party representative was asked to place his proposals before the meeting. He proposed the calling of a general one-day protest strike on February 25th in the Rhondda, the closing of pits, works, schools and shops. This was unanimously agreed to.

As a result of the carrying forward into life of this decision, the Rhondda Urban District Council decided to close all schools and to declare no work for their employees on that date. The Co-operative decided to close their doors on that date and even the Mid-Rhondda Chamber of Commerce, an association of shopkeepers, decided to close all shops and send a representative on to the Council of Action.

The threat of this developing strike movement undoubtedly caused consternation in the ruling

circles. The movement was confined, it is true, to the Rhondda Valley, and only 6,000 miners in four pits had as yet been involved in this action. But the Government knew that to let the strike take place was to give a tremendous stimulus to the rest of the working class and to popularise this method of action among the workers.

It was not for nothing that the *London Times* declared on February 26th:

"The spirit of 1926 which produced the general strike is showing itself again."

The real significance of the Rhondda movement was that it was a movement for a **POLITICAL** strike, for a strike directly against the Government, and was too dangerously like the 1926 atmosphere. Therefore, while the Rhondda miners were preparing to lay down tools on February 25th, the Government began to busy itself to bring all pressure to bear to prevent the strike taking place. On the eve of February 25th sudden decisions were come to by the Rhondda Chamber of Commerce, and by the Rhondda Co-operatives, to keep the shops open. The mineowners carried on a campaign of intimidation in the pits threatening the miners individually with the loss of their jobs. Government influences were unquestionably at work.

The "Defeatism" of the S.W.M.F. Officials.

True to their rôle, the officials of the South Wales Miners' Federation, instead of mobilising the support of the rest of South Wales behind the Rhondda miners, began to speak of the uselessness of "sporadic action," "unauthorised action," and threw their full weight against the Rhondda miners. At the Executive meeting on February 21st, a resolution was passed in which lodges were requested

"not to take any sporadic unauthorised actions which . . . may endanger the unity that has been secured in South Wales . . ."

and deciding

"to convene another meeting of the Joint Committee of Action of South Wales and recommends it to give serious consideration to the possibility of calling for a one-day strike of workers in all industries with a view to organising a national stoppage on those lines to enforce the withdrawal of the whole of the Unemployed Act."

In this way the miners' officials, under the cry of "unity" and utilising the call for "strike action," brought their pressure to bear to break the unity in the Rhondda and to sabotage the strike action already being prepared.

The Communist Party correctly interpreted this move by the Miners' Executive and warned the Rhondda miners. The *Daily Worker* pointed out that if the E.C. of the Federation wanted a general strike it had the power in its hands to call out every pit in South Wales on February 25th.

The Cambrian Miners' Joint Committee on February 22nd turned down the decision of the E.C. and reiterated their determination to go on with the strike. However, a coal field conference of the Miners' Federation on February 24th supported the line of the E.C. and under this pressure the mass meeting of the miners in the Rhondda decided to call off the strike. The meeting, however, decided to only postpone the strike until March 25th, and in the meantime to campaign throughout the Federation and coal field for the general strike on March 25th. [This article was written in the beginning of March.—Ed.]

The warning issued by the Communist Party that the line of the Executive of the Federation was intended as a means of gaining time, to deceive the Rhondda miners, in order to trick them into calling off the strike, was timely and correct.

At the meeting of the joint Council of Action for South Wales, a body made up mainly of full-time T.U. officials, held on March 4th, the following statement was adopted:—

"We authorise representatives of the Council to meet the National Joint Labour Council to discuss the future policy, including a one-day stoppage which the Council believes can only be effective if national action is taken."

It is as clear as daylight that the South Wales miners' officials never had any intention of taking strike action. To prevent the Rhondda miners from striking on February 24th, they used the argument that it would endanger the unity in South Wales, and declared their willingness to consider an all-in protest strike in South Wales. Having succeeded in stopping the strike, they now declare that a South Wales strike is out of the question because only national action can be effective.

The South Wales miners' leaders know perfectly well that a proposal for strike action on a national scale will meet with no response in the Joint Labour Council, which consists of the same people who were forced into the general strike of 1926, who betrayed the workers, and who swore "never again."

The real intention behind this double-dealing is to draw the movement back into parliamentary channels, to allow the Labour leadership to stage some new national constitutional window-dressing "demonstration" to serve the purposes of their general election campaign. The whole of the militant forces in South Wales are now mobilising every ounce of support of the branches, sending resolutions into the Federation and are exerting all energies to prepare the branches for action on March 25th.

What lessons can be drawn from the experiences

of the mass struggles of the unemployed this year, and what are the perspectives?

The Growing Demand for Political Strike Action.

The sharp character of the moods of the masses against the National Government justify the launching of the slogan by the 13th Congress of the C.P.G.B., which met during those days, of "Down with the National Government." The political character of the demonstrations were seen in the manner in which this slogan received a terrific response from the workers.

The deepening hatred for the National Government is demonstrated by the fact that the movement is developing from street demonstrations of the unemployed and employed, and is giving rise to the demand for action by the employed workers against the National Government, forging the unity of the employed and unemployed. The 13th Congress of the C.P.G.B., in summing up this situation of the growing mass dissatisfaction among the workers, declared for the urgent task of building the united working-class front, and stated:

"The Communist Party stands for the defeat of the National Government and pledges itself to exert all its powers and influence to mobilise and unite the working class in the daily fight to bring down the National Government."

The extent of the movement which has developed, and which shows every sign of growth, despite the sabotage of the reformist leaders, provides excellent possibilities for the building of the united working class front for the daily demands of the masses, and against the danger of war and the menace of fascism. This is the most important thing to be learned from these events.

A feature of the mass activity which developed round the campaign for February 24th, was the participation of Labour Party, Co-operative and trade union organisations in the united front. An important conference called in London by the Marxist organ, *The Labour Monthly*, against fascism and war gave its support to the February 24th demonstration. This conference was representative of trades unions, 66 delegates; Co-operatives, 42; Labour Party organisations, 40; united front bodies, 34; Independent Labour Party, 32; Communist Party, 17. It is quite symptomatic of the moods and changes taking place in the British Labour movement.

In South Wales all working-class organisations participated in the demonstrations, the Labour Labour leaders being compelled in many cases to speak from the same platform as the Communists. Thus, for instance, the well-known trade union leader, Bevin, a fierce opponent of the united front,

who is in the forefront of the drive against the Communists in the Trades Councils, was compelled, under the pressure of the masses, to speak on the same platform as the Communists. In the demonstrations in London and other places, Labour Party organisations carried their banners side by side with the Communists.

The building up of the united front from below in the day-to-day actions for the elementary demands of the workers is breaking through the official ban placed on the united front by the reformist leaders, shows that the mass of the Labour Party workers really want united action, and indicates the great possibilities which exist for achieving the united working-class front in Great Britain as has been done in France. This is the second big lesson to be learned from the happenings in Great Britain in January and February.

The forcing of the withdrawal of the scales by the Government gave a greater degree of confidence to the workers, and once more demonstrated in practice the meaning of class unity and mass action. At the same time the Government retreated in order to plan a more careful way to continue their attacks and they are as equally determined to carry through these plans. In this connection, the growing dissatisfaction among the diehards in the Government supporters, with the policy of MacDonald and Baldwin, became more sharp as a result of the Government retreat, which they interpreted as a sign of weakness. The mass resistance of the workers to the policy of the National Government is causing a regrouping of forces in the ranks of the capitalist parties. The invitation by the Cabinet to Lloyd George to tender his "new deal" proposals in person at a Cabinet meeting, the split in the Conservative vote at the Wavertree and Norwood by-elections, where independent Conservatives opposed the official candidate supporting the Government, the growing demand for the replacement of MacDonald by someone with a "firm hand," all are signs of the times. They indicate a fresh gathering together and review of the forces of the capitalist parties for a new advance against the working class, for the strengthening of the State apparatus against the working class, a new advance towards fascism. This is the third great lesson from these unemployed struggles.

The Manifesto of the 13th Congress of the C.P.G.B. rightly declared:

"We are on the eve of great events, of great struggles."

Build the Broad United Front of Struggle.

Great events are before the British working class. The carrying through of political strike action in South Wales against the National Government will be a revolutionising factor transforming the

whole situation in Great Britain, developing the struggle on to new paths. The working class is breaking through the fatal policy of class-collaboration and taking up the revolutionary class struggle against the whole capitalist class. For this purpose the strengthening and building of the Communist Party of Great Britain is a vital necessity. The success of the initial stages of the unemployed fights justify to the hilt the tireless activity of the C.P. fighting against the whole weight of the powerful reformist machine, of the building of the broad united front of struggle for the workers' demands. The working class are slowly but surely recognising the imperative need for a Communist Party, the value of which they have seen and are estimating in the present struggles. Since the C.P. Congress on February 25th, over 1,500 workers

from the scenes of demonstrations against the Unemployed Bill have entered the ranks of the Communist Party. More and more thousands of workers are realising that the fight against capitalism can only be carried forward under the leadership of the Communist Party. Here is the fourth great lesson to be drawn from the present events in Great Britain.

The line of the Communist Party will conquer. The united class front will be built up. Serious tasks lie before the British workers which they will meet under the leadership of the Communist Party of Great Britain, by their united class strength, in a broad united front of struggle against the capitalist offensive and the National Government, against the growing danger of a new war, and against the menace of fascism.

(b) INTENSIFY THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE PROLETARIAT

By V. MULLER.

A CHANGE must be brought about in the policy of the Communist Party of Germany. In what direction? In the direction of intensifying the struggle for the organisation and development of the united front, of a wide anti-fascist front of the people. If this is so, the leaders of the C.P.G. must first and foremost make a serious attempt to prove the need for this change in its policy to the Party itself.

The Party leaders must explain to the members of the Communist Party and to the entire working class of Germany that the proletarian revolution in Germany is again threatened with a great danger. Some of the forces of the bourgeoisie may again obtain influence over the growing opposition to the Hitlerite régime and may utilise it as part of a new mass basis if changes should be made in the form taken on by the fascist dictatorship, and in the government. These changes do not always take the shape of explosions, and events do not always assume the character of those of June 30th.

This danger is all the more serious because the split of the German working class brought about by social-democracy has not yet been overcome, and the C.P.G. has not yet won the majority of the working class, while the social-democratic leaders are striving to form a coalition with bourgeois groups.

The task facing the Party is to cut right across this policy of the bourgeois groups and social-

democracy, and at any rate, if a change does take place in the form of the dictatorship of capital, to ensure that this change takes place on such a narrow basis that the régime will not be able to offer further resistance to the onslaught of the proletarian revolution.

It must be explained to the Party that the destruction of the mass basis of fascism will develop at a more rapid and even at a headlong speed, if the Party succeeds in carrying on untiring work among the masses, in drawing all the workers and toilers who are discontented with fascism into a fighting united front, and in rallying them to the people's front, and thus by every means hastening the speed at which the régime becomes discredited, disintegrated and undermined.

We must convince all Party comrades that this united front policy and the development of a wide people's front make it possible for the Party to set going the necessary mass actions by means of which the Party will intensify the disagreements in the camp of the bourgeoisie, sharpen the crisis among those at the top, and severely shake the régime.

The united front policy will bring the masses to undertake big struggles to overthrow the Hitlerite dictatorship. The anti-fascist people's front will ensure that the Party has allies in these class battles.

The Crisis of the Fascist Dictatorship Does Not Develop of Itself.

The crisis of the fascist dictatorship has already begun. But it does not develop of itself. The tremendous economic difficulties that have arisen have not yet led to the automatic downfall of the régime. The fascist dictatorship can only be overthrown by an armed uprising of the workers and toilers. As long as the working masses, and with them the broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasants fail to carry on a struggle, fascism will always find it possible to gloss over and soften down the disagreements in its own ranks, to put off the explosion and even to prevent it.

The contradictions in the fascist camp will become more intense, and it is the task of the C.P.G. to develop and organise the mass struggles of broad strata of the toilers and of the working class.

The events of June 30th were the first serious convulsion to shake the régime. But on June 30th the Communist Party was not yet in a position to make sufficient use of the open explosion of the contradictions in the fascist camp, in the interests of the proletariat. The Communist Party proved unable to set the masses of the workers in the industrial districts into motion, and to unleash such mass activity as would have helped to further weaken the régime. As a result of this, a regrouping of forces took place—and what is more it took place without serious resistance from the oppositional proletarian elements in the storm detachments—and the centre of gravity was moved in the direction of the Reichswehr. The reason why the C.P.G. was unable to organise mass action by the workers was that it did not clearly understand the situation that had arisen. It was primarily for this reason that it did not develop a wide movement in favour of the united front.

It is quite clear that the objective difficulties facing the fascist dictatorship are growing. These objective difficulties, however, should not be exaggerated, and above all they must not be brought to the forefront, because this plays into the hands of the social-democrats who advance the theory that fascism will automatically collapse, and assists the development in our own ranks of a speculation on spontaneity. The development of the abilities of the masses is still the decisive point.

Germany is faced with a shortage of foreign currency and raw materials, while there has been a decline in her balance of trade. But this will by no means bring about a crash. As we know, the bourgeoisie have always a means of struggling against this, namely, by more intensively plundering the masses. It is precisely in this way that the monopoly-capitalist magnates in Germany intend to act with all consistency.

Organise the United Front with the Social-Democratic Workers and Organisations.

The objective difficulties facing fascism are growing, but the subjective factor of the revolution is lagging behind. We must give ourselves this serious warning, and make every effort to catch up on the time lost, reducing the gap between the growth of the objective difficulties which face German fascism, and the strengthening of the subjective factor of the revolution. And this can only be achieved by organising a very wide united front with the social-democratic workers and organisations. For the Hitler government is even now making use of the split and the division in the ranks of its opponents, and primarily of the scattered character of the anti-fascist forces of the proletariat. The reason why the Hitler government has succeeded, if not in solving some problems, at any rate in overcoming individual difficulties, is because as long as the proletariat was split it could not proceed to undertake extensive actions. The discontented toiling masses did not fight in a solid unbroken front. Hence, it is clear that those who want to defeat fascism must strive to bring about the united front, the anti-fascist people's front.

Therefore, the leaders of the C.P.G. call on all the Party organisations in the country to address themselves once more to the social-democratic groups, organisations and committees with a view to achieving agreement regarding joint struggle, and to concluding agreements on the united front. In those places where the majority of the members of the social-democratic party do not yet agree, for one reason or another, with the policy of the united front, an attempt must be made to bring about collaboration with the minority, to prove by convincing examples the correctness of the united front tactics, and thus to win the majority of the social-democratic workers for support of the united front.

In the struggle against the working class and the Communists, fascism was forced to considerably extend its expensive state apparatus. The fierce terror is now being carried out to an ever greater degree through the state apparatus. The proletariat and the toilers are beginning to offer up strong resistance, a feature which finds expression in numerous small actions in the factories and inside the fascist organisations built on a compulsory basis.

On the other hand, an increase is taking place in the activity of social-democratic party officials, directed towards restoring social-democracy. Now already social-democracy, is, if not a party, then at any rate, a weakly cemented union with a centre at Prague, to which the Lefts also belong. We may say that a definite and centralised organisa-

tional network of social-democrats has now been established.

At the same time the old conservative forces have also begun to move. They have taken up an oppositional position, have made contacts with the social-democratic leaders, and together with them have formed a committee of seven (the so-called coalition committee) to carry on a struggle for a new coalition.

The Communist Party, however, did not promptly take account of the fact that the situation had changed—especially does this refer to the activity of the social-democrats—and, therefore, did not develop a bold and extensive united front policy.

We fought to win over the active social-democratic workers to our Party, and thought that in this way we could prevent the formation of a second illegal Party, but did not understand that it is only a broad united front policy that can prevent the renewal of the split in the working class. It should not be forgotten that in 1918 the bourgeoisie succeeded in crushing the proletarian revolution in Germany, simply because they had a wide mass basis on which they could rest, namely, social-democracy, which was the strongest buttress of the Weimar régime. In various fascist countries, the social-democratic parties, as legal organisations, are conducting a struggle against the spread of Bolshevism. This is why the consolidation of social-democracy is such a tremendous danger for the proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution will demand greater sacrifices if the German bourgeoisie succeed once again in basing themselves in their struggle on social-democracy. This must be prevented. Therefore the united front with the social-democratic workers is a most urgent necessity.

We see that the social-democratic party leaders are aiming at a new coalition. This is why they are already concluding an alliance with the bourgeois opposition groups. But the majority of the social-democratic workers are against an alliance with those who obviously bred fascism. They want a united front with us Communists. We must arrange our tactics to suit this determination of the majority of the social-democratic workers, and must develop the united front on a wide scale.

The Attitude of the "Left" Leaders.

But although the mood of the majority of the social-democratic workers, and many of the social-democratic party officials is antagonistic to the German social-democratic leaders now in Prague, there is not a single more or less important social-democratic group which does not feel the influence of the "Prague" C.C. in some way, this influence being partly brought to bear through "Left"

leaders. The discipline of the "Left" leaders at the present time still takes the ascendancy over their desire to carry on a struggle against the majority of the "Prague" leaders, who are still hostile to the united front policy. The C.C. of the C.P.G. addressed itself to the "Left" leaders, in an effort to come to terms with them as to a joint struggle against fascism. The "Left" leaders rejected our proposal. They suggested that we should direct ourselves to the "Prague" C.C. These "Left" leaders who are grouped around Aufhäuser and Böchel have, in practice, hitherto attempted to hinder the development of the united front in Germany, although in their articles abroad they sometimes advocate the united front to a certain degree. The "Left" leaders in the "Prague" C.C. of the S.P.G.—and they must be told this—must take note that they will not be able for very long to carry on a diplomatic game and a double-dealing policy towards the workers.

It must, however, be recognised that we somewhat help the "Left" leaders in their game by the mistakes we make. But we correct our mistakes. Instead of the "Left" leaders drawing conclusions from our proposals, they refer us to the "Prague" leaders of the S.P.G., and in view of this, their declarations as to their readiness for the united front naturally lose all value, although Aufhäuser writes that "there was action at first." Nevertheless, when we approached him with a united front proposal, he did not draw the necessary conclusions. We, however, are bending every effort to take new steps in this direction. In this connection we state that we are prepared to make united front proposals in a suitable form and on a suitable occasion to the "Prague" leadership as well, since we have become convinced in the course of the struggle for the united front that the social-democratic workers in various parts of the country will support us in this respect, and this is the basic condition for the success of this step. We declare that we shall do everything possible in the future with the aid of the social-democratic workers to influence the "Left" leaders, and to stimulate them to bring about the establishment of the united front. We call on them to struggle against those in the "Prague" leadership of the S.P.G. who are opposed to the united front to overcome their own hesitancy, and to conclude a united front with us in spite of their links with the Prague C.C.

It is in this spirit that we wish to educate our own Party, so that our Party organisations enter into close contact with all those Left social-democratic workers and party officials who are carrying on a struggle against the opponents of the united front in their leading bodies. Wherever we succeed in doing so, we shall rapidly win the majority, because the majority of the rank and file social-democratic

workers are for the united front with us. By means of the united front, we want to link up more closely with our social-democratic class comrades, to paralyse the Right social-democratic leaders and restrict their freedom of action in the struggle which they are carrying on for collaboration with the bourgeoisie. We are sure that as a result of carrying on the united front, that the social-democratic workers will regard it a betrayal of their interests if the social-democratic leaders form a coalition with the bourgeoisie, and hundreds of thousands of them will come over to our side.

We shall conclude united front pacts. But at the same time we shall not restrict our own initiative by these united front pacts, but we shall try on our part to maintain a businesslike and comradely character in the tone, language and criticism we utilise. In no case shall we give up our struggle of principles, but in the given situation we shall carry it on in a more positive form than in the past, explaining the great objective which faces the working class. By means of the united front policy we want to destroy all the illusions of the social-democratic workers, which have bound them to capitalism for many years. At the same time by developing the united front we want to set the masses of the proletariat into motion, and to convince them of their own strength and power.

With the aid of the united front we can destroy the terrorist discipline of the fascists, destroy the shameful Hitlerite salute, the semi-military roll-calls in the factories, and put an end to the punishment system in the forced labour camps. We can struggle against the law of the "regularisation of labour" and the law on the youth, against the "village assistants,"* and obtain advances in wages and the recognition of elected trustees. With the help of the united front we shall be able to conduct a more successful struggle for freedom of speech and press, and for freedom to organise in trade unions. We must explain all this to all the social-democrats and all our class comrades in Germany. By means of the united front we shall be able to bring the masses closer to the proletarian revolution.

This is how we must prove to the whole Party the need for this new policy, for the change which we wish to bring about.

When we explain to our comrades and to our social-democratic class comrades that objective circumstances are becoming ever more favourable, that the difficulties facing fascism are growing and that all that is lacking is a united front embracing many millions, we shall be able at the same time to show them how close revolutionary battles are at hand, and make them understand that the over-

* Unemployed youth sent to compulsory work in the villages at miserable rates of pay.—Ed.

throw of the Hitler government is in reality a direct and important aim towards which we must direct our joint struggle against fascism.

* * * *

The Growth of the Number of Small Partial Strike Actions.

In spite of the difficult conditions of the terrorist dictatorship in Germany a characteristic feature of the working class movement there is a growth in the number of small partial strikes taking place. There is an increasing tendency for spontaneous struggles to break out, but at the same time organised partial struggles are becoming more frequent. We are quite correct in stating that the organising and leading rôle of the Party has increased in the recent period. But all these partial struggles do not now exceed the bounds of the struggle of isolated sections and categories of workers. The very forms of the small partial struggles also show that we are only at the beginning of the crisis of the Hitler dictatorship. The most prevalent forms are protests made by bodies of workers, and in this connection the despatch of delegations to the councils of trustees and to the directors, and passive resistance.

Strikes, mostly brief ones, are being conducted mainly by skilled workers. Recently there has been an increase in the number of strikes. In some cases the mere threat of a strike has been sufficient to prevent a wage-cut. In most cases, things do not go so far as the adoption of formal decisions to organise strikes. The call to down tools comes mostly from bold comrades, then passes from mouth to mouth, and when one of the workers leaves his machine, it is the signal for work to be stopped. This is the general rule, but some mistakes are also made. Often after stopping work the workers do not come out of the factory but remain inactive in their places, discussing and waiting for the results of the negotiations with the council of trustees and the directors. Only in a few cases have matters reached the point where all the workers leave the factory. In two cases, e.g., in Elmhorst, the workers left the factory, organised a demonstration through the town and marched in an organised way to the directors' offices. Recently there have been repeated demonstrations of all the workers of a given factory or various groups of workers to the offices of the management.

In almost all strikes the police and even the special police of the storm troops (Feldpolizei) are immediately informed. Then under the pressure of the police, the fascist commissars of the "Labour Front" try to persuade the workers to renew work. Very often the workers capitulate. In a number of cases, however, the employers have been forced to make concessions, and in spite of

the presence of the police and of the special "Feldpolizei," the workers have refused to go back to work. This shows that partial economic struggles in Germany are very rapidly growing into political struggles.

Many-Sided Forms of Working Class Resistance.

The forms of resistance are extremely many-sided. For example, at the time when the increase in armaments began in Germany, when there was a shortage of labour power in some branches of industry, and a shortage of skilled trained workers, there were cases when groups of workers, when their demands were not granted, declared that their agreements were ended, so that they could exert pressure in this way on their employers, and compel them to grant the demands of the workers. This took on its clearest form in Bremen, where some groups of workers succeeded in taking advantage of the struggle between the employers for skilled workers.

The small partial struggles of the workers are usually still of a defensive character, but entire staffs in enterprises or definite sections of them are already coming forward with their demands.

Here are some examples of actions by the workers in the recent period. At the railway station in Stuttgart, the workers engaged in laying the track quit work. They demanded payment according to the scale which had been abolished on the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. The strike lasted two days. The workers won. At a metallurgical plant a strike took place for similar demands. It lasted three days. This is the most prolonged strike held recently. The other strikes have so far been short ones and have lasted only a few hours or half a day. In one factory in Frankfurt the workers quit work. They put forward a number of demands. They succeeded in getting their demands granted. At one works in Berlin the turners demanded a 15 per cent. wage increase. For 30 turners they obtained a 7 per cent. increase and for the others, 5 per cent. At another place, 40 tool makers secured wage increases of 4 per cent. to 9 per cent. At a factory in Wuppertal, the workers secured a 25 per cent. increase for work on the night shift. Before this strike the workers had held a strike against the attempts of the employers to reduce wages. Many such examples can be given.

It should be noted that spontaneous expressions of discontent are very strong among the oppositionally-inclined workers in the storm troops and the N.S.B.O.* It frequently happens that these workers take the lead of the whole staff when action is taken. Hence it follows that the better the anti-fascist workers learn to utilise legal possi-

* The Nazi factory organisation.

bilities, the better will they succeed in acting jointly with the oppositional Nazi workers. Thus in a number of cases the workers have succeeded in defending their proposals before the council of trustees or in securing the resignation of the council of trustees and the appointment of a new one. The fact that our tactics in the election of the councils of trustees were correct is also proved by the fact that the councils of trustees, in many cases, are taking the side of the workers and entering into conflicts with the employers. Many members of the councils of trustees are being removed, and many are being sent to concentration camps.

The Growth of Class Solidarity.

It is very important to emphasise that solidarity is gradually becoming stronger, the denunciations which used to take place formerly are becoming more rare, and as a result, the big factories are compelled to maintain their own factory police. The workers are beginning once again to struggle for their representatives, and to protect them. There have been cases when solidarity has required great material sacrifices. And these sacrifices were made. I will give one example: a group of workers got work. When they were taken to their place of work, a storm trooper made a speech. His arguments were interrupted by the interjections of another storm trooper from among the workers. The directors demanded that the person who interrupted should voluntarily come forward. This, however, he did not do. Then the management stated that the workers must hand over this person, under the threat of dismissal and disallowance of unemployment relief for five years. In spite of the threats made, the management did not achieve the surrender of this person. As a result, the group of workers were dismissed. Then another group of workers were instructed to look for this person. But threats of dismissal and disallowance of relief for five years did not help. The workers refused to carry out the demands of the management, and were also dismissed.

Here is another example. In a certain factory during the inflation period, the workers established a mutual aid club in which there was a balance of 13,000 marks. The national-socialists wanted to appropriate this money, to "unify" the club with a state institution, and to turn it into a life insurance society. At a general meeting of the workers concerned, a 56-year-old man got up and spoke against the attempt. He was arrested. Then two others spoke and they were also arrested. In spite of this, however, the national-socialists did not succeed in carrying out their intentions, and had to beat a retreat.

At an aeroplane factory a spontaneous protest of

the workers broke out. One worker threw his tools through the window and was arrested. After this six others demanded their pay and walked out in sympathy. There are many such examples in Germany.

Solidarity sometimes spreads beyond the limits of the working class. There is a danger that some bourgeois elements are trying to use this in their own interests. But at the same time we see that proletarian solidarity is helping to create the anti-fascist people's front. In a certain textile factory in the West, the workers demanded the abolition of deductions from their wages for "winter aid."

Under the pressure of the workers the manager of the firm agreed to this demand. The Board of Directors heard of this and dismissed the manager. After this the workers held a demonstration carrying posters with various slogans, including one with the demand for the reinstatement of the manager.

The decisive thing is that these small partial struggles create the prerequisites for a broad united front, because they are already the expression of the common will to struggle and the first step towards the formation of the united front. The whole question is how to lead the working masses by this path to more developed and higher forms of struggle.

Ways of Establishing Contact with the Masses.

In the difficult conditions of the fascist dictatorship, the German Communists have sometimes to seek for primitive ways of establishing contacts with the working masses. Several examples of this may be given. In a certain pit, our comrades made a first attempt to test how far the workers were desirous of struggle. With this end in view, they suggested that at a general meeting to be held, the workers should refuse to sing the song with which such meetings are opened in Germany under the fascist dictatorship (it is a new song introduced by the national-socialists). Unexpectedly, all the workers agreed to this proposal. The chairman, who opened the meeting, proposed that they all sing the song (but he had to begin it himself) and sang alone. Unfortunately it is impossible to give here in full a splendid letter written to us by our comrade on this matter. The letter includes the following words: "Each of us felt that this was the **FIRST** step towards unity of action." Thus, the first primitive step is the attempt to discover the sentiments of the workers in the given factory. But now this first step has been taken, the comrades are thinking that among these workers they will be able in a short time to build up an organisation.

In a big factory in Berlin the workers sent a delegation with a petition to the foreman. The delegation met with no success. Then the workers

sent a delegation to the "council of trustees" with a demand that a meeting be called. On receiving a refusal, the workers themselves called a meeting in their workshop, and thus, despite the terror, broke through the framework of fascist legality. The results of such beginnings are shown by the following example: at a certain textile factory in Lausitz where a wage-cut was carried through, the workers left their work and made their way to the management offices. The wage-cut was withdrawn. Encouraged by this success, the workers demanded an increase of two marks a week. By struggle they obtained this as well.

Here are two more examples showing how the organising rôle of the Party is beginning to be felt. At a certain flour mill overtime was not being paid for. Our cell addressed a proposal to the social-democratic group that unity of action should be undertaken in the struggle for the payment of overtime. The social-democrats agreed. Then the workers sent a delegation to the "council of trustees." The latter defended the demands of the workers, but were immediately dismissed by the employers and replaced by others. In reply to this the workers left their work, organised a demonstration through the town and went to the management offices which stood apart from the mill. The management called in the police. When the police found themselves faced with solid ranks of the workers, they used demagogic measures — they arrested the manager of the factory and the newly-appointed "council of trustees." What is more, this newly-appointed "council of trustees" had been compelled, under the pressure of the workers, to march with them through the town. The workers succeeded in securing the satisfaction of all their demands and the old "council of trustees" was reinstated. This action led to a situation where the workers in all the factories began to put forward their demands and took steps against the law regarding the dismissal of young workers which was felt with special force in this locality. As a result, the operation of this fascist measure was prevented in a number of factories. Another result of this activity was that the question of the formation of trade unions in the factories began to be discussed in the other factories of this district. Immediately a beginning was made of the construction of free trade unions. Thus, one single demand, on the basis of which the united front was brought about, led to such fruitful results.

Our comrades write to us about the favourable results of our work in an artificial silk factory as follows:

"We Communists and social-democrats, members of the former free trade unions, have organised a close illegal union among ourselves. We are also drawing into it the

oppositionally inclined storm troopers, especially those who have authority among them. We have therefore twice been able to hold a strike in the spinning shop. We sent a mixed delegation to the management. The delegation was not received. Then we declared a strike. The strike was successful. Two weeks later we struck again and held a demonstration. We made quite a procession as we marched through all the departments in the factory and made our way to the management offices. As a result all our demands were satisfied."

Take another example. In a shipbuilding yard the workers had to listen to a speech by Hitler. The next morning they were to come to work an hour earlier to make up for the time lost. Our cell immediately came to an agreement with the social-democratic workers and the former trade union officials. Together they put forward the slogan that all should come to work at the usual time. The next morning, of a total staff of 700 men only the police and a few Brownshirt officials came to work at the time fixed by the management. Then the management ordered that deductions be made from the wages for the lost hour. The workers immediately threatened a strike, and by this means secured the withdrawal of the reduction. In the same enterprise, owing to the action referred to, the question was raised of re-establishing the free trade unions. Several other examples could be given of how a movement which arose in a particular enterprise led to the question being raised of the re-establishment of the free trade unions.

To Raise the Partial Struggles to a Higher Level.

The question arises here as to how these partial struggles should be connected up and raised to a higher level of the mass struggle. This can only be done with the aid of a live and broad united front. We must, therefore, welcome the fact that one of our district committees has given a new example of how to conclude united front agreements and to establish united front committees with social-democratic groups and also with a group of the Socialist Workers' Party and the Reichsbanner.

It is also possible by means of the united front to raise the struggle inside the fascist mass organisations to a higher level, and to undermine the fascist law of "totality." It will be easier with the help of the united front to utilise the traditions of the free trade unions, to intensify the struggle for the right to elect representatives in the "Labour Front," and to make wider use of its lower officials in our interests.

Our weakness in the sphere of mass work in the fascist organisations will most easily be eliminated if we establish unity of action with the social-democratic and Christian workers.* A number of

* Christian workers, i.e., workers who belonged to the "Christian Trade Unions," i.e., unions organised on the basis of common religious faith.—Ed.

examples show that our supporters have been able to make use of the "Labour Front" and to occupy the lower posts there. These examples, however, have been insufficiently used so far, and the experience has not been made known to the entire Party. On this matter we must without question catch up on lost time. Following the "unification" of the trade unions, the social-democratic workers secured quite a large number of such posts. And in so far as these workers form a united front with us Communists we can also utilise these lower posts in the "Labour Front" in the interests of the joint struggle.

We have also examples to provide a picture of the sentiments prevailing in the country, in the "Labour Front."

At a certain metallurgical plant a vote was taken among the workers regarding deductions to be made from wages for "winter aid." In spite of all the speeches of the "Labour Front" officials, and in spite of the terror, 600 out of 1,000 voted against the reduction. At the same time at a certain mine in Upper Silesia a meeting of the "Labour Front" was called. At this meeting the discussion was of such a kind that the "Labour Front" leaders had to inform the police. Flying squads were called in, but this method however, was insufficient to maintain the workers at the meeting. In all parts of the country police chiefs have issued warnings to supporters of the "Labour Front," and members of the Socialist Party of Germany, etc., threatening to arrest them. For example, the chief of police in Schwemmingen threatened to arrest anyone who shouted an interruption expressing Marxist ideas. In the Ruhr district and the Lower Rhine the National-Socialist Party have had to carry through a special campaign because mass desertions from the "Labour Front" have recently been observed, and there has been an increase of opposition of the workers at meetings of the "Labour Front."

* * * *

The Fight to Re-Establish the Free Trade Unions.

In this connection, the restoration of the free trade unions is of decisive importance. The C.P.G. has now officially advanced the slogan of the re-establishment of the free trade unions, as the basic and central task facing the working class. We have done this too late. We thought that it was possible to re-establish the free trade unions without calling the attention of the enemy to it by wide propaganda on an all-German scale. Therefore, in the materials issued by the centre, we gave unclear and indistinct formulations. Our leading Party workers, right up to the end of October, did not in their articles advance the slogan of the re-establishment of the free trade unions in so many words. We have thus lost a favourable moment which can

only be made up by rapidly bringing about the united front with the social-democratic workers for the re-establishment of the free trade unions. We do not want to organise Communist trade unions, we need MASS trade unions, mass in the sense that they will unite anti-fascists of various trends and tendencies, and that the leaders and functionaries in these organisations will be of such a composition as to reflect the will of the masses to establish trade union unity in the free trade unions. We know that, in present circumstances, we must build up not such mass organisations as the social-democrats understand them but organisations having strong and vital contacts with the masses.

In order to accelerate the formation of such class organisations we are instructing our organisational units to conclude united front pacts with the social-democratic organisations and leaders for the restoration of the free trade unions. We are also ready, with this end in view, to conclude a pact with the leaders of the Left groups, with the higher officials of the former trade unions and even with the "Prague" social-democratic leaders, so as to prevent the split arising again, playing, as it would, only into the hands of the fascists. As the formation of free trade unions depends on the whole on whether a united front is established for this purpose in the factories, we call on our factory cells and all comrades in the factories who sympathise with us to make a bold approach to the social-democratic workers with this end in view. Our efforts to include the R.T.U.O. (Red Trade Union Opposition) and the Red trade unions as rapidly as possible in the free trade unions which will have to be formed together with the social-democratic comrades, shows that we want to do everything possible to establish trade union unity in the free trade unions. We Communists, therefore, will also work for the liquidation of the district committees of the R.T.U.O., as they are frequently a hindrance towards the re-establishment of the free trade unions. It is very important to convince the supporters of the R.T.U.O. and the Red trade unions of the necessity for this policy.

A beginning has already been made in the organisation of free trade unions. Thirty-seven trade union groups have been formed in the Lower Rhine region. A centralised leadership is already being organised there for the free trade unions of textile workers and metal workers. In the process of re-establishing the textile workers' union, we have so far set up 22 groups. Fifteen groups have already been organised with a view to re-establishing the metal workers' union, and in addition there are several groups of sympathisers. Our weakness is that our comrades in the factories have not succeeded in making an approach to responsible

social-democratic officials so as to hasten the development of these trade union groups in the factories. In the south-west we have begun to set up a chemical workers' union which must first of all be consolidated in the chemical plants. The former social-democratic trade union organisations are rendering us energetic assistance in this regard. In Berlin a start has been made in the organisation of a metal workers' union, in the Ruhr district of a miners' union, and in Saxony, of a textile workers' union. Reports arriving from all parts of the country show that the workers take a very sympathetic attitude towards this activity.

The fact that the workers want to form trade unions was utilised by the Right social-democratic leaders to try to set up their own trade union groups on the basis of the old reformist policy. This means once again to organise the trade union split of the working class. So as to hinder the work of such splitters, of such supporters of coalition with the bourgeoisie, we make it obligatory on all Communists, in places where such groups are set up, to join them and bring about their unification with other trade union groups. In the re-establishment of the free trade unions, the main thing in any case is, as we have already emphasised, the establishment of a united front. But it is precisely in this sphere that we have shown the greatest weakness, and this has hindered the re-establishment of the free trade unions. We have met with resistance to the formation of free trade unions. Some Party organisations have thought that this was a Right wing line. Others claimed that the free trade unions were too much discredited, although the A.D.G.B.* had 4,500,000 members before the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship. Brandler, for example, is of such an opinion. Others declared that the revolutionary nature of the trade unions should now be openly stressed. As a result of this, formulations such as "revolutionary trade unions," and "Red trade unions" have appeared, with the repudiation of the slogan of free trade unions. It is quite clear that such views hinder the development of the united front.

Against Sectarianism.

It follows from this that we must carry on a strong ideological struggle against the sectarianism in our Party, the more so because we, the leaders, are ourselves responsible to a certain degree for this. We have often limited ourselves to an abstract struggle of principles against the social-democratic leaders, and in this way we have, in fact, nourished sectarianism. We have not made a distinction between the Left and Right leaders in the "Prague" C.C. This appeared in one of my

* The German reformist Trade Union Congress.

articles, a fact which shows that sectarianism has had a certain influence on us as well.

And these mistakes of ours have been utilised in an anti-Party spirit by conciliatory groups. We forgot that under the leadership of Comrade Thaelmann, the C.P.G. always conducted a struggle on two fronts so as to ensure that we operated the line of the Communist International, and that this struggle on two fronts was conducted on the basis of inner-Party self-criticism. Sectarianism is the main obstacle hindering our united front policy. At the present time sectarianism hinders the development of mass work in the fascist mass organisations. We have stated to our own mass organisations that illegal mass organisations can only exist in the fascist conditions of Germany if they have firmly consolidated their influence in organisations of the enemy. However, it is not sufficient merely to talk about this. Without a united front policy we shall not be able to bring about the real organisation of an opposition inside the fascist mass organisations. Our sportsmen, therefore, must everywhere find an approach to the former members of the Workers' Sport and Gymnastics Association. Our Freethinkers must draw nearer to the former supporters of Sievers.* Our members of the War Victims' Association must draw nearer to the former members of the War Victims' Association with a view to carrying on a joint struggle inside the fascist mass organisations.

This united front from below creates good prerequisites for the operation of our general line, of our united front policy. The experience which we already possess shows this. The best examples in this direction are provided by the sports movement, where we have already obtained influence over a considerable number of sports unions in Germany. There are similar examples in other fascist mass organisations as well. It is, of course, difficult to make these examples publicly known. But we cannot get on without making them known. We must do everything to practise the exchange of experiences between our Party organisations on the widest possible scale.

In many parts of Germany Reichsbanner groups still exist under various radical names. Our Red Front Fighters' Organisation does not conduct a united front policy in relation to them.

Sometimes such groups of the former Reichsbanner use extremely radical language (for example, they state that socialist aims can only be achieved by the armed struggle of a Red Army, and that all efforts should be directed towards the formation of a Red Army), but at the same time they reject mass work inside the fascist mass

* Sievers—the leader of the Social-Democratic Freethinkers' Organisation.

organisations, and they describe the restoration of the free trade unions as the resurrection of the reformist policy. Instead of getting into contact with such active workers and educating them in the spirit of our revolutionary policy, explaining the worthlessness of their views, some of our comrades try to outdo them in the use of radical phrases. We are, of course, in favour of the establishment of a Red Army, but the path towards a Red Army is that of a mass policy, is work in the mass organisations, in the "Labour Front," work to establish the united front, so as to raise the struggle of the workers to a higher level.

We want to take a serious line for the establishment of the united front with a view to creating a single fighting organisation of the proletariat, but the way this organisation shall be named is not a question of principle, but one of arrangement with the social-democratic workers, and of drawing them on an extensive scale into the formation of such an organisation.

Work in the Storm Detachments.

Sectarianism in the Party has also hindered us in carrying on mass work in the storm detachments with a view to disintegrating them, and has prevented us from drawing the members of the storm detachments into the struggle. Our comrades often say this to us: "We cannot enter a united front with those who have beaten us up, who have tortured us, and evicted us from our houses. There can be no question of such a thing!" On the other hand, the workers in the storm detachments often put the question: "After all the frightful things that we have done, do the Communists want to allow us among them?" We must put an end to the sectarian attitude to this question.

Matters are just the same in respect to the re-establishment of the free trade unions. Our comrades often say: "What, we have to organise free trade unions with those who immediately allow themselves to be 'unified' by the Fascist State, and who immediately capitulated!" This is how sectarianism makes itself felt in the most varied forms.

The social-democratic workers have come to us and said, "We want to join the free trade union groups, but we earn so little that we cannot pay two sets of dues—to the free trade unions and to the 'Labour Front'. We do not want, however, to leave the 'Labour Front' yet." Our comrades thought that they were acting in a revolutionary manner when they established unbearable membership dues! As though the will to undertake the class struggle can only express itself in membership dues! Of course, many social-democratic workers have a very weak appreciation of the

importance of re-establishing the free trade unions. Such workers say: "We are in the 'Labour Front' and we think that we can reorganise it along trade union lines." Our comrades often refuse to convince these social-democratic workers.

Our Policy Towards the Youth.

Sectionarism is now very much in evidence among us also in our policy towards the youth. Our Party has paid insufficient attention to the leadership of the youth. In connection with the fact that the fascists carry on chauvinistic incitement and social demagogy, and try in every way to consolidate their influence on the youth (in accordance with what they have in view regarding the prospects of war and the avoidance of the proletarian revolution), our Party must pay more serious attention to the struggle to win over the youth.

Fascism sees that the youth, considerable sections of whom supported it, are now beginning to become a serious danger to it. Fascism is, therefore, exerting every effort to preserve its influence on the youth. The main thing is that our leading Party bodies should give better guidance to the Y.C.L. regarding mass work and the development of the united front, so that they themselves should undertake more energetic leadership of the struggle against the law on the employment of youth and against the sending of young workers into the village, and that our Party organisations should themselves set an example of the united front between the Y.C.L.'ers and the Young Socialists. The Y.C.L. on its own part must widely and boldly formulate the smallest demands raised by the enslaved youth, and popularise them so as to be able to lead the youth into the struggle. With a view to joint action it must try to get into contact with the numerous discontented organisations, not only the Young Socialists, but all other groups. This can only be done with the help of our Party.

The central question in the sphere of our policy towards the youth is the struggle against chauvinism. A clear example of this is provided by the entire period before and after the Saar plebiscite, when it was clearly brought to light that the raging chauvinistic campaign carried on by the fascists had the strongest influence on the masses of the youth. The twofold demagogy of Hitler—to the effect that "we want peace but we demand equality of armaments" has its effect on the youth in thousands of varieties of chauvinism. The results of the Saar plebiscite were a serious warning for us, and reminded us of the necessity of intensifying the struggle everywhere against chauvinism. But in this direction we shall only be successful if we at the same time struggle against

the calculations of the social-democrats to the effect that help will come to the German people from outside. Help from outside means the struggle of the international proletariat. We ourselves must secure our liberty in our own country. In the difficult conditions of illegality we are ourselves in danger of dropping into an attitude which is nationally restricted. Therefore, in the struggle against national chauvinism we must energetically spread internationalism. If we strengthen it in our own ranks, we shall be in a better position to struggle against national socialism.

Our programme for national and social liberation is an important weapon in the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism. But we must learn to use this weapon better.

The Anti-Fascist People's Front.

The united front is the driving belt to the anti-fascist people's front! But the mere slogan of the people's front alone is insufficient to develop a broad fighting movement against fascism. We must infuse a living content into this slogan. Proof of the fact that the prerequisites for the formation of a broad people's front exist is provided by the growing discontent of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the peasants, the intellectuals and the students. Our comrades tell us that in quite a number of places anyone using the Hitler salute attracts attention to himself, and is looked on with the greatest distrust. In reality it may be said that in many places the Hitler salute has been wiped out.

At a butchers' meeting in Berlin, at which 2,000 persons were present, a big uproar took place in this connection. A meeting of coal traders in Berlin—about the same number—held a demonstration against forced contributions, and against the Hitler salute, and thus against the régime. A few days ago a meeting of hairdressers in Berlin-Neukölln was held in which 400 persons took part. This meeting was also very stormy. 95 per cent. of the audience demonstrated against those on the platform of the meeting. The Holstein peasants sent in a complaint about the national-socialist who conducted the elections, stating that he had falsified the results of the elections at the last plebiscite. A large number of peasants, living in this village, in spite of the fierce terror, testified on oath that they had voted against Hitler. At a peasants' meeting in Plauen a peasant made an oppositional speech. The police were called. The audience scattered. An exhibition was planned in Hessen, but just before it was to be opened it had to be abandoned because the peasants refused to give their produce for the exhibition as a protest against compulsory deductions for "winter aid." In the

peasant markets there have recently been repeated spontaneous protests by peasants against the compulsory delivery of produce and against the fixed prices on fodder. In Brandenburg and Upper Westphalia where the poor peasants play a big rôle, discontent with the landlords finds exceptionally sharp expression. Matters have now gone so far that the peasants state that only the Communists can give them the land.

It is clear from all this that the situation has changed. The Communists can and must again go into the villages from which, until recently, they were squeezed out in many parts of the country. There is a serious danger here that the oppositional bourgeois groups will succeed in utilising the opposition of the peasants for their own ends. In Bavaria, for example, the peasants say that a clerical government will soon be established. In Westphalia there are rumours about the forthcoming coalition of the Centre Party (Clerical) with the social-democrats.

Work in the Villages.

Now it is insufficient for us to act only through "village helpers"* in our work among the peasants. We must again set up firm organisational points of support in the villages as the prerequisite for the development of the broad policy of the people's front. Only thus can we come to the help of the peasants. We must learn to seize on the wishes and demands of these strata of the toilers, and formulate and popularise these wishes and demands in the proper form. The peasants expect from us that we shall help them in the struggle against the fascism commissaries. The fascist dictatorship, as the open terroristic dictatorship of finance capital, is striving to rob these strata still further, to destroy their organisations by the method of unification, as it has already done with the free trade unions. The urge towards the old organisations will become all the more clear because the peasants have no defence now against the robber methods used by the wholesale traders. The peasants are demanding a return to the old producers' co-operative societies and are protesting against the system of state and semi-state organ-

* Unemployed youth sent for compulsory work in the village.—Ed.

isations which squeezes the last drop of blood out of them.

In such conditions we are sure of the possibility of developing the united front into a broad anti-fascist people's front, and thus of winning allies for the proletarian revolution, for the people's revolution. To concretise the general line of the anti-fascist policy of the people's front means to help to disintegrate the terrorist organisations, to make the armed forces of fascism unsuitable for the struggle against the people. The linking up of the demands of the workers with those of the urban petty bourgeoisie and with those of the peasants, makes it possible to form a united front between the toilers, and to create a broad people's front. The organisation of the united front and the people's front must arise out of life itself. It depends on the activity of the mass policy of the Communist Party as to how far it will win authority among the masses, how far it will organise the forces of the masses. It depends on how energetically it rallies the masses and leads them to the struggle, as to when the fascist dictatorship will be overthrown.

* * * *

The Fight for Socialist Soviet Germany.

In the process of the mass struggles, and of mighty class battles, in the process of the people's revolution, the organs of the united front will turn into the executive organs of the toiling people. Thus, all our friends in the country can see that we have a revolutionary outlook, that our mass policy and the policy of the united front, our policy of the anti-fascist people's front, mean rallying all the toilers for the struggle against fascism, for a struggle in one direction, namely, for the overthrow of the Hitler dictatorship, for the power of the Soviets. In the struggle against the national-socialists, in the struggle against chauvinism, in the struggle for the establishment of a very broad anti-fascist people's front, we tell the toiling people what is written in our programme of emancipation. We Communists love our country and our people, our language, and our fatherland, and precisely for this reason we are seeking to overthrow the fascist dictatorship and are fighting for socialist Soviet Germany, for our German working class, for a well-to-do life, for Socialism.

VERBATIM REPORT of the Negotiations
Between the
SECOND AND THIRD INTERNATIONALS
on the Question of Supporting the Spanish Workers
WORKERS BOOKSHOP, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C. 3d.

(c) THE FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT IN SWITZERLAND

By KAROLSKI.

I. Social Democracy Revises its Programme.

AN extraordinary congress of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party took place in Lucerne at the end of January, 1935, after having been postponed four times. This delay is explained by the fact that the party leaders were not sure whether the congress would agree to a revision of the programme in the spirit of a social-patriotic recognition of the need to defend the fatherland and of the rejection of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." (In the previous programme of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party mention was made of the dictatorship of the proletariat.) By a majority of 80 votes (out of 700 delegates present), the congress approved the swing of Swiss Social Democracy to the Right; 300 oppositional delegates voted against the revision of the programme.

But it would be incorrect to draw the conclusion from this decision that no swing to the Left is taking place in Switzerland such as is to be observed in other capitalist countries among the social-democratic workers and a considerable part of their party officials. We shall try to indicate the processes that are taking place in the Swiss working class, to show HOW DEEP DOWN IS THE BASIS OF THE SWING TO THE LEFT BY THE SWISS SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS, how the influence of the Communist Party has received added strength during the last year, and what a unique form the struggle for the united front in Switzerland is assuming.

It is interesting to note the form in which the open social-patriots and the extreme Right wing of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party tried to serve up the bourgeois theory of the need to defend the fatherland to the social-democratic workers. They tried to utilise the healthy protest of the Swiss workers against Hitlerite fascism in their own interests, and the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union for the most despicable aims of their policy of "civil peace." It was in this way that they wanted to drag the revision of the programme into the congress, and to remove the formal barriers standing in the way of the coalition of social-democracy with the bourgeoisie.

But matters did not take the turn that the social-democratic leaders desired. In the first place, in spite of all the efforts of the party apparatus and the fact that the Congress was postponed four times, almost 300 delegates joined the opposition, which opposed at the Congress the thesis of the need to defend the fatherland. If we take the

fact that the Right-wingers had dozens of votes at the Congress, belonging to parliamentary and social-democratic officials, into consideration, it may be said that the 300 delegates who voted against the revision of the programme represented the majority of the members of the Social-Democratic Party. But what was still more important was the fact that THE FIRST STEP TOWARDS THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE NEW SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMME WAS REJECTED BY A CONSIDERABLE MAJORITY OF THE SAME CONGRESS. Against the wishes of the leaders, and in the teeth of a letter signed personally by Robert Grimm, who had been "suddenly taken ill" and could not come to the Congress, the Congress decided to REJECT the new bill which proposed to prolong the period of military service and which was to be submitted to a referendum of the whole nation on February 24th, 1935. All the efforts of the social-democratic leaders to drag in, by the back-stairs entrance, so to speak, the thesis of the need to defend the fatherland by giving great prominence to the "programme of work," the press law and a number of other questions, came to grief. The delegates at the Congress were under the powerful influence of the anti-fascist and anti-militarist sentiments of the toilers of Switzerland, and they understood instinctively that their attitude to the "defence of the fatherland" was the central problem on which the further policy of their party depended.

The opposition at the Congress was not unanimous. Here were to be found various elements, from bourgeois pacifists, christian socialists, and "Left" leaders, to class-conscious workers who, from the class point of view, consistently rejected the line taken by the leaders for "civil peace," and fought consistently for the policy of the united front. It was only the organisational weakness of the opposition that explains the fact that the Congress rejected the proposal to send the decision to the lower organisations for a second vote by 20 votes. This caused many of the delegates to leave the Congress in extreme indignation.

The results of the Congress have not satisfied anybody. The bourgeoisie had expected that social-democracy would take energetic action against the Communist referendum and would help to push the Army Act through. The Rights did not expect such strong resistance and such a growth of the opposition, for they considered that resistance in the Social-Democratic Party had been paralysed as a result of the expulsion of a number

of prominent leaders of the Zurich Left wing. But, what is most important of all, the expected settlement and stabilisation of the situation in the Social-Democratic Party has not taken place after the Congress. On the contrary, the crisis in the Social-Democratic Party has become extremely sharp as a result of the Congress, and it became evident in the course of its work that the little Communist Party of Switzerland was already exerting a strong ideological influence over wide sections of social-democrats.

To understand this swing to the Left on the part of the workers it is necessary to examine the peculiarities of the struggle of the Communist Party for the establishment of the united front in Switzerland. Until recently the two questions which, in all the neighbouring countries, had rallied the masses to the struggle for the united front, namely, the danger of fascism and the danger of war, were not so strongly felt by the broad masses of the people in Switzerland. Strong illusions reigned among the broad masses on the question of "neutrality," the belief that Switzerland would not take part in the coming war. They believed that fascism did not represent an urgent danger as far as Switzerland is concerned, because the Swiss bourgeoisie had not yet directly set about cutting down their fairly extensive democratic rights. Moreover, the crisis began in Switzerland much later than in other countries, and, finally, a great rôle was played by the fact that the relationship of forces between the Communist Party and social-democracy in Switzerland was different from that in the neighbouring countries. Here there was a little Communist Party, and a strong Social-Democratic Party which had succeeded in concealing its reformist policy by "Left" phrases. For many years the Communist Party had not been able to get over its isolation from the masses. At the same time the toiling masses of Switzerland had not yet felt the split in the working class so powerfully as in neighbouring countries, because with the exception of Basle and Zurich, the trade union movement in Switzerland was not split. While the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland has 40,000 members and there are 250,000 workers in the reformist trade unions, the C.P. of Switzerland has only 2,000 members, while the Red trade unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition have 4,000 members.

At one time the Swiss Brandlerites had tried to deduce the social-democratic theory of the so-called "exceptionalism of Switzerland" from the peculiar character of the working-class movement in Switzerland. The Brandlerites denied the imperialist character of Switzerland, they denied the war danger and the approach of the economic

crisis, and attempted to force their opportunist policy towards social-democracy on to the Communist Party. But the victory of fascism in Germany and Austria had its effect in Switzerland as well. A number of fascist organisations sprang up there, which tried to take root among the petty-bourgeois elements in the villages, and especially in the army, and even to penetrate into some factories. They succeeded in doing this, especially in Schaffhausen, where the Brandlerites who were thrown out of the Communist Party are carrying on a most foul social-democratic policy. A struggle has flared up in the camp of the bourgeoisie around the question of the foreign political line to be taken by Switzerland. The Communist deputy in parliament, Comrade Robert Mueller, has exposed the negotiations of General Ville, representative of the Swiss General Staff, with Hitler and Blomberg. This exposure has shown the extent to which certain sections of the Swiss bourgeoisie and generals are already prepared to base themselves on Hitlerite Germany. The economic crisis has become more intense. The unemployment figures have passed 100,000, and as the path of inflation has hitherto been closed as far as the Swiss bourgeoisie are concerned, they have begun a direct attack on the standard of living of the working class. At the present moment the government and the bourgeoisie are preparing to make a general attack on the working class, having in view a 20 per cent. wage-cut.

On this basis a profound leftward-moving process has taken place among the masses. As everywhere, the social-democrats tried to gloss over the danger, which the toiling masses in Switzerland, though later than in other countries, were beginning to understand, namely, the danger of war, the danger of fascism, the development towards fascism of the state apparatus, the cutting down of democratic rights and the lowering of the standard of living of the toilers. By taking a number of steps aimed at adaptation to the changed situation, and especially by indulging in wide propaganda of a Swiss variety of the de Man plan,* the social-democratic leaders wanted to keep the masses back from the class struggle, to lull them to sleep, so that they could at the same time begin to "grow into the state," after having changed the Party programme and included it in the thesis of the need to defend the fatherland.

Did the Communist Party take advantage of the favourable position to put an end to its isolation and to rally the masses to the struggle, to beat back fascism and defeat the reformist policy of social-democracy?

* See *C.I.* Nos. 12 and 13. Vol. XI. (1934).

II. The C.P. of Switzerland Organises the Resistance of the Masses.

A considerable improvement took place in the mass work of the Communist Party of Switzerland after the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. The Party ceased to carry on an "abstract" struggle against social-democracy. The little Communist Party of Switzerland, thanks to its independent action and correct policy, succeeded in compelling the powerful Social-Democratic Party to take a number of steps and to widely popularise the idea of the united front among the masses. Here are some examples.

FIRST EXAMPLE. At the beginning of 1934, the bourgeoisie tried to push through a bill which the toilers nicknamed the convict law. The aim of this law was to make a big drive against the right to organise and would have led to the suppression of the Communist Party. The Right social-democrats, and especially the trade union leaders, openly defended this convict law. Thanks to the fact that the Communist Party rallied the masses and introduced a proposal for a referendum, a wide opposition arose within the Social-Democratic Party against this bill. As the result of this opposition, the S.D. leaders were forced at the last moment to support the Communist Party's slogan of the rejection of the convict law. During the referendum, held on March 13, 1934, almost half a million workers and peasants **TURNED DOWN THE CONVICT LAW** and thus sharply defeated the first fascist efforts made by the bourgeoisie.

SECOND EXAMPLE. As against the line adopted by the social-democrats, "let the fascists demonstrate without hindrance in the working class quarters," the Communist Party, with the help of non-Party organisations, especially through the Zurich "League for the Struggle Against Fascism," rose to the struggle against fascist provocation. In Zurich on May 29, 1934, 10,000 workers came out on to the streets, built barricades, and fought fiercely, not only against the fascists, but also against henchmen of Wiesendanger, the social-democratic police president, who were protecting a fascist meeting. In these battles the Communist Party showed that it was able to strike a blow at the bourgeoisie, not only through the ballot, as was the case during the referendum on the convict bill, but that it was also capable of rallying the broad masses against fascism in the process of the **STRUGGLE OUTSIDE PARLIAMENT**, and, what is particularly important, of uniting many thousands of social-democratic workers in a united front of action.

The **THIRD EXAMPLE** also shows the flexibility of the activity of the Communist Party. On September 15, the social-democrats and the trade unions

held mass demonstrations in support of the so-called initiative in the struggle against the crisis, by organising a "day of labour." Although the social-democrats and the trade unions rejected the proposal of the Communists to hold joint demonstrations, the Communists did not boycott the demonstrations organised by them, did not call for independent demonstrations, but called on the masses to participate in the carrying out of the "day of labour" so as to give a united front character to these demonstrations. The Communist Party was fully successful in this respect. The masses demonstrated for the united front, against the reformist proposal to give special powers to the government and for a whole series of class demands.

FOURTH EXAMPLE. When the Swiss bourgeoisie began energetically to increase their armaments, the Swiss Communists brought forward a proposal for a referendum against the lengthening of the period of military service for conscripts, and drew a large number of social-democratic workers into the united front committees, collecting 80,000 signatures for a referendum against the army bill. They confronted the social-democratic congress with an accomplished fact and thus compelled it to support the referendum.

The fight against the army bill was one of the most difficult fights which the Communist Party has had to wage during the last year. The terror operated by the state apparatus, and all the bourgeois parties and the fascists, has been carried on with unparalleled force. In spite of the decision of the Lucerne Social-Democratic Party Congress, which, under the pressure of the masses voted against the bill, the Right social-democrats and trade union leaders openly went over to the side of the militarists. In a special leaflet entitled "Hello, the Right Socialists Speaking!" the social patriots advocated increased armaments. It was primarily as a result of this fact that the bill was adopted by a majority of 75,000 votes. But what is especially worthy of note is the fact that the Communist Party succeeded in rallying half-a-million workers and peasants to the struggle against the army bill. It is also important that a series of districts clearly peasant in character, such as Schwitz, Oberwalden, Nidweldon, Freiburg, Apentzel and Neinburg, voted against the army bill. This opens up great possibilities for the Communist Party, in the sense of winning allies for the fighting proletariat.

III. The Struggle for the United Front.

In these serious battles which the Communist Party has waged, we already find important elements of the policy of the united front. During this period the Communist Party repeatedly made

united front proposals to the social-democratic party for the struggle to secure the release of Comrade Thaelmann, to rally joint aid to the Spanish proletariat, and to undertake joint action against the army bill.

In reply to the proposal to organise the struggle for the release of Comrade Thaelmann, the social-democrats gave a most provocative reply, one such as probably no other Social-Democratic party has given to the Communists, indulging in incitement against the Soviet Union and proposing demonstrations in front of the Soviet Consulate. They gave no reply whatever to the proposal to aid the Spanish workers. But in respect to the last proposal, the social-democrats were forced to act differently in connection with the decision of the bureau of the Second International. But of this we shall speak later.

The calculations of the Social Democratic leaders who replied so provocatively to the proposal for a joint struggle to secure the release of Comrade Thaelmann and other anti-fascists were made without consideration for their masters. The changed situation in Switzerland and the actions organised by the Communist Party were bound to have an influence over broad sections of social-democratic workers and their party officials. At this time, especially in Zurich, a Left wing began to take shape, which differs very considerably from the traditional "Left" wing of the Swiss social-democratic party. The secretary of the strongest social-democratic organisations in Switzerland, Ernst Walter (Zurich) repeatedly made public declarations in favour of the united front with the Communists.

Then the platform of the Left social-democrats appeared for the first time. It still contained much that was characteristic of the old "Left" wing. It did not contain a word against the suggestion to defend the fatherland; the question of the united front with the Communists is not raised in a positive fashion. It even contains attacks on the Comintern. This was no accident, since the process of alignment among the Left wingers themselves was not yet sufficiently strong. The godfathers of this platform were Sternburg, the theoretician of the Socialist Labour Party, and also the Brandlerites, led by Bringhof, who introduced a series of Brandlerite demands into the platform. In spite of all these shortcomings and the serious political weaknesses of the platform it assisted in deepening the crisis in the social-democratic party.

As the class battles developed further in Switzerland, the narrow bounds of this platform were broken through by the process of alignment within the Left wing. While Nicol in Geneva, and Bringhof in Schaffhausen, who had strongly entrenched themselves in the state apparatus, differed very little from the Right social-demo-

crats, and while the former Left winger, Arthur Schmidt, from Aarau, openly joined the social-patriots, coming forward in favour of the need to defend the fatherland, the Left wingers in Zurich, led by Ernst Walter and Anderfuhren, took another step forward and energetically advocated the united front. But here the irresolute character of this Zurich Left wing made itself felt. It could not find the courage to do as the Left Paris district of the French Socialist Party had done, and bring about the united front over the heads of the central leadership of their party. And this led to a situation where the Left wingers, led by Ernst Walter, were removed, though by an insignificant majority, it is true, as a result of the pressure of the whole of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party apparatus and of that of the trade union and municipal apparatus which, in Zurich, are controlled by the Right wingers.

Meanwhile the session of the bureau of the Second International took place, at which the well-known decision was made to withdraw the decision prohibiting the socialist parties to form a united front with the Communists. In addition, Robert Grimm, the representative of Swiss Socialist-Democracy, signed the statement issued by the seven parties, in which the desire was expressed that negotiations be conducted with the Comintern with a view to the establishment of the united front on an international scale. In view of this statement and the decisions of the Paris Bureau, the Communist Party of Switzerland decided to make another approach to the Social-Democratic Party. Taking the statement signed by Grimm as its starting point, the Communist Party formulated a number of demands in defence of the democratic rights of the toilers of Switzerland and proposed that an agreement be made on this basis. For six weeks the social-democratic leaders, including Grimm, evaded a reply. But the double-dealing of Grimm, who had spoken in favour of the united front in Paris, while rejecting it or letting it pass by in silence in Switzerland, opened the eyes of many social-democratic workers and party officials who had still retained their faith in Grimm. The Zurich Left-wingers drew the first practical conclusions from this, and made a proposal to the Communist Party to conclude a pact on the united front. This was probably the only case when the opposition inside the Social-Democratic Party made an agreement with the Communist Party over the heads of their leaders. The platform is based on the promises made by Grimm in Paris, and shows what dangers threaten the Swiss working class from the government, the bourgeoisie and the fascists. The platform states the following:

"Such a situation and such a position makes it essential for all class-conscious workers to increase the struggle

against reformism, against the splitting policy, and for the establishment of unity of action, and to do everything possible to draw the broad masses of workers and other sections of the toiling population into a joint united struggle. The Communist Party and the socialist Left-wing conclude an agreement to undertake joint activity on the basis of a combined platform, so that they will help to bring about unity of action in spite of the sabotage of the reformist leaders."

The platform sets itself the task of bringing about the

"general mobilisation of all the forces of the factory workers, unemployed and tenants, in the struggle against fascism, militarism and the war danger."

Among the concrete measures proposed are "demonstrations, factory meetings, committees of struggle for the preparation of strikes, and the mobilisation of the unemployed and the tenants."

In addition, activity must be carried on jointly in the reformist unions against the reformist line. And in order to attract the masses of trade union members into the struggle against the attacks of the employers, it is proposed

"to promote to trade union posts those workers who stand for trade union unity, democracy in the unions and the class struggle."

This platform appeared in December, 1934, a month before the Lucerne Social-Democratic Congress. The Zurich Left-wingers and young socialists were compelled on this occasion to display their real face for a second time. At the elections to the municipal council in Zurich, a reactionary (an officer in close touch with the fascist circles) and the Communist worker, Otto Brunner, who is popular, were put forward as candidates. The social-democrats did not put forward their own candidate, so as to secure the support of the bourgeois parties in Zurich in getting the budget accepted. This was too much for the social-democratic workers. The Left social-democrats and young socialists issued a declaration calling on the workers of Zurich to vote for the Communist, Otto Brunner, under the slogan "class against class." For the first time a Communist candidate received 10,000 votes, whereas previously, the Communists had not received more than 4,000 votes.

IV. The Crisis in Swiss Social-Democracy is Becoming More Intense.

Each of these facts—the operation of unity of action, and the manifesto of the Left Social Democrats and the Young Socialists in favour of the Communist Brunner—caused the S.D. leaders to resort to the weapon of expulsion. Two days after this incident, the organisation of the Young Socialists was dissolved, and the same took place with the Zurich youth organisation. A number of prominent leaders of the Left wing of the S.D. party, including people of twenty years' Party standing, such as Ernst Walter, Anderführen and several other social-democrats were expelled.

In this way the social-democratic leaders tried to kill two birds with one stone: Firstly to destroy the united front with the Communists; and secondly, by expelling the prominent leaders of the Zurich Left wing and smashing up the opposition, to drag into the new programme the point about the need to "defend the fatherland" and to establish the united front with the bourgeoisie. But they did not succeed in carrying out this plan in full. The united front movement in Switzerland continues to develop. The Communists clearly realised this, and also clearly expressed the point in their agreement with the Lefts that this was only a "step towards co-operation" that this stage, namely, agreement with the Lefts, must be taken as the starting point for the establishment of the united front with the broad masses of social-democratic workers who have remained in the Party and who are organised in the trade unions. Together with the Lefts, a number of practical steps were taken to extend the united front movement beyond the confines of Zurich, and throughout the whole country. Meetings of Left social-democrats, together with the Communists were held in Basle, Geneva, Lausanne, and other smaller towns. A number of commissions were set up on a parity basis (for work in the reformist unions, among the tenants, etc.). Some practical successes were achieved in this sphere among the builders, metal workers and municipal workers in Zurich. The "unity of action" movement (Aktionsgemeinschaft) is now carrying on a struggle against the army bill.

The second task which the S.D. leaders set themselves when they expelled the Lefts was to break up the opposition at the congress. At the beginning of this article we pointed out how they were unsuccessful in achieving this. Almost 300 delegates voted against the resolution on the need to defend the fatherland, and the majority of the congress, in spite of the leaders, voted for the rejection of the army bill. There was even a purely proletarian group from French Switzerland at the congress, which, on behalf of six sections, took up a consistent Marxist position on all decisive questions dealt with.

The crisis in the Social-Democratic Party continued to deepen. The Left wing began to issue its own paper, the *Sozialistische Aktion*. It is interesting to examine the path of development of the Lefts. Half a year has passed between the first platform entitled "Hello, Hello, Left Wing Speaking!" the political mistakes and weaknesses of which we have described above, and the speakers' notes published by the Left wing on the eve of the congress. It is clear from the speakers' notes how far the process of alignment has gone in the Left Wing. As against Nicol, the Left wingers

now adopt a definite position on a series of questions. This was greatly assisted by the social-democratic workers' delegation that visited the Soviet Union on November 7, 1934. The delegation consisted entirely of officials of the Social-Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions, who travelled to the land of the proletarian dictatorship in spite of their doubts and hesitations, being really anxious to learn the truth about the Soviet Union and to give an honest report of what they saw there to the Swiss workers. We give here but a few quotations from these speakers' notes published by the Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, so as to show its path of development.

"The new (social-democratic, A.K.) programme is marked by all the features of a rotten compromise, and by confusion and ambiguity. The 1920 programme was a concession to the Left; the 1934 programme is a concession to the Right, to the middle classes; it is the SPIRITUAL RESURRECTION OF THE GRUTLI UNION;* its ideas are expressed with insufficient clearness; it has a rambling form of expression; and taken as a whole, is a very poor hash. The spirit and the language of the Marxian outlook, the Marxian theory, have been relegated to the archives from the very place where they are required, in the programme of the Party. The aim of the revision made is to keep the workers in the Party, and to win the middle classes. The most probable result is to lose these workers who are opening their eyes, and not to win the middle classes.

"Why do we completely reject this half-fledged programme? It estimates the course of development from the point of view of the PETTY BOURGEOISIE. IT SAYS NOTHING ABOUT IMPERIALISM, ABOUT OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS SOVIET RUSSIA. THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT DROPS OUT OF THE PROGRAMME, but it does not make up its mind to speak out for the domination of the toilers. It is enamoured of bourgeois democracy, without understanding the results of such a thoughtless love. It is a programme of social reform, and not a programme of socialist revolution. It is helpless where it ought to strike at fascism, and consequently cannot understand the necessity for overcoming it by a socialist revolution. There is therefore not a word about the illegal struggle, and not a word about socialist democracy."

In this document, despite certain weaknesses and unclarity ("The domination of the toilers," etc.), we clearly feel the influence of Communist ideology. The weakest side of the Left wingers is their organisational weakness, which showed itself clearly at the congress. If they had been more solidly organised, they could easily have secured the taking of a second vote in the lower organisations against the revision of the S.D. programme. Only twenty votes were wanting at the congress to carry through the proposal that a vote be taken in the lower organisations.

V. The Struggle for the United Front Continues.

The Communist Party will boldly and determinedly continue its united front policy in the coming battles, and as the starting point in the

* A bourgeois-patriotic organisation of workers and handicraftsmen in Switzerland.

struggle for the united front will put forward, in a differentiated form in each Canton, and in each locality, such questions as will render it possible to rally the broadest sections of workers and toilers for the struggle in the present situation. Thanks to the policy of the Communist Party, wide sections of social-democratic workers are beginning to understand that the Communist Party is honestly striving to bring about the united front, and that the accusation which the S.D. leaders usually hurl at the Communists of merely wanting to manoeuvre, is a piece of slander. Furthermore, it is becoming more and more clear to the masses that it is not the Communists who are manoeuvring, but Grimm and Reinhard, with a view to deceiving their own supporters and compelling them to submit to the policy of the united front with the bourgeoisie. In the process of the struggle, the S.D. workers will realise ever more clearly that it is perfectly illusory to hope to carry the whole S.D. party, with its present leaders, along the path of the class struggle, and that only a powerful mass Communist Party can carry on a victorious struggle against the bourgeoisie. But the Communist Party of Switzerland has never advanced the point that the S.D. workers must join the Communist Party as a condition for the united front. The C.C. of the Social-Democratic Party launched this reproach after leaving the proposal of the Communist Party without a reply for six weeks.

The C.C. of the Communist Party of Switzerland replied to this reproach by an open letter addressed to all social-democratic workers. Among other things, the letter states the following:

"Your Party leaders mention two questions which they addressed to our Party at the Binne Congress. Firstly, were we ready to conclude an armistice or a non-aggression pact in 'the form in which Communist Russia itself concluded one with the capitalist states,' and were we prepared to honestly observe such a pact?

"We do not think that the question of the pact for a joint struggle against capitalist reaction between two working class parties can or should be compared with treaties which the Socialist Soviet Union is compelled to sign with capitalist countries, because in the former case the question at issue is one of an alliance between class comrades, while in the latter case, it is one of a treaty between deadly enemies. But in respect to the essence of this question, we have repeatedly declared and again repeat the following:

"We are prepared to refrain from mutual attacks during the period of joint activity and will honestly and loyally carry out the obligations contained in the pact concluded between your party and ours. But are your leaders raising this question at the present moment really for the purpose of bringing about the conclusion of such a pact after receiving a favourable reply from us? Unfortunately, this is not so. In the reply given by your leaders it states that our party has twice proposed a pact to your party, but that at one and the same time it plays with the so-called Left wing and seeks to bring about a new split in the Party with the aid of a few irresponsible elements. They claim that our party denies its own pro-

posal, is guilty of treachery and proves that in general it does not understand the first condition of united front activity, namely, an honest desire to stop all conflict and intrigues in general."

And further:

"But your leaders remain silent about our proposals. Week after week passed, until a group of your comrades who have rallied into the socialist Left wing made a proposal to our Party that a start be made at any rate in carrying out unity of action, so as to set an example to the working class throughout Switzerland.

"Judge for yourselves, social-democratic workers, whether our Party could act otherwise, than it did, if it did not wish to betray the cause of the united front which it defended. Judge for yourselves whether our Party had to reject this proposal of the socialist Left wing, and whether such a rejection would not have been a just excuse for reproaching us with dishonesty, an accusation which your leaders now make against us without any foundation! From the very beginning the Communist Party has publicly declared to the organised workers in its press and at open meetings of the movement for unity of action, that it does not regard the pact with the socialist Left wing as the fulfilment of unity of action, but only as the first step towards it, as an example for the rest of the working class in Switzerland, and in particular for you, social-democratic workers."

The unity of action which the Communist Party of Switzerland has brought about with the Left wing, is the first considerable step towards bringing about unity of action by the Swiss working class as a whole. The C.P. of Switzerland will therefore carry out all the obligations arising from this agreement with the greatest consistency, as it has done hitherto. Having successfully made this first step, however, the Communist Party must now go further and exert every effort to extend the bounds of the operation of the united front. If the Zurich Left wing has already overcome many difficulties and objections which it previously raised against the Communists, this cannot as yet be said of the majority of the S.D. organisations in Switzerland. In its united front policy, therefore, the Communist Party will not always make the establishment of the united front dependent on all the points which are contained in the programme of collaboration. The Communist Party will make its starting point the degree to which the given S.D. organisations have moved to the Left, and the questions which are the most urgent in the given locality. These burning and urgent problems will also serve the Communist Party as the starting point for the further extension of the united front.

The double-dealing policy of Grimm, who was overflowing in Paris with promises regarding the united front, while in Switzerland rejecting it, meets with true support among some of the "Left" wingers. For example, Schneider, who prior to and at the congress, spoke against the need to defend the fatherland, is now, after the congress, trying to support the policy of the Right wing leaders. But it is not only important to expose

Schneider. The broad masses of the S.D. workers who follow him and who supported his position at the congress, are seriously striving to bring about a change in the social-democratic policy which has been carried out up to the present. This fact must be kept in the centre of our attention when operating our united front policy in Basle.

It is important in principle, that not only the social-patriots of the S.D. party should discredit themselves in the eyes of the masses during this stubborn struggle being waged by the Communist Party for the establishment of the united front, but that the same fate should overtake the Schaffhausen group of Brandlerites, led by Bringhof, and the handful of Trotskyites operating in Zurich. The Zurich Left wing social-democrats insisted on drawing these elements into the united front as well, harbouring the illusion with regard to these groups that they would not take the side of the social-patriots at the decisive moment. Very little time was required to disperse these illusions. The counter-revolutionary group of Trotskyites who had gone over to the side of social-democracy exposed themselves in the eyes of the social-democratic workers in the decisive December days when a fierce struggle was going on for the united front in Zurich. The Trotskyites acted as open agents of the social-patriotic C.C., and by their three votes rendered it impossible at the next meeting of the young socialists for a decision to be adopted regarding the operation of the united front.

Bringhof's supporters in Schaffhausen, whom even Brandler criticised for their open anti-working class policy, hesitated for several months in an effort to avoid displaying their attitude towards unity of action, so as not to lose the last vestiges of their influence in Schaffhausen. At the end of April, at the first unity of action conference in Switzerland, they had to throw off their mask. They tried to eliminate from the platform the most important condition for unity of action, namely, the necessity for the struggle outside parliament. Instead of this, they agitated for the inclusion in the S.D. programme of the Swiss variety of the de Man plan, and advocated reformist trade union legalism. As was the case with the Trotskyites, not only the Communists, but also the Left social-democrats gave a trouncing in this connection to Bringhof's supporters.

Following the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the Communist Party of Switzerland has proceeded to carry out a serious mass policy. It has drawn tens of thousands of workers into the orbit of its influence, and has rallied them for the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism and the war danger. Its authority among the social-democratic workers has grown apace. But so far it has not succeeded in transforming itself

into a mass party. Further, a particular weakness in the work of the Party is to be found in its weak positions in the factories, and the very insufficient work carried on inside the reformist trade unions. And although the Party has succeeded in maintaining its positions in the Lausanne Trades Council for a whole year, it has so far not succeeded in utilising them as a starting point for movement throughout Switzerland against the reformist line of the Trade Union Congress. The Party did not maintain its posi-

tions at the elections. The Communist Party must still do a great deal of work in this direction and act more boldly in operating the united front tactics, in carrying on mass work, and must bring in fresh and new cadres to the leading Party bodies with much greater energy. Everything goes to show that the Party, which has a consolidated leadership, steeled in mighty battles, will solve this important task and create the prerequisites for building a Bolshevik mass Party of the Swiss proletariat.

BOOK REVIEW

“COMMUNIST” — THE MONTHLY THEORETICAL-POLITICAL ORGAN OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P.U.S.A.

THE January (1935) number of the *Communist* opens the discussion on the coming Seventh Congress of the Comintern. The magazine introduced a special section on “The Discussion of the Seventh C.I. Congress.” There are two articles in this section: one by Max Young entitled “Sharpen the Fight for the Central Slogan of the World Communist Party—Soviet Power,” and another by Nat Ross on “Some Problems of the Class Struggle in the South.” The rest of the material in this number also very closely concerns most important questions of the Seventh Comintern Congress, for example, Comrade Bittelman’s article, “For Leninism — for a Soviet America,” Comrade Amter’s article, “The National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance—and After.” Besides this, there is also a reprint of Lenin’s article, “The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution,” one of the most important programmatic works of Lenin, and a reprint of an article of Comrade Stalin, “Three Fundamental Slogans of the Party on the Peasant Question.” The latter part of the number is devoted to the regular monthly review of the development of the economic crisis, prepared by the Labour Research Association, and to a brief review of the eight volumes of the Collected Works of Lenin published in English. The first few pages of the magazine are devoted to Comrade Kirov, and give his picture, the statement of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A., the memorial statement signed by Comrades Stalin, Ordjonikidze, Molotov and others, and the statement of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

This number of the *Communist* can be regarded as an achievement of the editorial board and of the Party.

The first article—that of Comrade Bittelman—is devoted to the eleventh anniversary of the death of the mighty genius Lenin—the immortal leader and teacher of the working class. Comrade Bittelman’s article occupies a central position among the original material included in the number. It is written on a high theoretical level, and endeavours, on the basis of Lenin’s doctrine, to throw light upon contemporary problems of the labour movement in the U.S.A. and the position of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. In the first section of the article called “The International Significance of Bolshevism,” Comrade Bittelman shows on the basis of concrete material concerning the growth of class contradictions, the sharpening of the class struggle in the U.S.A., the ripening of the revolutionary upsurge in the U.S.A. And here the author approaches the question of the international significance of Bolshevism, its methods, its programme, the programme of Soviet Power. The world-wide historic victories of Soviet Power in the U.S.S.R., side by side with the downfall of the policy of social-democracy in Germany and Austria, the fascisation of bourgeois democracy, etc., are more and more convincing the masses that the way of the Soviets is the only correct one for them.

However, it is just by force of this that the currents in the labour movement which are hostile to Communism are now increasing their fight and making more manoeuvres in order to save their weakening position. Comrade Bittelman briefly analyses the position of the A.F. of L. leaders, who advise the masses to take the N.R.A. road, and also the position of the Right wing of the Socialist Party. The position of the latter differs from the

position of the A.F. of L. leaders in so far as reformism, which is veiled behind socialist phrases, differs from the same reformism, which reveals itself in a more open, "pure" trade-unionist, bourgeois form. However, Comrade Bittelman is correct in not reducing the question merely to this difference and in polemising in more detail with Right social reformism and unmasking it. Further, Comrade Bittelman quite correctly approaches the problem of social reformism when he raises the question before both the supporters of the Detroit declaration,* before the "militants," and before the supporters of the "Revolutionary Policy Committee," in order to see to what extent and in what way they have really begun to free themselves of the deadening reformist ideology of O'Neil. And step by step Comrade Bittelman convincingly shows that there is a difference between the Detroit declaration of the Socialist Party and the position of the Rights, especially if we bear in mind those elements in the Socialist Party which, while voting for the declaration, honestly go to the Left. But the basis of the position of the declaration and of the Right wing of the Socialist Party, remains reformism, the denial of the international significance of Leninism, the denial of the Soviet way out of the crisis of capitalism.

Further, Comrade Bittelman examines the position of the Minnesota Farmer Labour Party which is in power there. What unites this party with the Socialist Party in a common bond is that they both strive to reform capitalism.

The Farmer Labour Party actually uses its parliamentary positions in order to save capitalism at the expense of the masses. This same policy of reforming capitalism arises out of the theoretical position of the Detroit declaration. From this, Comrade Bittelman draws the conclusion, well founded, that there does not exist any reformist, democratic way to power for the working class and that there remains only one way, that of the revolutionary overthrow of the power of the bourgeois and setting up of Soviet Power—the Bolshevik way.

Thus Comrade Bittelman arrives at the second section of his article, entitled "Our Chief Slogan—Soviet Power." Here he makes an analysis of the position of the supporters of the "Revolutionary Policy Committee," who were not satisfied with the Detroit declaration. Their position was described in the "Appeal to the Membership of the Socialist Party" (*The Revolutionary Socialist Review*, Vol. 1., No. 1). Carefully analysing the position taken up in this appeal, Comrade Bittelman

* Declaration issued by the "militants" (centrists) and "Revolutionary Policy Committee" (lefts) at the Socialist Party Convention which thus became the majority by joining forces.—Ed.

establishes how much of it is taken from the programme of the Communists, or rather which formulations, although with some modifications, are taken from the Communists (proletarian dictatorship as the State form of the transition from the capitalist to socialist society, soviets as organs of the armed uprising). After this, Comrade Bittelman analyses the shortcomings of this appeal, its inconsistency, its inability fully and basically to break with reformism. This is expressed first and foremost in the fact that the appeal makes the Soviets, the Soviet form of power, only a POSSIBLE form of power for the working class. On the basis of all the post-war examples of the working class struggle for power, and in particular the struggle of the Spanish workers, Comrade Bittelman points out that the proletarian revolution, to be victorious, in whatever form it takes place in the beginning, should take the Soviet road when it comes to the highest stage of the struggle for power.

The last section of Comrade Bittelman's article is called "The United Front and the Struggle for Power." In this section the author points out that the struggle for the united front does not contradict the struggle for the slogan of Soviet Power, but, on the contrary, widens the possibility of mobilising the masses around our main slogan.

We have dwelt in detail on Comrade Bittelman's article because it gives a very valuable criticism for workers and members of the C.P.U.S.A., of the positions of different shades of social-reformism, from the viewpoint of our main slogan of Soviet Power. At the same time it is necessary to dwell upon some shortcomings in this article. Comrade Bittelman very successfully showed that all currents in the labour movement which, in one form or another, to some extent or another, do not recognise fully the international significance of Leninism, Bolshevism, inevitably continue to remain basically reformist. This is perfectly correct and this must be constantly shown and proven. But the matter does not end with this, especially in the present period, the period of closely approaching the second round of revolutions and wars, of the strong leftward movement of the masses, of the crisis of social-democracy, its disintegration, and of inevitable mass splits and breaking away from social democracy. An important task is to follow up the ideological political and organisational forms in which the transition of the masses previously social-reformist, bourgeois-reformist, or even fascist, or simply non-party, to the position of the revolutionary class struggle, to the position of Communism, takes place. If the Communists to-day fail to make the most attentive and careful study of this process,

they will be unable to establish the correct tactics, for it is just this process that forms the necessary factor for the united front as the way of realising our important strategic task, of winning the majority of the working class. Therefore, having seen clearly that without the unconditional acceptance of the international significance of Leninism, there can be no consistent revolutionary policy, one must at the same time help different non-Communist strata of the workers and toilers to leave their own bourgeois or inconsistent revolutionary positions and come over to our Communist position. Comrade Bittelman did not devote sufficient attention in his article to this most important task—and we stress this—although the line of his criticism of various currents of social reformism gives a fairly good basis for doing so.

This shortcoming is particularly felt in the last section of the article. Here, what influence the changes in the Socialist Party have on the question of the united front should have been shown. We assume that both the magazine and Comrade Bittelman on future occasions will return to a careful analysis of all the changes going on among the masses, including the masses of the Socialist Party, which find their expression also in different currents of the Socialist Party and the theoretical positions taken up by these various currents, and show on this basis how the broad fighting united front can be developed. This will help those elements who have made one step away from open reformism to move forward in this direction.

In revealing the likeness which exists between the Detroit declaration and the position of the Right wing of the Socialist Party, Comrade Bittelman cites one place in the declaration according to which, in the words of Comrade Bittelman, the revolutionary class struggle "is permissible ONLY for the purpose of overthrowing fascism (or to prevent its coming to power)." The part which is given in brackets, "or to prevent its (fascism—I.M.) coming to power," is most significant from the viewpoint of practical struggle in the U.S.A. to-day. If there are elements and tendencies in the Socialist Party which agree upon revolutionary class struggles against fascism right now, to-day, without "waiting" until fascism comes to power, then this is undoubtedly a sufficiently serious factor for establishing a broad united front with them for struggle against fascism, against the capitalist offensive.

It is not enough to limit oneself to recognition of the differences in the positions of different non-Communist currents; one must also seek for the possibilities which differences, often not very significant, give us of increasing the struggle for bringing the masses over to more revolutionary

positions, and for increasing the struggle for the united front.

Let us mention, further, a few theoretical shortcomings in the article of Comrade Bittelman which can be very easily rectified. Criticising correctly the obscure conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat of the followers of the R.P.C., the author writes that it is wrong to talk about the transformation of the capitalist society into socialist, that one must speak of the abolition of capitalist society (he identifies capitalist society with capitalism, which, especially in the given case, is wrong). It is worth while to refer to the fundamental works* in order to understand that this transformation (of capitalist into communist society) is not just this abolition of capitalism, and it is wrong to place one against the other, and can lead only to confusion. The transition to socialism is not the act of destroying capitalism all at once, but is a more or less prolonged transitional period of the revolutionary transformation of one society into the other AFTER the overthrow, the abolition of the power of the bourgeoisie, the power of monopolist capital, and the establishment of the power of the working class, the Soviet Power.

Comrade Bittelman mentions, by the way, that the English word "council" is equivalent to the word "Soviet." This can hardly be considered correct, when used in the slogan of soviets for the workers, saying, in English, "Councils" for the workers. The word Soviet has become an international one, and all the workers the world over who are fighting for Soviet Power, are fighting, in all languages under the slogan of Soviets, in order to emphasise the fact that it is a question of the struggle along the lines of that of the Bolshevik Soviets in Russia.

These are some of the shortcomings in the generally excellent article of Comrade Bittelman and can easily be rectified.

The editorial board did well to print in this number, which was also the Lenin number, the article by Lenin entitled "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution." This article is of exclusive importance for the understanding of the tactics of the proletariat. Lenin's remarks about our attitude to the struggle for reforms is of most practical importance for every Communist Party to-day. "We are by no means opposed to fighting for reforms . . . We are in favour of a programme of reforms which is directed ALSO against the opportunists. The opportunists would be only too glad

* "Between the capitalist and Communist society there lies a period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other." (C.I. Programme.) "Between the capitalist and Communist Society there lies a period of REVOLUTIONARY RECONSTRUCTION OF ONE INTO THE OTHER." (Marx: "Criticism of the Gotha Programme.")

if we left the struggle for reforms to them . . ." etc.

Comrade Amter's article gives the members of the Party very extensive and convincing material for unmasking all kinds of plans for unemployment insurance put forward by the bourgeoisie and social-reformists as against the workers' bill for unemployment insurance put forward by the Communist Party. It is only a pity that Comrade Amter, as the leader of the Unemployed Councils, did not dwell in sufficient detail on the experiences of their struggle and the future tasks of this struggle.

Comrade Max Young's article raises the most important question of the struggle on behalf of our central slogan of Soviet Power in the U.S.A. The article is written on the basis of considerable material, and tries to reveal the weaknesses of the Party. We think, however, that Comrade Max Young was not able sufficiently to develop the question raised satisfactorily. This can be seen from the large number of inexact formulations both theoretically and in fact, as well as by a certain slovenliness to be found therein. For example, the author begins his article with the following:

"The struggles of the American working class during the past one-and-a-half years of the Roosevelt administration have attained a higher level than ever before. This is obvious both with regard to the character of the struggles and the vast numbers of workers involved."

We think that the last eighteen months or two years are distinguishable in the U.S.A. for such a widespread struggle on the part of the working class, that it is a mistake to underestimate this struggle; but there is not the slightest need to exaggerate the extent of the struggle. The level and extent of this struggle has not yet reached that of the first few years that followed the war (it would have been worth while for Comrade Young to take the strike statistics, and it would have become "obvious" to him that in 1919 the number of workers who went on strike was approximately twice as many as in 1934), although as regards certain points, the struggle reached a higher level. For example, this is to be seen in the fact that the Communist Party has grown up and is playing an incomparably bigger rôle in the struggles of the proletariat and as a result broader masses have risen to the understanding of their own revolutionary tasks, and also in the fact that the slogan of soviets is more popular, etc. In a word, there are several factors of decisive importance. These with a revolutionary movement as big as that which was apparent immediately after the war, will lead to class battles of incomparably greater importance, will raise the question of power more keenly, and will become the beginning of decisive battles for power. Therefore the Communists should not overestimate the extent of the

class conflicts achieved, but should at the same time see the prospects before them clearly, as the development of class battles on the eve of the second round of revolutions and wars, the round in which the Communist Parties have to play an incomparably more important and decisive part than in the first round.

By making those remarks we in no way wish to belittle the importance of Comrade Max Young's article. The article raises several practical questions like the ways of popularising the slogan of Soviet power, and requires careful study. It raises the important question of how the party to-day is putting forward the slogan of Soviet Power, wherein lie the shortcomings in the party's agitation, and what tasks face us. We hope that the magazine will continue the discussion of the question raised in this article and we hope to return to it on another occasion.

Comrade Nat Ross's article on some problems of the class struggle in the south is of extremely great importance. It analyses the economic position in the south, the development of the class struggle there, the importance of the campaign on behalf of the Scottsboro' prisoners, the work of the Communist Party in the south, the growth there of fascism and the reformism, the problem of the united front in the south and the immediate tasks of the Party. The reader will see that the circle of questions raised is very wide. Without going into an analysis of these questions, we would just like to express the warmest desire that the magazine will develop as broad a discussion as possible around the problems of the work of the Party in the south and among the Negro masses in general. The Negro south, the many millions of Negro proletarians, constitute a nationally compact and proletarian mass that is called upon to play an enormous rôle in the development of the emancipation struggle of the working class and the toilers of the U.S.A.

The magazine did well to print Comrade Stalin's work on the three fundamental slogans of the Party on the peasant question. This work is the most complete, systematic exposition of the programmatic position of our Party and of the Communist International on this question. Consequently, for the C.P.U.S.A., in the struggle for a mass Communist Party, in the struggle for Soviet Power, it is extremely important to study this programmatic document for the struggle and the winning over of the masses of the farmers as allies of the proletariat.

We must welcome the fact that the Party has seriously taken up the work of improving its theoretical organ. What more is required now to further improve the magazine?

First, that a most serious discussion be launched

on the problems facing the forthcoming Seventh Comintern Congress. Despite the shortcomings noted in Comrade Max Young's article, we welcome the appearance of such a detailed article on a question which is a central one for the Party. And the comrades must not be embarrassed by the fact that, in their articles, separate, even if serious, shortcomings may be found, but should take the most active part in discussing the problems of the Seventh Comintern Congress. The wider, the more serious, the bolder our discussion, the better we prepare for our world congress, the higher will be its rôle in our struggle for world Communism. And the rôle of the central theoretical organ of the Party in this work is extremely important, and the rôle of the American Communist Party in particular. It is known that in 1929, Comrade Stalin stated that

"the American Communist Party is one of those few parties, on which history placed tasks of a decisive character from the viewpoint of the development of the world revolutionary movement."

This means that discussions of this kind in the *Communist* should not be limited to problems which only concern in a narrow sense the American Communist Party, but should try also from the viewpoint of its own experiences to bring a contribution to the store for the enlightenment of problems which concern the whole Communist International.

Secondly, it is essential that each successive number of the magazine should unceasingly study

and sum up theoretically the experiences and tasks of the Party on three or four important lines of its work, such as trade union work, strike struggles, the development of the united front, questions of political changes in the country, in particular the question of the movement on behalf of an independent policy for the masses of the working class, the question of agitation and the Party slogans, training cadres, improving methods of organisational work of the party, in order to overcome the unstable membership and to adapt these methods to the requirements of the mass Party which the C.P.U.S.A. is already becoming. Besides this, we consider that it would be useful for the magazine to try to give leading articles devoted to the more important, individual, current, tasks of the Party, as well as an analysis of current events in the development of the political life of the country, the class struggle in the country, and the prospects of its development. We think that this would help to raise the political level of the Party members, make them better able to orientate in the present political situation and thus improve the whole political work and agitation of the Party which is so necessary to-day.

The American Communist Party is stepping out on to the broad road of a mass Communist Party. Such a Party should have a theoretical organ worthy of its world historic tasks. The number under review shows that the Party is making serious achievements in this direction.

THE BOOK OF THE YEAR!

ORDER NOW

THE GREAT CRISIS

and its Political Consequences

By PROFESSOR E. VARGA

Sometime Professor of Political Economy at University of Budapest; Director of Institute of World Economy and World Politics, Moscow.

A penetrating, exhaustive and comprehensive analysis of the entire present World Economic and Political Situation.

"Not a history—but an analysis looking towards the future."—*The Author.*

Prepared for the 7th Congress, Communist International.

CLOTH 5s.

PAPER 2s. 6d.

MODERN BOOKS LIMITED, 4a PARTON STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

PUBLISHED BY MODERN BOOKS, LTD., 4A PARTON STREET, LONDON, W.C.1, AND
PRINTED BY BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., SMITH-DORRIEN ROAD, LEICESTER, ENGLAND.