

ANTI-WAR NUMBER

Special Articles on:—WAR, AUSTRIA, GERMANY

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



August 15th, 1934

VOLUME XI

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No 15

THREEPENCE
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 15

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

1. BRITISH IMPERIALISM—ORGANISER OF WORLD WAR.
By R. Palme Dutt.
 2. THE BRITISH REFORMISTS PREPARE FOR WAR. By J. R.
Campbell.
 3. BRITISH IMPERIALISM PREPARING FOR WAR AND ITS
COLONIAL CONTRADICTIONS. By R. Page Arnot.
 4. THE I.L.P. AND THE WAR DANGER. By D.
 5. THE FOREIGN POLICY OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM. By
D. Gard.
 6. ON THE ROAD TO A MASS COMMUNIST PARTY IN
AUSTRIA.
 7. THE WORK OF THE C.P. OF JAPAN IN THE JAPANESE
ARMY. (Conclusion.)
-
-

BRITISH IMPERIALISM—ORGANISER OF WORLD WAR

By R. PALME DUTT.

TWENTY years ago England plunged into the world war which its diplomacy had for a decade assiduously prepared in order to crush its principal rival for world supremacy, Germany.

To-day British diplomacy is no less actively preparing the second world war. Only the enemies are changed. The principal enemy now is the Soviet Union, the fortress of the world revolution and of socialism, whose existence is regarded as a menace to the crumbling colonial empire of Britain. Germany is cast for the part of the armed ally of British war aims. In the further ground is the new imperialist rival of Britain for world supremacy, the United States.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM STANDS TO-DAY AT THE CENTRE OF ALL THE THREADS LEADING TO WAR THROUGHOUT THE WORLD. This fact is very important for the understanding of the world situation to-day. To expose the rôle of British Imperialism as one of the main inciters to war is the first urgent task in order to awaken the British working class to the real character of the struggle against war.

THE PACIFIST PRETENCES OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM.

As before 1914, British Imperialism covers its work of war-preparations with a camouflage of pacifist pretences. In contrast to the period before 1914, British Imperialism is directly supported and assisted in this task by the leaders of the Labour Party already before the outbreak of war.

In May, 1934, the leaders of the National Joint Council of the Labour Party and of the Trade Union Congress met the leaders of the National Government, MacDonald and Simon, in a friendly talk on the advance to war. An official report of this conversation was issued by the Foreign Office. This official report reveals the complete united front of the National Government and the Labour Party and trade union leaders on the question of war.

The Prime Minister, MacDonald, according to the report,

“expressed his pleasure at receiving the deputation and wished that such contacts could be more frequent.

“He could assure them that he shared their anxieties. Like them, as they knew, his one consistent aim was peace.

“As regards disarmament, the British Government had in the past two years used all their influence. They alone had put forward a practical plan for general disarmament.

“The British Government had taken the risk of setting an example in disarmament which had unhappily not been followed . . .

“Meanwhile they would continue to use every effort in the cause of international peace.”

The Foreign Secretary, Simon, “welcomed” the suggestions of the Labour deputation, and declared how “glad” he was to hear them.

How did the Labour deputation meet these protestations of complete unity of purpose of the National Government with themselves in the cause of peace? Did they for a moment expose, or even mildly criticise, the real rôle of the National Government, contrasting their deeds with their words, exposing their rôle of smashing and defeating every proposal of serious disarmament from the Soviet Union, exposing the rôle of their warships and punitive expeditions in every quarter of the globe, exposing their backing of Japanese aggression in Manchuria and of German re-armament? On the contrary. They fully accepted the pacific intentions of the National Government, and thereby proclaimed their unity with it. The only difficulty in their opinion was the warlike intentions of foreign Governments. Citrine, Secretary of the Trade Union Congress, declared:

“The question arose, what were the remaining forces in the world beside the British Government which could be counted on to maintain peace and stability?”

Thus only the British National Government—in the opinion of these faithful Labour servants of “their own” imperialism — “**COULD BE COUNTED ON TO MAINTAIN PEACE AND STABILITY.**” No imperialist Government could desire a more perfect blank cheque to cover its war-preparations.

This myth of the profoundly “peaceful” intentions of British Imperialism is spread on all sides by British Labourism. Thus the “left” Labour theorist, Cole, writes in his latest book entitled *What Marx Really Meant* (i.e., What Cole Proposes to Substitute for Marx):

“Nor are Great Britain and France, the two leading parliamentary countries, in any danger of military defeat in the near future, provided that they stand together. If another war came soon, they would win it, as they won the last . . . These countries do not want war, though it may be forced upon them, and though they could rely on winning it in a military sense. Their Governments want peace.”

“Their Governments want peace.” British Imperialism “can be counted on to maintain peace and stability.” This is the basic lie which is used to lull the masses and hide the realities of war-preparations. **THIS IS THE LIE WHICH REQUIRES TO BE SMASHED AND DESTROYED IN THE LIGHT OF THE REALITIES OF BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY, IF THE WORKERS ARE NOT TO BE ONCE AGAIN CAUGHT UNAWARES AS IN 1914.**

HOW BRITISH IMPERIALISM PREPARED THE WORLD
WAR OF 1914.

In these circumstances it is more than ever opportune to recall how British Imperialism prepared and organised the first world war. For the active preparation of this war directly took place under a Liberal-Radical "pacifist" Cabinet, supported by the votes of the Labour Party.

Up to the very last moment of entry into the war British diplomacy concealed its extremely active war-preparations under a veil of liberal-pacifism, declared total abstention from European commitments, and show of anxiety at all costs to maintain peace, with a success which succeeded in deceiving, not only the masses at home, but even the destined enemy whose destruction was being prepared. Only the subsequent publication of a portion of the secret documents, and the abundant memoirs of the statesmen and generals concerned, have finally revealed the completeness and thoroughness with which the world war was calculated, prepared and pressed forward by Britain, both diplomatically and strategically.

The Manifesto of the First Congress of the Communist International in 1919, proclaimed:

"Up to the very outbreak of war British diplomacy stood by with vizzor down in mysterious secrecy. The Government of the City was careful not to have it known that it intended to take part in the war on the side of the Entente, so as not to alarm the Berlin Government and put off the war. London wanted war; hence their action to make Berlin and Vienna build their hopes on English neutrality, while Paris and Petrograd were sure of England's intervention.

"The war, which had been prepared for decades, broke out through direct and conscious provocation by Great Britain."

This analysis is undoubtedly correct. In the critical years 1905-1914 the British hand lay behind the steadily closing encirclement of German Imperialism, patiently and laboriously preparing a superior concentration of forces against the enemy, but concealing all intentions until the favourable hour had come to strike. Britain endeavoured to pose as the moderating and conciliating force between the Franco-Russian Alliance and the Triple Alliance, at the same time as it was in fact exacerbating the antagonisms and preparing the war for its own gain at the expense of both sides. Only once before the war was the mask dropped for a moment in 1911, when there was a danger of a Franco-German understanding, and Britain hastily intervened with the bellicose Mansion House speech of the then supposedly "ultra-pacifist" Lloyd George in order to prevent it. The Liberal Government of Asquith, Lloyd George, Haldane, Grey and Churchill, which ceaselessly prepared the war throughout 1906-14, evolved the most elaborate and subtle technique to cover these preparations, a technique of alliances which were

no alliances in form and were alliances in fact, of commitments which could be solemnly denied in parliament at the very same time as the general staffs were drawing up their detailed plans for joint action, of Peace Missions and Armament Holiday offers at the same time as armaments were being gigantically increased. This technique served, not only to deceive petit-bourgeois pacifism and the mass of the workers, but also to draw Germany into the trap of a heavily unequal war, by encouraging to the very last day the hope and expectation of British neutrality.

The whole of this technique has since become a standard model for all the imperialist Powers in the preparation of the second world war.

HOW BRITISH IMPERIALISM IS PREPARING THE SECOND
WORLD WAR.

This process of the preparation of the first world war is more than ever important to recall to-day, twenty years later, when we are forced with the ever-closer menace of the second world war.

The foreign policy of the National Government is widely attacked by its critics for weakness, uncertainty and vacillation. At one moment it is accused of too great conciliation to Germany, at another of too great subservience to France. At one moment the National Government courts Germany and offends France. At another moment the National Government courts France and offends Germany. Divisions of opinion are widely expressed in bourgeois quarters as to the policy to be followed. These divisions are reflected in parliament, and are even reported as reflected in the Cabinet. In extreme forms, press-campaigns are conducted, on the one side for a complete British-French military alliance, on the other side for the repudiation of Locarno and a policy of isolation from European questions. Wooing of America and affirmation of Anglo-American unity as the pillar of world stability is combined with ill-concealed hostility to America and constant friction. Frequent reaffirmation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance as continuing in spirit, even if not in the latter, is combined with sharp antagonism to Japan in a whole series of economic and other questions. Thus the picture appears a picture of considerable uncertainty and confusion.

YET A CLOSER EXAMINATION WILL SHOW THAT THESE VARYING STRANDS REPRESENT IN REALITY VARYING ASPECTS OF A BASIC IDENTITY OF POLICY.

Ever since Versailles, British policy has in fact pursued very clearly marked and consistent aims, despite the fluctuations necessitated by changing circumstances:—

First, while maintaining the essential basis of

Versailles, the alliance with France and the League of Nations, to weaken French predominance by assisting German restoration to power and by close relations with Italy;

Second, to draw Germany from the Eastern to the Western orientation;

Third, on this basis to build the bloc of Western Imperialism under British hegemony;

Fourth, to co-operate with Japan outside Europe;

Fifth, on this basis to build the bloc against the Soviet Union and against the United States;

Sixth, to direct the main aim against the Soviet Union as the immediate principal enemy, and to delay so far as possible the inevitable conflict with the United States.

Through all the vicissitudes of post-war diplomacy the continuous development of this policy may be traced; and IT HAS AT THE PRESENT MOMENT REACHED A HIGH DEGREE OF FRUITION FOR THE BUILDING OF THE ULTIMATE WAR-BLOC. THE MOMENT IS AGAIN APPROACHING WHEN BRITAIN MAY THROW DOWN THE VIZOR AND REVEAL ITS OPEN WAR-AIMS.

In the period up to the world crisis of 1931, the outstanding landmarks of this policy were Locarno on the European side, and the Naval Limitation Agreement with the United States (Washington, 1922, and London, 1930), on the extra-European side. It was manifest that the signing of the Locarno Treaties in 1925 marked at the time a big stage of advance in this policy, towards the restoration of Germany in principle as an equal Power, the drawing of Germany under Stresemann from an Eastern to a Western orientation, the guaranteeing of peace on the Western frontiers, and thus the building of the bloc of Western Imperialism against Communism. This objective was clearly stated at the time.

But Locarno failed in the full realisation of its object, although marking an important stage forward. For Germany still followed the two-sided or "re-insurance" policy, and followed up Locarno with the Berlin Soviet-German Treaty, renewing Rapallo, in 1926. Britain at the time was tied up with the General Strike. When the General Strike had been successfully settled, and Britain struck its blow against the Soviet Union in 1927, it found itself isolated. Birkenhead's journey to Berlin for support met with no response. The Chinese Revolution concentrated British attention. At the same time, from 1927 onwards (Geneva Naval Conference breakdown) Anglo-American antagonism came sharply to the front. And in 1929 came the world economic crisis. The whole policy was delayed. Japanese aggression in the Far East brought again strong preparations for attack in the

spring of 1932. But the opposition of the United States, the internal economic difficulties of Britain, the Empire difficulties and Ottawa, and the Lausanne and debts complications, the persistently active peace policy of the Soviet Union, as well as the uncertain inner situation and rapid growth of the forces of the proletarian revolution in Germany, hindered the advance and held over the issue.

IT WAS THE VICTORY OF FASCISM IN GERMANY IN 1933 THAT HAS BROUGHT TO THE FRONT AGAIN, COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY ANTI-SOVIET WAR UNDER BRITISH LEADERSHIP. Here at last was seen the means of smashing one of the principal obstacles in the path, the German revolutionary working class movement, and securing in German Fascism an obedient tool, provided it could be turned from its anti-Western threats and concentrated on the line of aggression in the East.

FROM THIS POINT BRITISH POLICY HAS GONE ACTIVELY FORWARD, TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THE UNIVERSALLY DEVELOPING WAR-TENDENCIES ARISING FROM THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS AND SHARPENING ANTAGONISMS, ON THE PATH TO WAR.

THE RE-ARMING OF GERMANY.

In the existing world situation the two most vitally aggressive Powers which are openly driving to war are German Imperialism and Japanese Imperialism.

If, however, the situation is examined more closely, behind both will be found the British hand. WITHOUT BRITISH SUPPORT NEITHER GERMANY NOR JAPAN COULD FOR A MOMENT MAINTAIN THEIR PRESENT AGGRESSIVE ROLE. Here lies the real crux of the present world situation.

In relation to Germany, this process has been brought glaringly to the front over the question of German re-armament.

THE BRITISH NATIONAL GOVERNMENT HAS SUPPORTED AND MADE POSSIBLE, BOTH DIPLOMATICALLY, AND ALSO TECHNICALLY, GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT.

The technical side is worth noting. At the annual meeting of Vickers, Ltd., the giant semi-official armaments trust of British imperialism, in March, 1934, the question was raised with regard to certain advertisements inserted in the German press by Vickers of tanks and other weapons forbidden by Versailles. The answer was given that these advertisements had been inserted in the German press in order to reach the South American public (subsequent enquiry elicited that the proportion of circulation of the journals in question

in South America was minute). The question was then directly asked by a shareholder who was a Member of Parliament, whether Vickers had not been in fact assisting in re-arming Germany, even in contravention of Versailles. The answer of the Chairman, Sir Herbert Lawrence, was sufficiently revealing:

"I cannot give you an assurance in definite terms, but I can tell you that nothing is done without the complete sanction and approval of our own Government."

The diplomatic side is even more important.

From the moment of the victory of German Fascism (which was already closely related with British Conservative circles), the British National Government has constituted itself the patron-protector of German Fascism and of its armament. Already in March, 1933, MacDonald proceeded immediately to Geneva to proclaim to the world that "Either Germany is given justice and freedom, or Europe will risk destruction," and to put forward the British plan for doubling the German army. Thence he passed on to Rome and evolved with Mussolini the Four Power Pact, or most direct expression of the aim of the bloc of Western imperialism for a single policy "in all questions, political and non-political, European and extra-European." "These were the four Powers," explained MacDonald in a press interview at the time, "which, if the worst were to come, would have to bear the brunt of the work." Since "the worst" evidently meant war, the question might be asked against whom Britain intended that the bloc of Britain, Germany, Italy and France should conduct war? The answer was sufficiently obvious. In April, followed the British rupture of trade relations with the Soviet Union. Within twenty-four hours of the British rupture followed the Japanese ultimatum to the Soviet Union over the Chinese-Eastern railway.

But this first stage of the offensive in 1933 broke down over a series of complications. French hostility to the military concessions to Germany was strongly aroused, and France drew to closer relations with the Soviet Union (Herriot and Cot Missions). Germany signed the renewal of the German-Soviet Treaty. Thus the Four Power Pact was for the moment successfully broken by Soviet diplomacy, which proceeded to add the ring of Non-Aggression Pacts with the Border States. At the same time Anglo-American antagonisms grew acute with the failure of the MacDonald-Roosevelt meeting in the spring, the open currency war of the dollar and the pound, and the resounding fiasco of the World Economic Conference; the United States in the autumn resumed relations with the Soviet Union. The British attack was again isolated, and it was demonstrated that the whole aim of its strategy, which was to build up

a simultaneous Western and Eastern combination, had failed on this occasion.

British policy was accordingly compelled to manoeuvre. Modifications were made in the British "Disarmament" (i.e., Re-armament) Plan to allow concessions to French views at the expense of Germany. This led to strong German resentment at British "desertion" and Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations in the autumn of 1933. Such an outcome was not at all in accordance with British calculations, and it looked as if the carefully prepared British plans were in danger of breakdown.

There followed the long process of separate and secret negotiations through the winter and spring. Britain urged a French-German understanding on the basis of German re-armament. The National Government Minister, Eden, saw Hitler in Berlin in February; "the discussions were conducted in a very friendly spirit . . . he and Hitler appear to have got on very well together" (*Times*, 21/2/34). The protracted British-French exchange of Notes revealed sharp divergence, culminating in the deadlock following the French Note of April 17th and the open Barthou-Simon duel at Geneva in May. French pleas of the glaring breach of Versailles were dismissed by Britain with indifference. The French charges of the breach of Versailles, declared the *Times* (24/3/34), no doubt have "flawless logic" on their side, "but logic seldom has the last word in international affairs." Between the British and the French, explained the *Observer* (22/4/34), there is—

"one deep difference. They are logical. We are realists. They say that German re-armament ought not to be allowed. We say that nothing on earth can now prevent it."

The necessity of German re-armament remains the one fixed point all through.

"No convention could be conceivably accepted by Germany which did not allow her a certain measure of re-armament. That point has been explicitly conceded in principle by both the British and Italian Governments." (*Times*, 19.4.34.)

Meanwhile behind all these diplomatic negotiations German re-armament went forward at headlong speed, with the assistance of British armaments manufacturers.

TO-DAY, IN FACT AND IN PRACTICE, GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT HAS WON — BY THE SUPPORT OF BRITAIN AND ITALY. French verbal protests have been powerless to prevent this. France endeavours to rebuild the weakened Versailles bloc (the Barthou tour), and to develop relations with the Soviet Union (Barthou-Litvinov meetings at Geneva) in order to strengthen its position. But France has been in no position to take action to prevent German re-armament. The Belgian Prime

Minister, De Broqueville, was only stating facts when he stated that it was impossible to prevent German re-armament since any attempt to take active measures to prevent it would be met with the opposition of Britain and Italy.

BUT THE RE-ARMAMENT OF GERMANY, AND MORE ESPECIALLY OF GERMAN FASCISM, MEANS THE ENORMOUS ACCELERATION OF THE ADVANCE OF WAR. THE DIRECT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS RESTS WITH BRITAIN.

With what object and against whom has Britain pressed forward the re-armament of Germany? For the purpose of war against France? Obviously not. On the contrary, having once secured its objective of German re-armament, Britain is now straining every nerve to strengthen the **BRITISH-FRENCH ALLIANCE**, and even considering a closer direct military alliance (the Weygand visit to London in June).

BRITAIN HAS PRESSED FORWARD THE RE-ARMING OF GERMANY FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE WAR ON THE EASTERN FRONT—TO DRAW THE GATHERING MANY-SIDED WAR CRISIS IN EUROPE INTO THE CHANNELS OF THE WAR ON THE SOVIET UNION.

THE PROBLEMS OF BRITISH-JAPANESE AND BRITISH-AMERICAN RELATIONS.

This policy is linked up with the aim of the Japanese offensive against the Soviet Union in the Far East. Here, however, a number of further complications have arisen. The long-established **ANGLO-JAPANESE ALLIANCE** has in fact continued in practice, despite its formal abrogation since Washington in 1922. This has been particularly conspicuous since the Manchurian War in 1931. Britain has consistently supported and protected Japanese aggression in the Far East, both against the diplomatic opposition moves in the League of Nations and against the attempted pressure of the United States. The repeated appeals of the United States to Britain for common action against Japanese aggression in the Far East have met with no success, and Japan on this basis—and only by this support of Britain—has been able to get away with the spoils. At the same time British armaments manufacturers have been actively supplying Japan with arms.

The object of this line of policy has been transparently clear—to support Japan in its capacity as opponent of and as a balance against the United States, and, above all, as an immediate instigator of war in the Far East against the Soviet Union.

But this policy has not been plain sailing. In the first place, there is intense and very rapidly sharpening economic conflict of British and

Japanese interests in the Far East and even to-day throughout the world. Japanese cheap goods have to-day replaced the old pre-war nightmare of German cheap goods as the most dangerous and active immediate competitor driving out British goods in the markets of the world, and even successfully invading the British home market. The extreme resentment and anger of British manufacturers, and especially of Lancashire, has been only with difficulty partially stifled and repressed by the Government on the urgent representations of the Foreign Office. The prolonged Anglo-Japanese trade negotiations completely broke down in April; and in May the National Government was compelled to proclaim the launching of open trade war against Japan by cutting down colonial markets against its goods.

Further, Japanese expansionist aims are directed above all to China, and here come in conflict with strongly entrenched British interests. This was sharply shown in the Japanese declaration of April 17th, 1934, to the effect that nobody other than Japan has the right to interfere in the affairs of China. It may be noted that this declaration coincided with the British-French deadlock of April 17th, thus taking advantage of the confusion of the European diplomatic situation. By this declaration Japan publicly announced its claim to overlordship over all China, and warned off all other Powers. But Britain is in fact the largest dominant financial and monopolist Power in China. British resentment against Japan was extreme.

Nevertheless, in spite of this open threat, the British Foreign Office stood by Japan, and refused to register any protest against the new Japanese offensive. The American approaches for a joint Anglo-American stand against the Japanese offensive, strongly voiced in the American press, were ignored. The direct Japanese official statement that "the Nine Power Treaty is dead" (War Office statement in the *Nichi Nichi Shimbun*) and the no less direct statement by the Japanese Ambassadors in Berlin and Washington, warning off the financial activities of other Powers in China, were brushed aside by the Foreign Secretary, Simon, as not within his cognisance: "His Majesty's Government are content to leave this particular question where it is." Thus once again, as over Manchuria, was laid bare the still continuing Anglo-Japanese alliance—against the Soviet Union and against the United States.

At the same time Anglo-American relations develop to increasing sharpness. The breakdown of the London Economic Conference in 1933 has been followed by the breakdown of the debts negotiations in 1934 and British open default. The failure of the United States to win British support against the Japanese offensive has influenced

American-Soviet relations. The British naval authorities call openly for the ending of the London Naval Treaty, and the inauguration of a big naval building programme.

All these questions of the Far-Eastern situation come to a head with the approaching expiration of the Naval Treaty in 1935 and the preliminary negotiations for the new Conference. Japan has already given warning of its intention to demand the ending of the old ratios and the establishment of full naval parity. The Roosevelt Government has put in hand the largest American naval building programme of the post-war period, covering an expenditure of 570 million dollars over a period of five years on the construction of 102 warships. The British Admiralty has tabled proposals, in preparation for the Conference, for heavily increased naval building. In these conditions, increasing doubt is developing whether the Conference can be held with any prospect of success.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM COMES INTO THE OPEN—FORWARD TO INCREASED ARMAMENTS!

To-day the declarations of all the leading British statesmen on the question of war have begun to take on a new tone. The failure of all attempts at disarmament is loudly proclaimed, and the inevitability of a new world war in the near future begins to be affirmed. The lesson is drawn that all efforts must be concentrated on increasing and strengthening British armaments. Already last October the Conservative Conference passed unanimously a resolution which, in the words of the *Times*, "if literally interpreted, enjoins an immediate measure of re-armament by this country." Baldwin declared to this Conference:

"if Britain found herself on some lower rating, and some other country had higher figures, that country must come down, and we must go up, until equality was reached."

The First Sea Lord, Admiral Chatfield, announced in October at the Cutlers' Feast in Sheffield (that is, before the assembled armaments makers):

"The nation must take stock of its defence position and consider whether in its present naval expenditure it is maintaining a naval strength in accordance with its policy."

Earl Beatty underlined this at the Navy League dinner:

"The country must never again bind itself to any such unsafe limit (i.e., the London Naval Treaty), but must as before build the naval cruisers needed for the exceptional responsibilities we have on the seven seas."

Immediately after, at the end of November, came the Government's announcement of the urgent necessity to increase the Air Force by at least ten squadrons, and build upwards to the level of the strongest existing Air Force. This demand has been actively taken up and echoed throughout the press.

"We require not another hundred machines, but a thousand. We need one hundred squadrons, something more than double our existing strength. That is the new 'irreducible minimum'." (*Observer*, 3.12.33.)

The principal leader of the opposition at the Geneva Conference to all proposals for the abolition of aerial warfare and air-bombing was Britain.

The British Budget in the spring provided for the increase of armaments expenditure by over £5 millions. In addition, provision was openly made for possible further increases during the year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Neville Chamberlain, declared:

"If other nations either will not or cannot follow our example and reduce armaments, the Government would be failing in its duty if it did not proceed to restore the deficiencies that now exist.

"If in the future the Government should declare that in its opinion it is necessary still further to increase our expenditure on defence, I am certain the country will not refuse to grant us the money."

At the same time the declarations gather on the prospect of a new war. In the disarmament debate in the House of Commons in February, Churchill declared with regard to the changed general outlook:

"In Mr. Baldwin's late Conservative Government they thought it right to say as a rule of guidance that there would be no major war within ten years in which this country would be engaged. No one could take that principle as a guide to-day; and no Government, however peace-loving, could possibly arrange the basis of their naval and military organisation on such an assumption."

And in response to the American journalist, Knickerbocker, "Will War Come in Europe?" published in May, 1934, Churchill replied:

"It is not far distant. Perhaps a year, perhaps eighteen months."

Lloyd George wrote in the beginning of June: "To-day the prospect of another war is the stable talk of every club in Europe. Some of the astutest men I know will offer you a bet that there will be another great war—greater than the last—within two years."

The National Government Minister, Duff Cooper, Financial Secretary to the War Office, was even more explicit. Speaking at King's College, London, on May 14th:

"The Disarmament Conference is at its last gasp. In the coming year large sums of money will be spent in increased armaments. **BRITAIN WILL BE COMPELLED TO COME IN IF THERE IS ANOTHER WAR.**"

When the pointers to war are given so directly by the leaders and spokesmen of British imperialism, it implies that the danger of a new war is hanging directly over us.

BRITISH LABOURISM SUPPORTS THE DRIVE TO WAR.

The most serious sign of all of the maturing of the British war plans is the rapid change-over already beginning in the utterances of the British Labour and trade union leaders towards preparing the open support of the coming imperialist war.

At the Hastings Labour Party Conference last

October the sentiment of the mass of the delegates against the menacing war, and the criticism of the official ban against the anti-war movement was so strong that a resolution was carried pledging the Labour Party

"to take no part in war and to resist it with the whole force of the Labour Movement, and to seek consultation forthwith with the Trades Union and Co-operative Movements with a view to deciding and announcing to the country what steps, including a general strike, are to be taken to organise the opposition of the organised working class movement in the event of war or threat of war."

This resolution, which came, not from the Executive, but from the body of the Conference, was carried unanimously with the assent of the Executive, which knew that it could not afford openly to oppose it. But from the moment of its carrying the entire efforts of the official machine have been directed to destroying even this very incomplete and confused anti-war resolution and making it a dead letter. Official "interpretations" of the resolution were immediately issued, explaining that the resolution was only to be regarded as opposing illegal war, i.e., . . . war not in accordance with the League of Nations, Locarno or other treaties by which the country might be bound; any such war would not be supported by the Labour movement." This was further borne out by the issue at the same time of the official Labour Party pamphlet, *Labour's Foreign Policy*, in the name of Henderson. In this pamphlet Henderson demanded that a special "Peace Act" should be passed. The character of this "Peace Act" he made quite clear:

"The Government shall have full power to take all the economic, financial and other measures required to enable it immediately to fulfil all our national obligations under the Covenant, the Locarno Treaties and other instruments by which we may be bound."

This is the official Labour policy—"TO FULFIL ALL OUR NATIONAL OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE COVENANT, THE LOCARNO TREATIES AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS BY WHICH WE MAY BE BOUND." It will be seen that Labour's proposed "Peace Act" is an Act for the prosecution of imperialist war.

Meanwhile the mandated consultations of the Labour Party Executive and General Council of the Trades Union Congress on the question of the general strike against war have been dragged on now for nine months without so far reaching even the pretence of a result.* The speeches of the leaders have openly denounced any such policy of the general strike against war.

But the more recent utterances of the leaders of British Labourism have gone even further.

The leader of the Labour Party, Lansbury, has now come out with an emphatic declaration against the general strike and against all strikes, under any conditions (article entitled "Strikes Will Not

Win Us Power: Why I Have Changed My Views," in the *Clarion*, 5/5/34). In this he declares:

"All governments are bound to protect public services, and will always be forced to take this position.

"A general strike in this country is now quite illegal."

He details how the previous Labour Governments organised strike-breaking, and how any future Labour Government will do the same. The significance of this pronouncement of the leader of the Labour Party, in the moment of intensifying war menace, is obvious.

Not only this, but a number of recent utterances of prominent trade union leaders have begun already to come out on the side of social chauvinism and support of future imperialist war. Thus, Bromley, Secretary of the Locomotive Engineers, and late Chairman of the Trade Union Congress, stated in a speech on May 27th:

"While generally, the British trade union movement was against international warfare, the members of the union should not commit themselves too readily to the opinion, often expressed by those who had no authority or responsibility, that the British trade union movement must prevent war by a national strike. Members must remember that at the moment a number of important nations were not governed by political Governments, but were servile States under the heel of armed dictatorship, which aimed at smashing by brutalised force the trade union movements of the world. HE CONCEIVED CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH MIGHT OCCUR WHEN IT WOULD BE TO THE INTEREST OF BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM NOT ONLY NOT TO REFUSE TO ASSIST BUT EVEN WILLINGLY TO HELP OUR COUNTRY IN THE EVENT OF WAR."

It is sufficiently obvious that under this veiled talk of "dictatorship" in general is covered war on the Soviet Union. Similarly, Swales, at a meeting of the Amalgamated Engineering Union National Committee, at which a resolution was put forward for strike action IN THE EVENT OF A BRITISH WAR AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION, opposed this resolution and declared:

"IF THERE WERE AGGRESSIVE ACTION AGAINST THIS COUNTRY, I DO NOT KNOW THAT WE SHOULD ALLOW THE AGGRESSORS TO WALK OVER US, EVEN THOUGH WE DO NOT BELIEVE IN WAR."

In this language of prominent trade union leaders can be seen the full expression of social chauvinist support of imperialist war, as in 1914—but this time, even before the outbreak of war. When this war-language of the British Labour leaders coincides thus with the war-language of their imperialist masters, the signs are more serious than at any time since 1914 of what is preparing for the workers. On this twentieth anniversary of the first world war the call is more urgent than ever before to the entire mass of the workers to put all their strength into the organised anti-war struggle, into the struggle against the combined offensive of fascism and war, while there is yet time, in the face of the gathering war-crisis which is now maturing and threatening to burst.

* This article was written before the later decision on this question.—Ed.

THE BRITISH REFORMISTS PREPARE FOR WAR.

By J. R. CAMPBELL.

ON the anniversary of the outbreak of the World War of 1914-18 the British National Government is preparing to launch a great programme of armaments expansion. Already in its last Budget it had increased military, naval and air force expenditure by five million pounds. This was intended to be a mere stop gap measure pending the results of the Disarmament Conference. If that Conference failed to secure disarmament (and no one expected it to succeed), then the British Government was pledged to increase its air force to the size of the strongest air power in the world, complete the mechanisation of its already very highly mechanised army and substantially add to the strength of its navy.

But before the failure of the Disarmament Conference the Government carried through a series of supplementary measures to carry this policy into effect. It instructed the Royal Air Force to make all the necessary preparations for a great increase in armaments should the Disarmament Conference fail.

Baldwin openly explained to the House of Commons that what this really meant was that the Government was going ahead with all possible speed to increase its air force. Even if the House of Commons were to decide at this moment (i.e., during the debate of May 18th, 1934) to double the air force, several months would have to be spent in preparations before effect could be given to this decision. Therefore, argued Baldwin, let us decide to begin the preparations now, so that if the Disarmament Conference fails we will be in a position to discuss an air programme that can be immediately carried out.

This drive for increased armament is being carried out under the plea that Britain is being outstripped in armaments building by the other Powers and is getting into a position of absolute defencelessness. This is clearly lying nonsense. British imperialism has been spending well over 100 million pounds per year on armaments and has obviously been getting value for its money. But it has spent on quality rather than quantity. Its army appears numerically very small when compared with the armies on the continent, but it is the most highly mechanised army in the world. The number of its first-line aeroplanes compares unfavourably with those of France, but they are all the most up-to-date fighting and bombing machines. Up till recently the line of the British Air Force has been that as an aeroplane becomes obsolete in a year it is uneconomical to maintain a huge fleet which will have to be re-

placed year by year. Rather it was advisable to have a medium-sized fleet of the very latest planes. In the event of a war the highly-developed aeroplane factories in Great Britain could speedily bring the British Air Fleet level with that of any other country. That policy was based on the assumption on which Churchill declared the Government of 1924-29 had proceeded—namely, that Britain was not likely to be involved in a first-class war in the immediate future. This assumption is now being abandoned, and the new air programme will have as its basic assumption the fact that Britain has to be ready if involved in a large-scale war at any moment.

And so this autumn new estimates will be introduced, providing for a rapid increase in British armaments. It is a notorious fact that, in presenting his Budget, Chamberlain deliberately underestimated the Budget surplus for the coming financial year. In doing so he was creating a hidden reserve which can now be drawn upon for the purpose of developing the war might of British imperialism.

What line of foreign policy are these huge armaments being called into being to support?

There can be no doubt that the line of British foreign policy is primarily the preparation of anti-Soviet intervention. British imperialism stands alongside Japan and Hitler Germany in actively preparing a counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet war.

Ever since the Japanese attack on Manchuria in 1931 British imperialism has sought to direct Japanese imperialism's urge for expansion, away from the British spheres of influence in Central China, and towards the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic. It threw its entire weight into supporting Japan in the Councils of the League of Nations, it gave its armament firms the necessary license to export munitions to Japan, it sought to break up every attempt of rival imperialists to build a bloc against Japan. Even the frenzied "dumping" campaign of Japanese imperialism, which has played havoc with the markets of the British textile industry, has not induced it to modify this line. When the Japanese imperialists recently put forward what amounted to a claim to the hegemony of all China, and when certain capitalist circles in Britain demanded that the British Government take a strong line against this claim, it was the British Foreign Office which came forward to soothe the capitalist public opinion with the declaration that this claim of the Japanese did not involve any challenge to British interests in China.

It must also be noted that now there are no such anti-Japanese feelings in capitalist circles in the British Dominions as were to be observed when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was denounced in 1922. Australia, where anti-Japanese sentiment was most powerful, is now finding in Japan a market for a considerable quantity of its wool. Indeed, at the moment of writing, an Australian trade mission is in Japan. It is not likely that these facts have reduced the threat of Japanese expansion in Australia, but they will nevertheless enable British imperialism to win Australian support for its policy of directing Japanese imperialist expansion towards the Soviet Union and towards the Mongolian People's Republic.

In the West the already considerable re-arming of Nazi-Germany has only been possible with the diplomatic support of Britain, which, in conjunction with Italy, has brought to nothing all French imperialist projects to restrain Germany. At the Disarmament Conference in June, Simon acted as the Attorney-General of German Fascism. Nevertheless the Disarmament Conference concluded its session by a certain rapprochement between British and French imperialism. Since that rapprochement, General Weygand has visited Britain, and only simpletons can believe that this visit has no political or military significance. What is the meaning of these facts?

British imperialism is pursuing in Europe its historic policy of the balance of power in the new post-war conditions created by the existence of the Soviet Union. It is willing to allow Nazi-Germany to be strengthened militarily, at the expense of France, so that instead of the French hegemony of Europe there will be a balance of power with Great Britain as the determining factor.

"Europe is passing," writes Lord Lothian, "from a system of stability through the military preponderance of France and her associates to one of stability by balance"—with, of course, British imperialism holding the balance.

In this situation British imperialism is as determined as France to prevent the westward expansion of Germany. Any attempt on the part of Germany to challenge the present frontiers on the West will find British imperialism solidly behind France.

But the more determinedly the British imperialists oppose the westward expansion of Germany, the more energetically they support all attempts to expand to the East—towards the Soviet Union. On this basis British imperialism continues to attempt the reconciliation of France and Germany and the building up of a powerful anti-Soviet front. That is why the Soviet project for turning the Disarmament Conference into a permanent Peace Conference was received in British

capitalist circles with a mixture of cold hostility and mockery. That is why in making armaments comparisons with other countries the British capitalist politicians always emphasise the large armaments of the Soviet Union.

Of course, in emphasising this fundamentally anti-Soviet line of British imperialism, one must not forget its strong antagonism towards U.S. imperialism. The refusal of British imperialism to pay its debts to the United States of America, while at the same time insisting violently that countries like the Irish Free State and Germany pay their debts to Britain has not improved relations between the two great imperialist States, and this will find sharp expression in the Naval Conference which is meeting next year to discuss the question of the relative strength of the imperialist navies. But short of a sudden unexpected change in this quarter, it is clear that the main war danger arises out of the anti-Soviet policy being pursued by British imperialism in Europe and the Far East.

In this situation the policy of the British Labour Party and Trade Union Congress has undergone a rapid evolution.

Let us remember what the official policy of the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress was.

Like all social-democratic parties, the Labour Party professed to stand for a policy of peace and disarmament to be secured through the League of Nations. In the event of this policy suffering defeat, however, the reformist Labour movement was pledged to a policy of industrial action in order to prevent the British imperialists from going to war. This latter policy was actually embodied in the standing orders of the Trade Union Congress, which instructs the General Council to call a special Trade Union Congress in the event of the danger of war becoming acute, which special Congress is empowered to organise industrial action to stop the war.

What little value that clause has can be seen from the fact that during 1932 while the British imperialists were sending munitions to Japan, while a war was waging around Shanghai, the British trade union leaders were doing all in their power to prevent organised efforts being made by the workers to stop the supply of munitions going to this country.

The whole policy of the reformists at this juncture was to ask the British National Government (then supporting Japan) to appeal to the League of Nations to take economic and diplomatic action against Japanese imperialism.

The development of the events in the Far East and the failure of the disarmament conference caused widespread distrust amongst the Labour Party supporters with regard to the League of Nations and led to a growing sympathy for the

policy of the British anti-war movement. Both the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference in 1933 had to take up an attitude against war.

The Trade Union Congress passed a resolution against war in general and it accepted without discussion the report of its delegation to the Paris Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions, in which was embodied support for the I.F.T.U. resolution in favour of a general strike against the "aggressor" country, the "aggressor" country being the one which refused to go to arbitration under the covenant of the League of Nations or under the Kellogg Pact.

This I.F.T.U. resolution was not discussed, but the President of the Trade Union Congress, A. G. Walkden, claimed that the General Council of the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party Executive would discuss the full meaning of the resolution and would report to a special Congress as to the measures which would be necessary to carry it out. It is now claimed that Walkden was speaking without the consent of the General Council and no special Congress has in fact been held nor is any under preparation.

At the Labour Party Conference a month later the local Labour Parties succeeded in getting carried a resolution which went far beyond that of the Trade Union Congress. The resolution pledged the Labour Party amongst other things:—

"(a). To launch vigorous propaganda to counter in advance those tendencies in the present social system which predispose large sections of the population to respond easily to a war appeal and stressing:

1. The growing acuteness of the war danger.
2. The appalling nature of modern methods of warfare and their results.
3. The economic crisis and the deepening of imperialist and capitalist rivalries as a direct cause of war.
4. The growth of fascism and its relation to war.

(b). To work within the Labour and Socialist International by an uncompromising attitude against war preparations.

(c). To pledge itself to take no part in war and to resist it with the whole force of the Labour movement and to seek consultation forthwith with the Trade Union and Co-operative movements with a view to deciding and announcing to the country what steps, including a general strike, are to be taken to organise the opposition of the organised working class movement in the event of war, or direct threat of war, and urges the National Joint Council (i.e., the Trade Union Congress, Labour Party and Co-operative Union J.R.C.) to endeavour to secure international action on the same lines."

The resolution is an exceedingly confused one, but it clearly cuts across the policy which had been pursued by the Labour Party during the previous year, and it cuts across the I.F.T.U. and Second International decisions with regard to the general strike being used only against "aggressor" countries. The resolution, confused though it may be, undertakes to oppose war by the whole power

of the working class, including the general strike. There is no reservation to the effect that the general strike is only applicable in States which are aggressors.

The Labour Party Executive did not dare force a debate on the points at issue in the resolution. It adopted the resolution and sought to kill it by interpretation.

Immediately after the resolution was accepted, Henderson delivered a speech (which the conference ordered to be printed) in which he again stressed the fact that the action of the Labour movement against war must be only directed against Governments taking part in an illegal war—a war carried out against the decision of the League of Nations.

In the House of Commons a month later Sir Stafford Cripps, the leader of the so-called "left" Socialist League, gave a similar interpretation in the House of Commons. In the course of his speech, Cripps was asked by a diehard, "What about a general strike against war?" and he replied, "I have said that the general strike would be a way to stop this country from acting contrary to its obligations." So that if a British Government goes to war under the Pact of Locarno or with the approval of a capitalist League of Nations there has to be no general strike but on the contrary active support for such a war.

How has the Labour Party and the General Council acted since the above-mentioned resolutions were passed. It is noticeable, in the first place, that the reformists never attempt to expose or criticise the actual war policy of the National Government. They denounce war in general, but make no attempt to expose to the workers how the National Government has supported Japan in Manchuria and is seeking to incite Japan against the Soviet Union. Now and then they hint that the National Government might have done more to use the League of Nations to restrain Japan. But that the National Government assists and seeks to incite Japan in every possible way to attack the Soviet Union—that fact is concealed by the reformists.

So with the support that the National Government has been giving to Nazi Germany, the Bank of England has helped the Reichsbank in every possible way, the British armament firms have participated in the re-armament of Germany, the National Government has rendered Hitler the utmost diplomatic support and has sought to direct its expansion drive against the Soviet Union. These concrete war moves are not exposed by the reformists, however, and the general impression that their anti-war propaganda leaves on the minds of the workers is not that the National Government is pursuing a war policy that ought to be

sharply opposed, but that the danger of war arises from the fact of (1) the National Government allowing itself to be drawn into a war started by two other countries, or (2) of the National Government being wantonly attacked by another Government. Thus, in refusing to combat the war policy of their own Government, the reformists help forward that policy.

At the same time they advocate that war can be prevented and disarmament secured by the strengthening of the League of Nations. So the General Council and the Labour Party Executive sends a deputation to see the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, with a view to enlisting the support of the British Government in favour of the admission of the Soviet Union and of the U.S.A. into the League of Nations. This manoeuvre is in no sense a support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

On the contrary, the General Council and the Labour Party Executive put forward the policy of support for the Soviet Union joining the League of Nations as an alternative to the policy of mobilising the masses against their own warlike Government. It seeks to spread the illusion that the presence of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations would, without the action of the masses, and without the overthrow of the antagonistic imperialist governments by the workers, secure permanent peace. That this is a manoeuvre is made plain by the fact that when the Soviet Union at Geneva puts forward its proposals for a permanent peace conference, the Labour Party and T.U.C. does not come forward and support this proposal.

The nearer the war approaches the more determined is the whole reformist bureaucracy to throw overboard any commitments which bind them to taking mass action against war.

Speaking of the resolution of the Hastings Labour Party Conference, Mr. H. L. Elvin, of the Cambridge Trades and Labour Council, said:

"I do believe that this resolution is only just in time for some of our keener and younger members and I hope we will act upon it, even if it involves us in the consideration of possibly illegal steps. We have heard to-day about the Trades Disputes Act. I believe I am right in saying that a general strike under that Act is not legal. Do not let us pass this resolution without knowing what we are doing."

The Labour Party Conference passed this resolution in favour of a general strike against war after it had been reminded that such a general strike (or indeed, for that matter, a partial strike against war) was illegal under the Trades Disputes Act.

A month later, Citrine, the General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress, however, attacked this resolution on the specific grounds that a general strike against war would be illegal:

"It is no use assuming that the Trade Union Movement can be used on any and every occasion when war broke out in some remote corner of the world. A general strike under our present law is illegal and it would be folly to resort to it in the way we are exhorted to do from some quarters."

The "some quarters" is an obvious reference to the Labour Party Conference.

The question is then discussed behind the scenes at the Labour Party and T.U.C. joint meetings, and early in June Mr. John Bromley tells a meeting of his members in London that the matter is under discussion, but that it is impossible to oppose all wars as it might be necessary to take part in a war against Fascism.

So that, just as in 1914, the British Labour leaders urged the workers to go forward to the slaughter under the pretext that the foul capitalist war was a war for "democracy against militarism," so they will drive the workers into the next war under various pretexts such as "that it is a war in defence of democracy," "a war of democracy against dictatorship." The latter slogan and the whole line now adopted by the Labour bureaucracy assume special importance in view of the leading rôle in the anti-Soviet drive of the National Government and the persistent way in which the Labour bureaucracy couple Fascist dictatorship with the dictatorship in the Soviet Union. At the same time the strong Fascist tendencies of the National Government are being revealed by the passage of a Seditious Bill directed against anti-war propaganda. Mr. Bromley's formula, however, is not wide enough for some other members of the General Council, and so when at the Conference of the Amalgamated Engineering Union a resolution in favour of a strike against war is moved, Mr. Bromley's colleague on the General Council, Mr. A. B. Swales, says:

"The Joint Council were still discussing it and a comprehensive report confirming the principle of a strike or no strike would be submitted to the Trade Union Congress at Weymouth."

"If there were aggressive action against this country, I do not know that we should allow the aggressors to walk over us even though we do not believe in war."

So that, according to Mr. Swales, the Trade Union Congress should mobilise the workers for the slaughter as they did in 1914-1918 if only the National Government will inform them beforehand that the other side is an aggressor.

A further stage was reached at the joint meeting of the Labour Party Executive and the Trade Union Congress General Council on June 28th. Here a report on the attitude of the Labour Party towards war was presented by Mr. Arthur Henderson. The old fox who led the British Labour movement into supporting the last war, is preparing to lead it into the next. The central feature of the statement adopted at this meeting was for-

mulated in the *Daily Herald* report of the meeting in its headline, "General Strike proposal dropped."

The report says plump and plain:

"The responsibility for stopping war, moreover, ought not to be placed on the Trade Union Movement. Every citizen who wanted peace and every other section of the Labour Movement must share the responsibility for organised action against war." (*Daily Herald*, June 29th.)

At first sight the argument seems to justify the policy of the Trade Union movement seeking allies in the preparation of the general strike. But, in actual fact, the argument is advanced in favour of abandoning the policy of general strike against war altogether.

The argument proceeds:—

"... the lack of an independent trade union movement in such countries as Germany, Italy, Austria and others, made the calling of a general strike against their Governments an impossibility; and in other countries like Japan the weakness of the trade union organisation made it unable to restrain its Government.

"Recognising that aggressive action might come from some of these countries, the statement declared that the general strike could not be made effective by the trade unions in these countries (D.H. Report), and therefore the General Council declares against the application of the general strike policy by the workers of Great Britain."

The vile tribe who are responsible for the smashing of the powerful trades unions by the fascist dictatorship now declare they can do nothing because there are no "independent trades unions." The same reformist leaders who refuse point-blank to prevent arms, guns, bullets, etc., from being shipped to Japan sneer at the heroic efforts of the Japanese revolutionaries, working under the most brutal terror, to mobilise the masses against the war on China and the Soviet Union. What contemptible cowards and knaves they are!

The following must be stressed with regard to this line of argument of the reformist leaders. Firstly, the British National Government is as aggressive an imperialist Government as are the German and Japanese Governments. In so far as the Soviet Union is an object of aggression, then British imperialism, together with Japanese and German imperialism, are the main organisers of this aggressive counter-revolutionary war. Secondly, even if the workers in Germany and Japan are not in a position to launch a general strike right away, why should not the British workers use the strike weapon to impede the supply of munitions to these countries and to prevent British imperialism intervening militarily on their side.

At the present time British imperialism is co-operating with and supporting all the aggressive actions of Japan and Germany directed against the U.S.S.R.. But even assuming that a war broke out between one of those countries mentioned and British imperialism, what warrant is there for assuming that the workers in those countries could not launch strike action to impede their own war-

mongers? During the war, and especially in 1918, the German and Austrian workers launched powerful strikes against their Kaiser Governments, in which their own patriotic social-democrats were numerous. There is no reason to assume that the German, Austrian or Italian working class will not be able to launch similar strikes against their Governments. So the sophism of the Labour Party and the General Council is, "We cannot be sure that any other workers will oppose their Governments by strike action in a war situation, therefore we will not oppose our Government."

In short, the line of the General Council and the Labour Party is that the British workers must under no circumstances use mass action against a government seeking to drive them to the shambles of a new imperialist war. Thus, not after war has broken out, but before, the reformist Labour movement passes with bands and banners on to the side of its own war-mongering Government.

The attitude of the reformist bureaucracy to the future war is expressly clearly and precisely:

"But it is recognised that there may be circumstances in which the Government of Great Britain might have to use its military and naval forces in support of the League in restraining an aggressor nation which declined to submit to the League's authority and which flagrantly used military measures in defiance of its pledged word."

This open repetition of the old standpoint of the Second International is of especial significance at the present time in view of the eve of world war situation. As the British National Government comes out more and more openly, more and more aggressively in the strengthening of its armed forces, air, military, and naval might; as the day for the launching of world war draws nearer and nearer, the reformists prepare also openly to win the working class to the side of Britain, for the "defence of the country; for new imperialist slaughter.

The same Henderson, who was so enthusiastic a member of the War Cabinet of the British capitalists in the last war, keeps silent in his resolution about the "aggressiveness" of Britain. This is understandable, since Henderson is the agent used by the National Government at Geneva to cover over its militaristic plans, boasts and demands. Hoping with the aid of this formula to hide from the workers the war plans of the British Government, its increased naval and air expenditure, its feverish efforts to build up alliances on the continent against the Soviet Union, a Government which is hated and detested from one end of the country to another, the "Socialist" leaders declare that the Labour movement must recognise:

"The duty of supporting our Government unflinchingly in all risks consequent and attendant upon its taking action in collective measures against a peace-breaker."

BRITISH IMPERIALISM PREPARING FOR WAR, AND ITS COLONIAL CONTRADICTIONS

By R. PAGE ARNOT.

BRITISH imperialism is preparing for war, increasing her armaments and making diplomatic, economic and financial moves in every part of the world. Again, as before 1914, British imperialism is preparing for war in every way. But it is no longer the same world; the general crisis of capitalism has had a profoundly disintegrating effect on the oldest capitalist country, and its Colonial Empire. The Soviet Union holds one-sixth of the globe as the citadel of the world revolution. Soviet power has also been established over a large part of China. New antagonisms have arisen amongst the imperialist powers. New rivals of British imperialism have come to the forefront.

Nor is it any longer the same Empire. Deep and rending contradictions are developing and putting entirely new problems before the British bourgeoisie. The centrifugal tendencies of the British Dominions; the anti-imperialist revolutionary movements in the Colonies and semi-Colonies of Britain, and the growth of the revolutionary working-class movement at home, have tremendously altered the whole situation.

The main antagonisms are clear. British imperialism, backing Japan and Germany, organises the war drive against the U.S.S.R. and sets itself to hinder the operation of the peace policy of the Soviet Union. In the second place, within the capitalist world, British imperialism makes one after another long-range moves against its powerful imperialist rival, the United States of America. In the third place, contradictions exist between British and French imperialism, and in the camp of the instigators of war, namely, between Britain, Japan and Germany, Germany refuses to pay the interest due under the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. Japan becomes a powerful trade competitor of Great Britain, especially in the Colonial markets. Italy clashes with Britain in the Mediterranean Colonies.

It is an undoubted fact that the interests of British imperialism clash everywhere with the interests of other powers. That "far-flung battle line" of British imperialism comprises not only the Empire of 1914, but the new mandated territories of the Middle-East and the warships that guard British interests on the China Station, and the interests of the allied empires of Portugal and the Netherlands.

The British Empire comprises over thirteen million square miles, with a population of four

hundred and ninety-five millions, divided as follow:—

	Area in square miles	Population
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	94,633	46,386,000
Europe	27,125	3,241,000
Africa	3,820,274	57,995,000
America	4,008,214	13,091,000
Australia	3,278,917	9,347,000
Asia (other than India)	317,584	12,558,000
India	1,808,274	352,383,000
Total	13,355,426	495,456,000

Of this official total Empire population no less than five-sevenths is India.

But this total hides the fact that a number of "independent" and "sovereign" States are entirely under British control. Egypt, with a population of fourteen and a quarter millions, was formally declared to be "independent" in 1930 (the British Protectorate had been "terminated" in 1922), but "DEFENCE IS RESERVED AND REMAINS UNDER BRITISH CONTROL," says the Statesman's Year Book. Actually there is a British army of occupation about twelve thousand strong, while the chief officers of the Egyptian Army are British. This is what is meant by "independence" as granted by Mr. Arthur Henderson when he was Foreign Secretary of British imperialism.

Similarly in the case of Iraq. British imperialism "terminated" its mandate in 1932—but the British Air Force remains stationed in Iraq.

Similarly with "independent Arabia," whose many monarchs are mostly in the pay and under the control of Britain.

Altogether these independent territories, including Tibet and the Himalayan States, with those already mentioned, swell the total size of the British Empire by over two million square miles. To this again must be added the territories of the junior imperialisms, which Britain reckons on having to defend by "the King's Ships," namely, the three-quarter million square miles of the Dutch East Indies, with a population of nearly sixty-one million, and the Portuguese Empire of over three-quarters of a million square miles, bringing the real grand total under British imperialism to nearly seventeen million square miles,

containing well-nigh six hundred million of mankind.

THE BRITISH DOMINIONS.

War greatly accelerated the growth of these extensions of the British capitalist system until now the tendency to independent economic policies has been expressed also in a frequent tension between Great Britain and the Dominions, and in resulting political concession from Whitehall. Moreover, the influence of American capital has grown in the Dominions. Capital exports from the U.S.A. into Canada grew rapidly in the post-war years. Wall Street proved ready to float an American loan when the City of London tried to exercise financial control. Eventually, beginning with the signature of the Halibut Treaty by both the diplomatic representatives of Canada and the British Ambassador to the U.S.A., the Dominions, headed by the Hertzog Government of South Africa, insisted on a constitutional definition of their co-equality with the Government of Britain. The Statute of Westminster passed a few years ago registered the extent to which these centrifugal tendencies of the Dominions had developed.

In the special case of Ireland, the oldest Colony, which has now been given the name of a Dominion, British imperialism maintains its warships in all the Irish harbours and waterways and wages a bitter economic warfare with the Irish Free State.

During the world economic crisis, Downing Street tried to recover some of its hold over the Dominions by means of financial pressure through the Bank of England. It was partly successful in Australia, while in the case of New Zealand the subjection to British finance capital is still more complete. In Newfoundland, where a popular revolt compelled the Dominion bourgeoisie to call on the armed forces of the British Crown, the right of self-governing Dominion status has been "temporarily" surrendered; and that Colony strategically placed under the lee of North America is now being governed by a Commission directly appointed by His Majesty's Government.

What would be the attitude of these Dominions if the antagonisms in the Pacific developed into war between Japanese imperialism and American imperialism? Britain has been and is now backing Japan. For twenty years up to 1922 a formal military alliance existed between Britain and Japan, until the Washington Conference. But the belief that a secret understanding exists up to this very day between these two powers is frequently voiced in the American Press, and is borne out by events of the last three years. Before 1914 a declaration of war by His Majesty's Government involved all the Dominions; but now their separate

assents must be received. Nor is this mere form. In the autumn of 1922, when Lloyd George threatened war with Turkey at Chanak, the Dominion of Canada made it clear that it would not participate.

Would assent be given to support of Japan by the Dominions? The whole tendency of Canada, Australia and New Zealand was against Japan, even during the currency of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Canada's policy towards Japan has been similar to that of the United States. For over thirty years Australian Governments have proclaimed the "White Australia" policy against Japanese immigration. This antagonism has by no means been weakened.

Lastly, support by Britain of Japan in a Japanese-American war would find a large section of the Irish Free State backing America. The attitude of the De Valera Government to Britain depends largely on the United States. The American Government is very keenly aware of this situation; it is no accident that the American Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Kellogg, had no desire to visit London, while at the same time paying a ceremonial visit to the capital of Ireland.

Efforts are being made to counteract the anti-Japanese line of the capitalists in the Dominions. A trade mission has gone from Australia to Japan which has been hailed as "Australia's best customer for wool," and an Australian Legation has been established in Tokio. But whatever softening of antagonisms is expected from these efforts is very largely offset by the hostility which has arisen between cotton and other manufacturing interests within Britain itself. In the case of Canada much American stock has been repaid; and in this last year Canadian loans have been floated in London. Newfoundland has been brought under administrative control of Britain, and New Zealand under financial control. Nevertheless the centrifugal tendency remains.

An Anglo-American war, therefore, even in the partial stage of an American-Japanese war in the Pacific, brings up sharply before the British imperialists the problem of Dominion support and of Empire disintegration.

But there is one war in which capitalists in every Dominion would be fully united with Britain. All the Dominions have shown themselves in full agreement with the anti-Soviet policy of the British Government. The capitalists of Canada, itself a secondary imperialist power, even took the lead two years ago in pressing for a breach of Anglo-Soviet trade relations. Likewise in Australia the Labour Prime Minister of New South Wales, Lang, the "leftest of the Lefts," joined in the slave-labour campaign against the Soviet Union. In South Africa, where the whole policy of the South

African capitalists is concentrated on the oppression of the natives, a single "nationalist" party has now been formed by Smuts and Hertzog to hold down the natives; and there also the influence of the Soviet Union's example is dreaded. The Irish Free State, strongly under the influence of the Pope, who launched the anti-Soviet religious campaign of 1930, would be nothing loath to see the end of Communism in the Soviet Union.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that the problem of the centrifugal tendency of the Dominions is one of the factors that has dictated Britain's present tactics of organising a war drive against the Soviet Union, backing Japan and Germany and striving to extend the anti-Soviet front.

THE COLONIES.

But the Dominions are only the first part of the problem.

Whereas in the Dominions centrifugal tendencies had begun to show themselves, though in a less marked degree, before the war of 1914, the anti-imperialist movement in the Colonies is almost entirely a product of the years after 1914. The twentieth century's first decade had seen the awakening of the Indian masses, represented by the Gadr Party, the Terrorists and other small groups, but it was only with the deepening of exploitation in the years after 1914 that it developed into a mass movement. The same is true of Ireland, of Egypt and in general of the whole colonial world. The colonial world became a blazing hearth of revolt, with the development of the general crisis of capitalism, one of the fundamental and important spheres of which is the liberation movement in the Colonies. It was these colonial revolts which, in 1920 and 1921, were factors of tremendous importance in compelling all-powerful British imperialism to conclude a trade agreement with the R.S.F.S.R. on the one hand, and on the other to submit to the demands of its American rival (naval equality; cancellation of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty; payment of the American debt, etc.). In the years that followed, the Chinese revolution raised the spectre of Communism in Hong Kong and Singapore and led to new ferocities, new repressions in all the Far Eastern parts of the Empire. In Polynesia, the mass strikes in Fiji were followed by the still unsubdued movement of the Mau in New Zealand's mandated territory of Samoa. Right throughout Africa, from north to south, and from east to west, now in one colony and now in another, the flames of colonial revolt have burst forth.

In East Africa (Kenya) the first attempt to organise a Trade Union was met by the imprisonment of its leader, Harry Thuku, while in the

"model" colony of West Africa (Nigeria) forty-four women were massacred under the second Labour Government for refusal to pay taxes. In the Middle East the mandates held by Britain as a "sacred trust of civilisation" failed to meet with the grateful acceptance of the masses of Arabistan. Even the Mediterranean Colonies, Cyprus and Malta, were affected by the colonial revolution. It seemed as though British imperialist exploitation had been planted on volcanoes that were not extinct, but only slumbering and now beginning to erupt.

Every possible manoeuvre has been resorted to by British imperialism in order by fraud and force to quell the colonial revolts. But every step taken, every move made by the ever-extending trusts and combines to squeeze the ruined peasantry of the British Empire still further, results only in a still more formidable accumulation of volcanic forces underground. This time, as the British imperialists prepare for war, they must take into their reckoning, as they did not require to do before 1914, that the outbreak of a new world war may detonate the colonial volcano. Moreover, the influence of its rivals, the U.S.A. in Latin America, of Italy in the Near East, of Japan in the Far East, is much stronger and more penetrating than before 1914.

INDIA.

But the problem of problems of British imperialism is India, with its 350,000,000 population, well-nigh a sixth of mankind. For over one hundred and fifty years the British capitalist system has grown up with India as its colony, sucking the life-blood out of India. British imperialism has retarded the development of the natural resources of India, destroyed its manufactures, kept hundreds of millions in poverty and suffering under conditions that have in two generations reduced the expectation of life in India from thirty years to twenty-three years. Every movement of the Indian people for liberation has been met with unparalleled ferocity, rising to a climax with the British Labour Government's bombing of villages, burnings, floggings and imprisonments of sixty thousand political prisoners. In the Burmese war of liberation in 1932-33 the British put a price on the heads of the "rebel" leaders and gave them no quarter.

But an agrarian revolution advances with the inevitability of a natural process. Now that consciousness is spreading amongst the peasantry; now that the workers themselves are becoming more and more class-conscious, are advancing to the leadership of the whole movement for national emancipation, British imperialism is seeking to make a bargain with the capitalists of the Indian

National Congress in order to maintain and strengthen their dictatorship over the toiling millions. The Indian White Paper, as the "Proposals for Indian Constitutional Reforms" is called, will actually strengthen the feudal-imperialist régime in India under the pretence of granting a Constitution.

In particular, all control of the armed forces will be despotically administered by the British Viceroy. For India, "the brightest jewel in the English Crown," is not only to be guarded against a rising of the masses, but is also likely itself to be a central strategical focus in the new world war.

"For unthinkable ages," wrote Karl Marx, eighty years ago, "there have been in Asia only three departments of Government—that of Finance, or plunder of the Interior; that of War, or plunder of the Exterior; and finally that of Public Works . . . The British in India have taken over from their predecessors the departments of Finance and War, but they have entirely neglected that of Public Works."

The two departments of war and finance form a single problem for British imperialism on the eve of the second world war. Political-economic problems affect strategy, and strategy creates new political-economic problems. The Simon Commission, in its Report published in 1930, was compelled to admit that the current expenditure on arms of the British Government in India was over three-fifths of the total expenditure, "a higher proportion, in fact, than in any other country in the world." Fifteen years after the outbreak of war, when armaments expenditure in Great Britain had increased by half, in India it had gone up by one hundred per cent. For over two generations the frontiers of India had been steadily extended; buffer States have been created beyond the frontiers, and as these buffer States have been subjugated new buffer States have been created beyond them again.

The external strategy of making India "safe for British imperialism" begins with its protection by sea and the protection of the air and sea routes thereto. The centre of the eastern marine protection is at Singapore in the Straits Settlements, where the construction of the great new naval base has occupied all the post-war years. Here a hostile fleet coming from the east is to be stopped. But since the Dutch East Indies lie within the sphere of British Malaya, the Dutch colonies must also be protected. Much to the chagrin of Japanese imperialism, as expressed in June by the "Asahi," the arrangements for the protection of Dutch Indonesia have been carried further forward by the visit of Field-Marshal Lord Allenby and the Conference of Admirals at Singapore.

But the fortifications extend still further. A new Hadrian's Wall is being built along the air route that runs down from Burma and Eastern

Bengal through the Federated Malay States, down through Java and Sumatra and Portuguese Timor right to North Australia. Nor is there any fear that these junior allied imperialisms can be broken away from British imperialism. Holland and Britain are strongly linked together by a thousand ties, including the enormous Royal Dutch Shell Oil Trust, headed by the open enemy and opponent of Bolshevism, Sir Henry Deterding, and the Great Unilever Trust, which plunders Equatorial Africa for the joint benefit of British and Dutch shareholders. As for Portugal, it is within the pocket of the British Empire these last two hundred years. Therefore British imperialism is safe as far as its capitalist junior partners are concerned. But here the strategic problem is involved with the possibility of social-revolution, for the Indonesian revolt of 1926 was echoed again in the heroic mutiny of the sailors and the De Zeven Provinciën, when European and Malayan sailors fought together for the first time in history.

On the western sea route Britain holds the Suez Canal, has turned the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf into British lakes, has constructed the air and motor routes from Egypt and Palestine across the desert of Basra, and has made colonies, mandates or feudatories of all the hinterlands to these routes. So thus "independent" Iraq serves at once as a buffer State and an air base for war upon the Soviet Union, while if in South-West Arabia the Emem Yahia of the Yemen become too friendly with Italian imperialism, the British feudatory, Ibn Saud, brings him to heel in the war that was concluded last month.

But the strategic problems of British imperialism on the land frontiers are much greater than before 1914. Siam, bordering on Burma, has been subjected more and more to Japanese influence, while all round the north, north-western and north-eastern frontiers the Tsarist Empire and the Chinese Empire have been transformed by revolution. The radiations of revolution cross the most impassable mountain barriers. The moment the hour of revolution struck, British imperialism began to prepare to the defeat of that revolution from India as a base lest they themselves be defeated inside India by the revolutionary movement of the masses. Thus British imperialism, whilst consolidating its influence in South China and ceaselessly patrolling with its warships the Yang-tze-Kiang River, began in 1925 to establish a new frontier on the Chinese borders of Burma as a stage to the occupation of the districts in Yunnan and Szech-Wan. Only last December Pan Hung, the rich mining district of Yunnan, was invaded by two thousand British troops. In proportion as the Chinese Soviets take root and grow, British imperialism advances from the west.

Twenty-two years ago, when the Manchu Dynasty was overthrown, Lenin, in his article "Backward Europe and Advanced Asia," called attention to the way in which British imperialism proceeded at once to extend its influence in Tibet as a step in the partition of China. Since then the penetration of Tibet has gone steadily forward, until now the strategy of British imperialism, expressing its counter-revolutionary political aims, is to advance into Sin-Kiang (Chinese Turkestan), where it can threaten the flank of the Middle-Asian Soviet Republics.

For what the British imperialists term "the strategic defence of India" actually means the partition of China, imperialist war against the Chinese Soviets and imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. The advance to war in these regions is prepared by all sorts of "scientific expeditions," mountaineering and orographical, aeronautic and archaeological, anthropological, philological and "humanitarian" expeditions.

But each such advance extending the area of exploitation extends also the arena of the colonial revolution against British imperialism in the East Indies and the Middle East.

Therefore, British imperialism in attempting to solve by political strategic preparations for war the new problem of the colonial revolution, only creates further extensions and intensifications of that problem.

British imperialism is making preparations for war again, as was done before 1914. This time it faces a new round of problems. First, in the Dominions, and second, and more important, in the Colonies. The two problems are bound together in that British imperialism endeavours to make out of the "White Empire" a garrison to hold down the "Coloured Empire." Feverishly, measure after measure is being taken to meet the contradic-

tions that are rending and tearing within British imperialism. Allies are being sought and found among the feudal classes, amongst the National Reformists, and everywhere in the parties of social-democracy. An Empire fascism, with oppression multiplied upon oppression, is being built up in Britain, in the Dominions, and in the Colonies. British agriculture, by tariffs and quotas, is being placed upon a war footing. Two years ago the Ottawa Empire Conference was held—a war preparations conference, whose immediate results were increased hostile relations with the United States of America on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other.

But above all, in relation to the Colonies, British imperialism depends on the support of social-democracy. Whereas, before the war of 1914, social-democracy in WORDS was against war, only to betray the working-class movement when war broke out; this time social-democracy has helped to prepare the war. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress is at present elaborating the formula with which they will assure British imperialism of the support of social-democracy BEFORE the war breaks out. But deeds are still more important than words. Therefore the calculations of British imperialism for overcoming its problems by the help of social-democracy are based on the bloodthirsty practice of the Labour Government in its treatment of the Colonies, in its brutal repression in India, Palestine, and throughout the world.

But there is one factor which can upset these calculations. That is the growth of the consciousness amongst British workers that "no nation which oppresses another nation can itself be free"; that the class struggle at home is bound up with the class struggle in the Colonies, and that it is a common struggle of the British workers and the colonial masses against a common enemy.

WAR

ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TO WAR	6d.
THE TOILERS AGAINST WAR. KLARA ZETKIN.	1s.
WAR AGAIN TO-MORROW. NEMO.	1d.
THE PRESENT SITUATION IN GERMANY	3d.
THE FAR EAST ABLAZE	2d.
LENIN ON THE I.L.P.	3d.
THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS	9d.
JAPANESE IMPERIALISM STRIPPED	1d.
THE TWENTY-ONE POINTS OF THE C.I.	1d.

THE I.L.P. AND THE WAR DANGER

THE 6th World Congress of the Communist International pointed out in its resolution* on "The Struggle against Imperialist War" that the nearer and more clearly the threat of war advances, the more dangerous does "radical pacifism" become for the working class. And among the organisations mentioned as being the bearers of this "radical pacifism" a place is given to the I.L.P. in England, while among the slogans mentioned as being characteristic of this "radical pacifism" a place is given to the slogan of "general strike in reply to the declaration of war."

And it is precisely just now, when the war danger looms particularly heavily over the world, that the columns of the *New Leader*, the official organ of the I.L.P., are being plastered with the call to the British working class to put their faith in a "general strike" in the event of war breaking out. Louder than everybody else, feeling the tremendous pressure of the masses who are striving for a real struggle against capitalism, who desire a real struggle against the warmongers, and who are beginning to turn to Communism, Fenner Brockway is in the forefront with this very "revolutionary" slogan, hoping that by shouting this loud enough he may be able to persuade the workers that he really stands for a revolutionary policy, and that therefore revolutionary rank and file I.L.P.ers do not need to work for affiliation to the C.I., but should maintain the I.L.P. as the only "Socialist" Party of the working class.

This Brockway is the same war-time pacifist who in October, 1931, declared that he believed "the duty of pacifists . . . is to contribute a technique of revolution not based on violence." It is the same Brockway who just over a year ago, in trying to frighten the workers against taking a revolutionary course, hypocritically declared at the Derby Conference of the I.L.P. that "no Socialist would be foolish enough to throw untrained, unarmed masses against the powerful weapons of destruction which are in the hands of the capitalist class."

And now he comes forward as the apostle of the "general strike," a struggle against war which "must develop into a struggle for workers' power," and so on and so forth.

It seems therefore to be worth while to examine a little exactly what IS the attitude of Mr. Fenner Brockway on the war question, and we are helped in answering this question by an article written by him in the June 1st issue of the *New Leader* under the title of "The War Crisis."

What is the basic point that strikes you as you read this article? The fact that there is not a

single word in the article in reference to the danger of war on the Soviet Union. Well, you may say, Mr. Brockway is a busy man, he was anxious to make his point clear about the "general strike"—after all, people make such slips. But is it so simple as that? Is Mr. Brockway so green that he does not know that one of the most profound causes giving rise to the danger of war to-day is the fact that the capitalists throughout the world seek to smash the one country in the world where the workers are building Socialism, and to even, if only temporarily, solve their difficulties at the expense of the huge territory and wealth of the land of the proletarian dictatorship? Does he know nothing of Japan's war preparations against the U.S.S.R., of Germany's raging war preparations directed against the U.S.S.R., and of Great Britain's open and hidden support to these two outposts of world counter-revolution in their preparations against the fatherland of the world's workers? Can it be that he has already forgotten the point in the Wood Green resolution as adopted by the recent Annual Conference of the I.L.P., which "pledged the conference to unconditional refusal to assist any government whatever in the prosecution of war except for the purpose of defending a workers' Socialist Republic against imperialism" (leaving insufficiency and unclarity aside, the spirit of this rank and file proposal is there)? Can it be an accident that Brockway's henchman, C. A. Smith, Chairman of the London I.L.P., also forgot to devote a single word to the U.S.S.R., when in December last he issued an open letter to the Labour Party members, enquiring what they were going to DO to prevent war? (See *New Leader*, December 15th, 1933.) Can it be an accident that Maxton forgot to make any reference whatsoever to the Soviet Union, to the danger of war on the Soviet Union, in his opening remarks to the recent York Conference of the I.L.P., as chairman of the organisation? We do not think it is any accident at all. The greater and closer the war danger on the U.S.S.R. the more these "lefts" are trying to dull the watchfulness of the workers in this connection — and if they are not now engaged in slandering the U.S.S.R. in the same gross form as other bourgeois journals do, they keep silent about the necessity of the workers preparing to defend the workers' fatherland. They may be able to produce an occasional quotation where they refer to the need for the defence of the Soviet Union, but what is this worth when we remember such facts as the following?

For instance, during the recent Upton by-election where Brockway was I.L.P. candidate for Parlia-

* See *The Attitude of the Proletariat to War*.

ment, the Communist Party asked him to answer several questions, among which were questions regarding the peace policy of the Soviet Union. In reply, he declared that "he recognised the peace policy of the Soviet Union as the strongest factor for peace, but that he did not withdraw the criticisms he had made of certain aspects of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." And what were these "certain aspects" but that the Soviet was sacrificing the world revolution to its own interests by signing a trade agreement with Hitler and by offering to sell "Soviet interests in the Manchurian Far East Railway to Japan" (a trade agreement with the "democratic" National Government of MacDonald and Baldwin is, of course, quite in order!)?

And did not Maxton maintain the same line when in writing on the "New Policy of the I.L.P." just about a year ago (see *New Leader*, August 18th, 1933) he stated, "Even Russia does not display the aggressive confidence in international affairs that was characteristic of it two or three years ago, but bends the main proportion of its efforts to maintaining economic relations with even the most reactionary nations (the British National Government, of course, does not come within this category!) that will enable it to carry on its own plans of construction"? And did not the *New Leader* specially open its columns to the arch counter-revolutionary Trotsky after C. A. Smith had been to visit him (see *New Leader*, October 13th, 1933), in order to allow him to give the following encouragement to world counter-revolution: "Specifically," stated Trotsky to C. A. Smith, "the present Russian bureaucracy differs from the bourgeois bureaucracies of the capitalist countries in that the former desires to preserve the Soviet Union and the latter desire to overthrow it. Generally, however, **THEY ARE IDENTICAL IN OUTLOOK AND METHODS.**" (My emphasis—D.) The "impartial" Mr. Brockway printed this stuff without a word to indicate disagreement.

Yes, here we have the outlook of the I.L.P. leaders, and here we have the explanation why they refer to "capitalist and imperialist wars" but not to the danger of "counter-revolutionary" war on the Soviet Union. Mr. Trotsky has proven to them that if the imperialists desire to overthrow the Soviet Union it is merely a question of substituting one bureaucracy for another. If, then, Mr. Brockway and his cronies do not refer to the Soviet Union in their loud shouting about the "war danger" no conscious worker will be deceived into believing it is just an accident.

No more than he will be deceived into believing that it is quite by accident that the *New Leader* neither in its June 1st, 8th, and 15th issues says a single word about the rôle of the Soviet Union

in the struggle for peace at the Geneva Conference taking place at the time these issues appeared.

A specific feature therefore of the war preparations against the Soviet Union is, as far as the "lefts" are concerned, periodic slander of the Soviet Union, combined with silence regarding the actual war preparations directed against it, and silence regarding the active struggle for peace of the Soviet Government.

In this article, Mr. pacifist-turned-general-striker Brockway speaks of capitalist and imperialist wars—but about the rôle of British imperialism not a word. The failure of the Disarmament Conference, we learn from this article, will have the result that "Japan intends to build a navy as large as any in the world," as large perhaps as the navy of Great Britain, which would please neither the former I.L.P.er Mr. MacDonald nor the present I.L.P.er Mr. Brockway, nor their masters, British imperialism. But he "forgets" that Great Britain, for instance, "intends to build an air force as large as any in the world."

While ready a year ago to distort the relations between the Soviet Union and Japan and Germany, he does not now notice at all the "alliance" with "reactionary" Japan and the "dictatorship" of Hitler when British imperialism is concerned, directed as it is against the U.S.S.R.

No, Great Britain is as innocent now as it was in 1914, when, as he writes, "the Liberal Government WAS COMPELLED (my emphasis—D) to support France in a war against Germany, and when war came the peace policy of the Liberal Party counted for nothing." Poor honest John Bull—dragged into the last war by France! Poor honest Liberal Party of Sir Edward Grey, Asquith and Lloyd George! Is there any honest rank and file member of the I.L.P. who believes this attempt to whitewash the part played by British imperialism in the last war? Does Mr. Brockway himself believe it—we doubt it! If he were honest enough to tell the truth to the workers he would say precisely that the main antagonisms which gave rise to the war of 1914-1918 were those between imperialist Britain and imperialist Germany, he would say that the "peace policy" of the Liberal Party was the figleaf that covered the real war preparations of British imperialism, he would say that "the British imperialists at the present time have taken the place of the French as the chief organisers of an anti-Soviet war" and that "British and American imperialism, availing themselves of the war alarm in Europe and the events in the Far East, are increasing their preparations for a decisive imperialist struggle for world hegemony in the Atlantic and Pacific" (Thesis, 13th Plenum E.C.C.I.). But he chooses to paint the picture of innocent Britain being again drawn into war

because "IT IS THE LOCARNO PACT WHICH WILL INVOLVE BRITAIN IN A WAR BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. THE LABOUR PARTY (he adds) IS PLEDGED TO SUPPORT THAT WAR" (Brockway's emphasis). Like a good and faithful servant of British imperialism, he presents the latter as a passive instrument, the plaything of the struggle between France and Germany, and hides the active rôle of British imperialism, which, as the recent Disarmament Conference showed, is prepared to support German armament, within certain limits, against France's wish, in order thereby to provide the requisite mailed fist for a drive at the Soviet Union from the West.

And the Labour Party, he tells us, is pledged to support France. Once again poor innocent Labour Party, being dragged into war by their allegiance to the Locarno Pact. Here we see the "red herring" flung before the workers to hide from them the real ACTIVE rôle of the British Labour Party in its support for the policy of British imperialism.

A brief reading of the columns of the *Daily Herald*, the official organ of the Labour Party, particularly during the Disarmament Conference, will soon convince any worker that the hostile attitude of the Labour Party towards France left little to be desired by the British imperialists. Thus, the leading article in the *Daily Herald* of June 21st, 1934, states: "Many French statesmen cherish the hope of an alliance with Britain. They are crying for the moon. The Labour Party will not support an alliance with France or any other country." This leading article, however, adds: "Germany is re-arming and will go on re-arming. The question for France . . . is whether that re-arming should proceed by agreement . . ." i.e., the point of view of British imperialism.

Fenner Brockway tries to paint the picture of the Labour Party in such a way that the rank and file worker will not see what is really taking place.

"At the Labour Party Conference last autumn," he says, "a resolution was carried in favour of the general strike." A careful reading of the Hastings resolution will show that the Labour Party bureaucrats under the pressure of the masses took good care when drafting the resolution to mention the words "general strike" but by no means to declare for a "general strike." The resolution instructs the E.C. "to seek consultation . . . with a view to deciding . . . what steps including a general strike are to be taken . . ." Thousands of Labour Party workers really believed that the Labour Party declared for strike action, but, although the resolution was passed last October, they "sought consultation" until the end of June this year. And now they have openly declared themselves against

a general strike against war on the grounds of "its impracticability." They make it clear that, as far as they are concerned, there is not going to be anything in the nature of mass action against the warmongers. And they openly prepare the way for active support to the British Government in the event of war by declaring that they will defend the Empire in the event of the war being a "defensive" one. Since in any imperialist war, the tactics of the respective powers are to show that they are "defending" themselves against the aggression" of their opponents, the Labour and T.U.C. bureaucrats will in the event of war have little difficulty in "justifying" their betrayal of the working class and their service to British imperialism just as they did in 1914-18. This decision has been prepared by a series of declarations by responsible T.U. leaders.

The closer the war danger approaches, the more openly do the trade union and labour leaders speak. Citrine, Secretary of the T.U.C., declares a general strike for political purposes illegal; Bevin, Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union, is against a general strike; Bromley, Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, has openly declared that he could "conceive of circumstances when it would be to the interests of British trade unionism willingly to help our country in case of war." For instance, in a war of democracy against Fascist States. (And since the Labour Party has openly declared time and again that it is against the "dictatorship" of both Communism and Fascism, and since Mr. Citrine has written articles to prove that the trade unions in the Soviet Union are in the same situation as the "trade unions" in Fascist Italy and Germany, then in case of war on the Soviet Union it may also turn out to be "for the interests of British trade unionism willingly to help our country.") This lead given by Mr. Bromley, which prepares the way for support for British imperialism in time of war is not termed treacherous and counter-revolutionary by the pacifist Mr. Brockway, but a "dangerous lead." And he urges us later on, "unless there is immediate and overwhelming protest, we shall again see the horrible and humiliating spectacle of the British Labour Movement supporting a British capitalist Government in calling upon the workers of this country to slaughter the workers of other countries in their masters' interests." Mr. Brockway tries to give the impression that an "immediate and overwhelming protest" will prevent the leaders of the Labour Party, Trade Union Congress, etc., from supporting British imperialism either officially or unofficially. Let us just refresh Mr. Brockway's memory a little. At the Labour Party Conference held in January,

1916, a resolution protesting "against conscription in any form" was passed by 1,796,000 votes against 219,000 votes. A resolution opposing the "Military Service Bill" was passed by 1,716,000 votes to 360,000 votes. But in spite of this "immediate and overwhelming protest" the Labour leaders continued on recruiting platforms, joined the Government and operated conscription of the British working class to fight the battles of British imperialism.

And Mr. Brockway tries to tell the workers, after the experience of two Labour Governments, that the "protests" of the workers are going to stop the Labour bureaucracy from attempting to drive the British working class to be the cannon fodder of British imperialism in any war that may take place. Mr. Brockway tried to introduce some doubt into the minds of the working class as to whether the Labour Party will "repeat" what it did during the last war. The decision taken by the Labour and Trade Union leaders, to which we have referred above, shows that the answer, as far as they are concerned, is in the affirmative. "Is history repeating itself?" asks Mr. Brockway about the Labour Party. But what about the I.L.P. itself?

Let us recall, for instance, that the I.L.P. Chairman, Snowden, declared that "The present military crisis will, I sincerely hope, be only brief, and that immediate arrest of the advance of the enemy will again create a situation free from panic where the voice of reason may appeal for peace. The incredible ignorance or criminality of our (!) Government has lost Russia for the Allies . . ." (see official Report of Conference, page 42 onwards).

Let us recall that the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. suppressed the opposition of those members of the I.L.P. who were opposed to those Labour M.P.s "WHO HAVE SUPPORTED THE GOVERNMENT WITH ENTHUSIASM IN ALL THEIR REACTIONARY LEGISLATION, AND IN THEIR SUPPRESSION OF CIVIL LIBERTY, AND THEIR OPPRESSIVE METHODS" (my emphasis). (See N.A.C. Report to 1918 Conference of the I.L.P., page 24.)

The war, let it be remembered, was still on when the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. was taking this attitude "of refraining from encouraging any opposition to these sitting Labour M.P.s" (Ibid), so that any honest worker will be able to judge for himself how genuine was the "opposition" of the I.L.P. LEADERS to the war. But by their use of "opposition" phrases then, by encouraging the idea that it was better "to go to jail" than "serve in the capitalist army," the I.L.P. leadership succeeded in diverting the revolutionary energy and hostility to British imperialism of masses of rank and file workers into "conscientious objection" and isola-

tion from the masses of workers and soldiers by going to jail, etc. For which the British bourgeoisie was only thankful, and now that the war danger is growing more intense, Mr. Brockway and Company are at their game once again. "Conscientious objection" is not openly popularised, since it does not sound very well nowadays on the lips of a "revolutionary" party, so the slogans now spread include more "terrible," more "revolutionary" words.

"Indeed, Mr. Brockway, in his article, even ventures to say, "It (the I.L.P.) urges that at the first threat of war a general strike should be declared, legal or ILLEGAL. It is worth remembering that in the last war we find the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. declaring (ibid, pages 28 and 29) that as WE DID NOT FEEL that we could supply leaflets to, or URGE MEMBERS TO DISTRIBUTE LEAFLETS WHICH MIGHT RESULT IN LOCAL POLICE ACTION BEING TAKEN — we have not reprinted leaflets likely to be condemned by the censor, etc., etc. (my emphasis—D.).

Could a more miserable record be read of an organisation allegedly "fighting" war, which urges its members to cease even distribution of leaflets in case "it might result in local police action being taken"? Will history repeat itself, Mr. Brockway?

What does he actually propose? "The I.L.P. stands by the policy of uncompromising resistance to war." (To all war? To a revolutionary war of colonial peoples against their imperialist oppressors? To a revolutionary war of the Soviet Union against an imperialist onslaught? We would like to hear what the rank and file of the I.L.P. have to say about this—D.) "It urges," he continues, the workers to refuse to become soldiers, to refuse to make munitions, poison gas, to refuse to run the trains, to refuse to dig the coal. It urges that at the first threat of war a general strike should be declared, legal or illegal."

If the Labour and trade union leaders have now openly declared their hostility to strike action in connection with a future war on the grounds of its "impracticability" in order thereby to smash right now any possibility of revolutionary struggle against war, the "left reformists" of the type of Brockway hinder the real serious preparation to struggle against the warmongers by their light-hearted talk of refusal, in the event of war, to do this, that and the other and to merely declare a general strike. They hide from the workers the tremendous difficulties under which the workers will have to struggle. They hide the fact that when war comes about the bourgeoisie will direct the whole of its State apparatus against the workers to drive them to the slaughter. All the forces of the pulpit, press, platform, radio, and all the apparatus of repression at the disposal of the bourgeoisie

will be mercilessly directed against the workers. We have to face up to the fact of the effect of this gigantic pressure on masses of workers in the first stages of the war. Successful struggle against war under such conditions demands tremendous preparation in advance which such "leftist" "simple" solutions as the "revolutionary pacifist" Brockway puts before the working class merely serves to disarm.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks, who successfully transformed the last imperialist war into a "civil war against their own bourgeoisie," warned the workers precisely against the attitude of the "lefts." As the resolution of the 6th World Congress of the Comintern on the war question states:

"It is essential again and again, and as concretely as possible, to explain to the masses what the situation was at the time of the last war, and why that situation was inevitable."

"It is particularly necessary to explain to the masses the significance of the fact that the question of 'national defence' is becoming an inevitable question, which the enormous majority of the toilers will inevitably decide in favour of their own bourgeoisie." (Lenin.)

"In view of recent experiences of war, we must explain that on the morrow of the declaration of war, such an enormous number of theoretical and social questions will arise, that the overwhelming majority of the men called up for service will find it utterly impossible to examine them with a clear head and with any degree of impartiality." (Lenin.)

The Trade Union and Labour Party bureaucrats are preparing even now to make sure that the workers will answer all these theoretical and social questions in favour of the bourgeoisie.

Fenner Brockway and Company, on the other hand, are hiding from the working class the circumstances under which war breaks out. Let it be remembered that the secrecy in which the governments make their war plans is far greater now than in 1914. The experience of the Japanese onslaught in China in 1931, without even the formality of declaring war, the war that is now being waged against Soviet China by the Kuomintang supported by the various imperialists, the fact that military specialists openly speak of the necessity of a swift and sudden blow as being decisive in a coming war—all these show that the "simple solution" offered by Mr. Brockway is leftist phrasemongering that plays into the hands of the trade Union and Labour Party bureaucrats. Here is what Lenin and the Bolsheviks stated:

"We must tell the masses the real facts about the profound secrecy in which Governments make their plans for war and how impotent the ordinary labour organisations, even those that call themselves revolutionary, are in the face of impending war." (Lenin.)

The Bolsheviks, having a well-set-up illegal organisation, were the only Party able to carry on revolutionary work during the war. Yet even they could no more prevent the masses from responding to the bourgeois call for "national defence" than they could prevent the outbreak of war, notwithstanding the fact that the proletarian

struggle in Russia was at high tide at that period. In fact, only a few weeks before the outbreak of war, barricades were erected in the streets of St. Petersburg.

Consequently, only by thoroughly explaining to the masses the tremendous difficulties that have to be overcome in a real struggle against war can the foundation be laid for the solution of the tactical problems involved in this struggle (6th Congress Resolution on War, Section A., Sub-section 1, S.14 (b)).

As against Brockway's "leftist" slogan shouting, the Bolsheviks approach the question of the struggle against war in the following serious fashion:

"... the only possible way of continuing revolutionary work after the outbreak of war is the creation of an illegal organisation. But, an illegal organisation is also necessary in the anti-war struggle before war breaks out." (Ibid. S.16.)

As for the political programme of the Communists during imperialist war, one of its basic points is "the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war," and this means first and foremost "revolutionary mass action." But Mr. Brockway will attempt to tell you that the line he indicates implies "revolutionary mass action," to which the Comintern in the 6th Congress resolution replies that—

"the struggle against war is not a single and simultaneous act, and that revolutionary mass action on the part of the workers and poor peasants, in the rear and at the front, for the armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie, is the only proper means of combatting war, to which all other means must be directed." (Ibid. S.19.)

And as for replying to war by a general strike, the Communists followed Lenin's lead when he made it clear that—

"It is impossible to 'reply' to war with a general strike, just as it is impossible to reply to war with 'revolution,' in the simple and literal sense of the word." (Ibid. S.20.)

This is further commented on in the 6th Congress resolution as follows:

"But while Communists repudiate the slogan of 'reply to war with a general strike, and warn the workers against harbouring such illusions, which can only injure the real struggle against war, they do not by any means abandon the weapon of the general strike in the struggle against war, and sharply condemn any suggestion to do so as an opportunist deviation. Side by side with other revolutionary mass actions (demonstrations, strikes in munition works, transport strikes, etc.), the general strike—as the supreme form of the mass strike movement—is an extremely important weapon, and as a transition to the armed uprising it constitutes a stage in the transformation of imperialist war into civil war. This transformation, however, does not depend upon the will of the Party alone. It presupposes the existence of a revolutionary situation, the capacity of the proletariat for mass action, etc. These conditions do not as a rule prevail at the very beginning of the war; they develop in the course of the war. But even in war time the general strike does not come like a bolt from the blue. It comes on the rising tide of revolutionary mass action (demonstrations, partial strikes, etc.), and as a result of the persistent preparation, which the Communists must make, and which may entail heavy sacrifice. Of course, a general strike in war time will lead to revolutionary results much more rapidly than in peace time; but it is by no means easier

to prepare for and organise it in war time than in peace time. On the contrary, in war time the bourgeoisie will take determined counter-measures to prevent it. They will call the strikers to the colours, militarise the factories, etc. Communists, therefore, cannot, in war time, confine themselves to abstract general propaganda. As in peace time, they must carry on daily revolutionary work in the factories and trade unions. They must champion the economic demands of the workers and link up these demands with anti-war propaganda; organise revolutionary factory councils; capture the subordinate trade union organisation; eliminate the social-patriotic elements from these organisations, and, when they have been captured, elect new executives parallel with the reformist executives, and despite the will of the latter, organise, lead and extend partial strikes, etc. The general strike must not be an abstract watchword. It must be the aim and the outcome of our general practical activity. That being the case, the revolutionary proletariat must be ready, in the event of a general strike, firmly to steer a course towards transforming the strike to an armed rebellion, if conditions are propitious for that." (Ibid, S.20.)

Mr. Brockway, however, starts out from the assumption of a general strike "at the first threat of war." And if the workers do not immediately respond, then, doubtless, he will, as of old, point his finger at the workers and put the blame on them. But if there should be resistance on the part of the workers, the I.L.P., says he, "realises that such resistance must become resistance not only to war, but to the Government which declares war."

But suppose the Government does not "declare" war?

Suppose it is on the "defensive," the trade union leaders have openly declared where they stand. They will defend British capitalism—all that is necessary is to prove that it is a "defensive" war! The Bolshevik position is clear, namely, that whether the "home" imperialist Government is on the "offensive" or "defensive"—it is an imperialist Government participating in a robber war and therefore the Bolsheviks work for the defeat of the "home" imperialist Government.

"The I.L.P.," he continues, "recognises that the struggle must develop into a struggle for workers' power, that it must be carried on until the capitalist Government is overthrown and a new form of workers' government replaces it."

All of which sounds very fine, but vague enough not to seriously trouble the capitalists, not to mention that all talk of carrying on a struggle against a capitalist government during war is so much moonshine if steps have not been taken to set up an illegal party organisation BEFORE the war breaks out.

To carry on a struggle until the "capitalist government is overthrown" is, if we are serious and honest proletarian revolutionaries, to smash the capitalist state machine, and by armed uprising to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in its Soviet form, as was done in Russia at the end of 1917. But Mr. Brockway, we can say, deliberately avoids clearly using the language we have used and instead talks of the establishment of a "new form of workers' government." But apart from the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no workers' government. Any other government operating on the old State apparatus and not created by the working class can only be a bourgeois government, even if it be a Parliamentary Government where all, or the majority of the portfolios, are held by I.L.P. "socialist" ministers and it calls itself a "workers'" government.

That Mr. Brockway is so vague is no accident, for what was true of the differences between the I.L.P.er, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and Lenin, 15 years ago, is true of the differences between Mr. Brockway and the Bolsheviks to-day.

In his article written exactly 15 years ago entitled "The Tasks of the 3rd International,"* and devoted to the attitude of the I.L.P.er Ramsay MacDonald to the 3rd International, Lenin stated that:

"The most profound and radical differences, which sum up all that which has been said above, and explain the inevitability of an irreconcilable theoretical and practical-political struggle of the revolutionary proletariat against the 'Berne' International, are the questions of the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, and the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Further on Lenin adds:

"Attempts are made to recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat in words in order secretly to drag in alongside of it the 'will of the majority,' 'universal suffrage' (this is exactly what Kautsky does), bourgeois parliamentarism, rejection of the complete destruction, blowing up, complete breaking up of the whole of the bourgeois state apparatus. These new evasions, new loopholes of reformism must be feared more than anything else."

It is the task of the British Communists, in taking the teachings of Lenin as the basis for their struggle against the war danger, to pay special attention to the exposure of left radical pacifism as one of the most dangerous tendencies in the working-class movement aiming at preventing the working class emerging victoriously in the event of imperialist war, as the Russian workers and peasants did out of the last war under the leadership of the Bolsheviks headed by Lenin.

* See "Lenin on the I.L.P."

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

TWENTY years have passed since German imperialism threw itself into the world war with the confident belief that it would be able, by means of its army and its military power, to bring about the ancient dream of the German bourgeoisie. Long before 1914 the theoreticians of German imperialism had worked out in detail plans of annexations and conquests. Already at that time the theory of a people "without a territory" was widely used, and much was spoken of the great cultural mission of the German nation, which brought culture to the "lower races" at the point of the bayonet. Long before the world war, German economists used figures and diagrams to prove that the German people which was "deprived of territory" needed conquests and the EXTENSION of its frontiers if it was to secure salvation and the possibility of development. The slogan that "The future of Germany is on the seas" was launched at that time. Some tens of years have passed, and German imperialism of the fascist order has replaced this slogan by another one, namely, that "The future of Germany is in the air." And the Frantz Herman type of national socialist writers write "utopias of the immediate future," in which the German air squadrons conquer Ukraine, India and Egypt.

German imperialism, thorough-going and solid even in its fantasies and dreams, had two alternative plans of political and military expansion on the eve of the world war. The first of these was directed towards the Near East and had in view German penetration at first in the Balkans, then to the Bosphorus and to Bagdad. Still further, the German imperialists dreamt of the shores of India and in the mists of the future, of world hegemony. This plan, the south-eastern alternative, was carefully elaborated and thought out, and was carried into effect with exceptional energy. The second alternative plan of German imperialist expansion, the so-called "western" plan, became politically urgent only after the defeat on the Marne, when the German general staff became convinced of the impossibility of securing decisive military successes on the Western front. Somewhat later this "Eastern plan" was given flesh and blood, was realised in the shape of the occupation of the Ukraine. The German bourgeoisie counted on ending the war in the West as a draw, while at the same time seizing enormous territories in the East under the guise of Hetman rule over the Ukraine. It would, however, be a mistake to imagine that the famous "Ukrainian plan" of General Hoffman took shape in the brains of the German general staff and the German diplomats only during the war. In pre-war Germany the "Ukrainian prob-

lem" was dealt with in an extensive and instructive literature. The conception of including Ukraine in the sphere of Prussian influence was first advanced during the Crimean War in 1853 by a group of Prussian politicians under the leadership of Moritz von Bethman-Hollweg, who instructed the Prussian ambassador in London, Bunsen, to draw up a memorandum on the Ukraine. In it he developed the idea of the necessity of forming an independent Ukraine as a protectorate of Prussia. At the end of 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War, the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, instructed his friend, the philosopher, Edward Hartman, to publish an article in the journal *Die Gegenwart* on the necessity of thrusting Russia out to the East. Hartman advanced the plan of forming an independent Ukrainian State with frontiers running through Vitsbsk, Kursk, Saratov, the Volga and Astrakhan. The hopes of putting this plan into action blossomed freely during the war, when scores of pamphlets dealing with the Ukraine were published. Among them were the works of Rohrbach, Klainov, Schrupp and many others. Prof. Gensch wrote insistently in his works of the necessity of forming an "Inter-Europe" (Zwischen-Europa). The Ukraine, according to this conception, opened the path to German imperialism across the Caucasus into Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia and India. A certain A. Rudolph demanded the return to Germany of its historic "hunting grounds" which stretched, if we are to believe him, right up to the Urals. Martin Spann stated right at the beginning of the war that "Our struggle in the East is not only romantic faithfulness to the ideal of the Niebelung, but a political assurance of the vital interests of the German race."

In 1918, German imperialism tried to carry out the Eastern plan and suffered a double defeat, as follows: in the Ukraine at the hands of the proletarian revolution, and in the West from the proletarian revolution and the armies of the Entente. The German bourgeoisie, who imagined that they had taken every factor into account, left out of account in addition a factor like the German proletariat. The robber dreams of the imperialists which had been paid for in the blood and sufferings of millions of toilers, shamefully collapsed. German monopolist capital, defeated in the world war and compelled to sign the Versailles Treaty, appeared to have been removed for a long time from active participation in the imperialist stage.

After the failure in 1923 of its so-called passive resistance in the Ruhr region, Germany began to fulfil the obligations put on it by the Versailles

Treaty. In the sphere of foreign politics—an era of “pacifism” set it. In estimating the policy of this so-called Stressmann period, we should take as our starting point the fact that the bourgeois circles behind Stressmann had by no means given up the idea of restoring the power of German imperialism. This has not prevented the Hitlerites from accusing the politicians of the Weimar period of “internationalism,” of betraying the interests of the nation, etc. But Stressmann and Brüning were no less convinced imperialists than the present rulers of the Third Empire. At the same time it would be a mistake to over-simplify the situation, and regard the foreign policy of Weimar Germany as being identical with that of the Hitler régime.

Stressmann, and within certain limits also General von Seckt, and von Schleicher, who played a very important rôle in the foreign policy of Germany before the Hitler period, regarded the struggle against Versailles as a lengthy process, and took into account that the restoration of the power of German imperialism would take place very slowly, and would pass through numerous stages. Germany must not reckon on rapid big successes, but on the small but sure results of everyday diplomatic activity. Stressmann constructed his policy on a view which envisaged this process of the restoration of the power of German imperialism as extending over a long period. During this period, as Stressmann presumed, German imperialism would have to play a subordinate rôle, dragging in the wake of British or French imperialism. Gradually, however, Germany would free itself from the burden weighing her down, and the time would come when, as a result of its small successes, German imperialism would come out on to the broad path of expansion and struggle for the noted “place in the sun.” Stressmann consistently carried on this policy. Though an open imperialist, before the defeat of Germany, he came out after the signing of the Versailles Treaty, as an equally ardent pacifist, and a loyal supporter of the League of Nations. Following the line of “conciliation,” Stressmann was able to secure some concrete results, such as the withdrawal of military control, the withdrawal of the military control commissions, the evacuation of all three occupied zones, and later began negotiations for the solution of the Saar problem before it was due. The development of events seemed to justify Stressmann’s tactics. Germany slowly but surely came out on to the broad imperialist path.

Other German politicians of the military type, especially von Seckt, were rather sceptical of these calculations of Stressmann. They did not believe that the restoration of the power of German imperialism could proceed entirely along such a path

of evolution. These German bourgeois politicians considered that there was a definite limit to the voluntary concessions made by France, beyond which France would not go. First of all, Germany could not reckon on having the right to equality in armaments recognised. By taking the path of “small business,” Germany could not obtain decisive results. Nevertheless, Seckt and the others did not reject the tactics of Stressmann, and considered that Germany had no alternative but the policy of “conciliation” (*Verständigungs politik*). In such conditions, however, the chief reliance must be placed on the international situation, on the absolutely inevitable sharpening of the contradictions between the victorious powers. Germany must wait for the clashing of these contradictions, and show the greatest caution and restraint until this moment. At that point, however, when the international atmosphere became heated to a definite point, Germany, which would have carried out all the preparatory work, would proceed to restore its military power at rapid speed and would emerge on to the broad imperialist highway. The pre-requisites for this were to be the maintenance of freedom of action for Germany, for which the policy of balancing between the West and the East is vitally necessary. It requires what they liked to call the “Russian card” in Berlin, naïvely and confidently believing that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was simply a passive card in the hands of the cunning and cautious German player. At the same time, very much was done to create the economic pre-requisites for future armaments. In the secret cupboard of certain industrial enterprises, and in the pigeon-hole of the Reichswehr, the designs for the construction of all kinds of armaments were preserved. As a military reserve, extensive financial aid was given to the “Steel Helmets” and even the social-democratic “Republican Flag” organisation was regarded as a military organisation in the rough.

The policy of Stressmann, as well as von Seckt’s alternative, had in view, as we have stated, activity stretching over a lengthy period, and the use of cautious methods, the repudiation of adventurist experiments. A necessary condition for the carrying out of this foreign policy was the preservation of parliamentarism and the utilisation of social-democracy with a view to the all-round deception of the proletarian masses. The blows of the economic crisis undermined the foundations of this reformist pacifist policy, with an ever-increasing force. The death of Stressman was a kind of symbol in this respect. German monopolist capital became convinced that it was illusory to calculate on a foreign policy carried out at a slow tempo. A process of the re-arming and

re-grouping of the forces of the German bourgeoisie began. The Brüning Government already made a change in tactics both in the sphere of home and foreign politics as seen in the speeding-up of the offensive against the working class on the one hand and in the activation of diplomatic activity on the other hand. The attempt to bring about the Anschluss—the signing of the Kurzius-Schauber protocol in the spring of 1931, was a manifestation of this new line.

As is known, this policy broke down. Papen came to power, and the German bourgeoisie made an attempt to get out of the impasse by bringing about a military alliance with France directed against the U.S.S.R., in the sphere of foreign policy, and by bringing about a régime of fascist dictatorship directed against the working class in home politics.

However, the conditions became more and more threatening. German capitalism began to totter more and more, and to crumble away under the blows of the crisis. A new revolutionary wave began to grow. In the autumn of 1932, the Communist Party won millions of new votes, and a wave of strikes developed against the Papen law on wage-cuts, a wave which reached its apex in the Berlin Transport Workers' strike. German monopolist capital was forced to adopt a serious decision and to use its reserve, namely, the fascist National Socialist party.

The German bourgeoisie gave the following twofold and very responsible mission to Hitler and his staff. In the sphere of home politics the National Socialists were to destroy the Communist Party and to weaken the revolutionary menace with the aid of blood-letting; while in the sphere of foreign politics they were to carry out a policy of emerging from the crisis along the path of war. The National Socialist Party came to power with a programme worked out in detail for an expansionist foreign policy, as set out in a number of documents, especially in Hitler's "My Struggle," the bible of National Socialism, and in the "Future Path of German Foreign Policy." At the basis of the foreign political conception of the National Socialist strategists was and is the idea of a military alliance, and, moreover, exclusively an offensive one. Hence, Hitler makes it his basic task to make Germany "capable of alliance" (bundig-fähig).

For this purpose the following pre-requisites are necessary, namely, *a régime of unlimited terrorist dictatorship in Germany, potential allies and a basis for alliance*. The first of these pre-requisites set out by Hitler himself was immediately created by the National Socialists. The potential allies were also decided on in advance by the National

Socialist leaders, and were to have been in the first place Great Britain and Italy. In order to attract the former to participate in a military alliance, Germany had to make Britishers believe that National Socialist Germany had forever abandoned all the ideas of rivalry with Great Britain. This, of course, was still insufficient to draw in Great Britain, and Hitler expected to utilise the traditional policy of the balance of power applied by Great Britain, which at the given moment was interested in preventing France from increasing its rôle to that of a world power. Therefore, Great Britain was to support fascist Germany against France, which had become a menace to British interests. However, Hitler understood that all this edifice was without a firm basis. He therefore placed a foundation under the idea of a British-German military alliance, in the shape of the preparation of an anti-Soviet war. Thus, Hitler's conception amounts to the following: Great Britain, which is interested in weakening France, cannot nevertheless permit the strengthening of Germany in the West. It consistently conducts an anti-Soviet policy and strives towards the annihilation of the U.S.S.R. Finally, Great Britain understands that the path for expansion must be opened to German imperialism, otherwise an explosion is inevitable. The anti-Soviet plan satisfies all these demands.

Thus a basis is formed for Germany's active foreign policy. Germany can come out on to the broad highway of aggression and territorial plunder only along the line of anti-Soviet war. This is the basis on which the Ukrainian plan is built in the foreign policy of German fascism, which reproduces the line of the German general staff of the period of the end of the world war. The national socialists are the lawful heirs of the pre-war type of German imperialism, and have adopted the "Ukrainian alternative" of Bunsen, Hartman and General Hoffmann. The theory of "A people without territory," "A nation without space," has been brought to the forefront again.

Hitler writes:

"We must find the courage to unite our people, to collect their forces for a movement along the path which will bring Germany out of the present limitations of the living area for the people to a new territory, and thus liberate it for ever from the danger of perishing on this land."

"The gigantic struggle of 1914-1918 was lost because the German people entered it without being in essence a world power. It was and still is at the present time a country on our planet in which the relationship between the size of the population and the size of the territory is unusually pitiful. In the epoch when the land was completely divided between the states, it was impossible to speak of the world rôle of a country whose territory was limited to a pitiful area of only about half a million square kilometres."

Further, Hitler states that:

"The frontiers of a state are formed by people and are changed by people. The fact that some nation is able to possess an enormous territory does not mean that this fact will be recognised for ever." (Trans. from the Russian.)

Even before he came to power, Hitler finished off all the detail and explained what territory he was speaking about:

"We National Socialists begin where Germany stopped six centuries ago. We are completing the century-long movement of the German race to the South and West of Europe and are turning our gaze to the lands of the East. We are finishing with the commercial and colonial policy of pre-war times and are passing on to the policy of conquering new territories, and when we speak to-day of new lands in Europe and the districts under its power, we have in view Russia and the territory under its control."

Hitler considers that the Government of Wilhelm made many mistakes when it spoiled its relations with other countries. "For one thing only it does not deserve censure, and that is that it did not maintain good relations with Russia."

Rosenburg, in his books, gives a philosophic foundation to Hitler's foreign political conception, and, moreover, he openly emphasised that the destruction of the Polish State is a prime necessity for Germany. Further, Rosenburg has stated that the conquest of Poland and Ukraine is an intermediate link towards a further policy of annexations directed towards the Caucasus, Persia and Syria.

Such was the programmatic line with which the national socialists came to power, a line which cannot be called inconsistent. It would, however, be a mistake to regard the foreign political plan of the Third Empire as being simply a repetition of the so-called "Ukrainian alternative" of the pre-war plan of German imperialism. For whereas for the latter the conquest of the Ukraine was equivalent to a seizure of territory, for fascist Germany a war against the U.S.S.R. would not only be an act of foreign policy, but also one of home policy. It represents a struggle against Communism, against the citadel of the world revolution, the Soviet Union. The aggressive foreign policy of German fascism fully corresponds to his home policy, the crushing of the proletariat and the struggle against the revolutionary movements, and the attempt to drown them in blood. Further, the "Eastern plan" of the national socialists differs from the pre-war projects in that, under conditions when the world is closely approaching a new round of revolutions and war, it is regarded by the German bourgeoisie as the only path of salvation for capitalist Germany. This is the main difference in principle between the national socialist anti-Soviet plans and the "Ukrainian conception" of pre-war German imperialism.

The national socialists came to power on January 30th, 1933, with such a programme. Immediately after their victory they began to carry out their anti-Soviet policy, including the moral preparations of the petty-bourgeoisie mass for an anti-Soviet war, and slander against the U.S.S.R., as well as the negotiations of Rosenberg in London and the famous Hugenberg memorandum. The national socialists calculated that their victory and the declaration of their readiness to stand at the head of an anti-Soviet bloc would immediately cause the latter to crystallise, and that in the process of the preparations for an anti-Soviet war, Germany would be able to re-arm herself. The first calculations were a fiasco, being dictated not so much by properly formed ideas as by the intoxication of victory at home. Six months before he came to power, Hitler explained in a letter to von Papen that a prerequisite for an active German foreign policy was increased armaments.

On October 16th, 1933, a sharp change took place in the foreign political course of Germany. The national socialists concentrated all their efforts on armaments, temporarily leaving everything else on one side. As a result, Germany resigned from the League of Nations and left the disarmament conference, and we say the beginning of a stage in the struggle for armaments, concealed by the smokescreen of impudent "pacifism" and demagoguery. The national socialist leaders permitted themselves to make statements which would have cost Stressmann his life had he dared to make them. First of all, a complete *volte face* took place in respect to Poland.

In the programme principles of the National Socialists the destruction of Poland was regarded as the first stage of an "active" policy, and in the first few months of the National Socialist régime German-Polish relations took on a most tense character, and the landing of Polish troops on Westerplatt threatened a serious conflict. But the second half of 1933 saw a period of flirting between Germany and Poland. First of all the National Socialists in Danzig declared their loyalty to Poland, and then the Hitler-Lipsky declaration on non-aggression was published. Finally, a treaty was signed on the repudiation of violence, and a "moral pact" of non-aggression was concluded providing for mutual control over the press and radio material. An era of touching German-Polish friendship set in. Such a policy is easy to understand from the point of view of Germany. Germany needs first of all to provide for the safety of the Eastern frontier while she is re-arming herself. Then it is very important for her to make a breach in the French system of alliances, and to strike a heavy blow at France. Finally, owing to her rapprochement with Poland, fascist Germany can demonstrate her loyalty to peace.

The foreign policy of Polish imperialism has a much more complicated under-structure. The Polish bourgeoisie, taught by the bitter experience of the Four-Power Pact, have decided to insure themselves against all eventualities and, as Herenshaft, the German correspondent in Warsaw, has expressed it, to ride simultaneously on three horses. Poland is trying to maintain an alliance with France and at the same time to establish close collaboration with Germany. As a result, a situation has arisen in which the "faithful" ally of France supports the policy of Berlin on the question of armaments which are directed against France. Further, Poland has evidently given Germany a guarantee in one form or another that it will not hinder the bringing about of the Anschluss at the moment when Germany considers this to be advisable.

However, it would be a gross mistake to close sight of a tendency among some influential circles of the Polish bourgeoisie, including those near to Pilsudsky, who consider that the present form of German-Polish relations is not sufficient, and who are trying to find a common language with Germany on the basis of an anti-Soviet policy. The adherents of this idea link up their calculations with the chances of an attack on the U.S.S.R. by Japanese imperialism, and are working out a plan for making appropriate use of the situation together with Germany.

Thus the question at issue is the attempt of Poland to come to terms with Germany, regarding the Corridor and Silesia, on the basis of an anti-Soviet policy. National Socialist strategists insistently support this tendency of certain Polish circles, because they know that the first stage of German-Polish military collaboration will under any circumstances be the occupation of Poland by the German army. These perspectives do not escape the sight of the cautious circles of the Polish bourgeoisie, who are afraid of the catastrophic results of a policy of adventure.

However this may be, National Socialist Germany has made excellent use of the Polish manoeuvre, and has struck a serious blow at the position of France on the question of armaments. At the same time, the very unfavourable position of England has been made clear. In the Far East Great Britain is interested on the one hand in the weakening of its basic rival, the U.S.A., and on the other hand it fears too great a strengthening of Japan which is a menace to the vital interests of Great Britain. In such circumstances Great Britain tries to direct Japanese aggression against the U.S.S.R. In Europe British imperialism is trying to create a relationship of forces which would permit Great Britain to play the rôle of deciding factor, and would guarantee the safety

of her rear, thus ensuring freedom of action in the Pacific. Great Britain had calculated that as a result of the World War, France and Germany would be equally weakened and that a balance of power would be created which would fully correspond to British interests. These calculations, however, proved to be mistaken. French imperialism restored its forces at a relatively high speed, and France began to lay claim to the rôle of a world Power, building up its military hegemony in capitalist Europe on a powerful army and a system of military alliances. As a result, a very complicated position arose for Great Britain, and it became necessary to have another strong continental factor as an offset to France. This explains the support given by Great Britain to the German bourgeoisie during the last few years.

Nevertheless, Great Britain reckoned on the process of the restoration of Germany's military power taking place slowly so that London would always be able to regulate it according to its own interests at any given moment. The coming of the National Socialists to power shattered these calculations of Great Britain, and put it in a very unfavourable position. It should be kept in mind that besides its strivings to play the rôle of arbitrator in European matters, Great Britain was also forced to reckon on other circumstances. First of all Great Britain cannot at the present moment allow an armed Franco-German conflict to take place, as she would inevitably be involved, in view of her Locarno obligations and, of course, mainly by reason of her vital interests. This in turn would mean a blow at the British Empire, as the Dominions in 1925 demonstratively refused to sign the Locarno Pact. Further, Great Britain cannot permit the destruction of Germany, because this would mean the breakdown of German capitalism. Finally, the British imperialists understand quite well that an armed Germany would be a very serious danger for Great Britain itself. The time has passed when Great Britain felt itself to be completely out of danger behind the protecting guns of its battleships. German military aviation could make Great Britain pass through very serious trials. First of all Great Britain has determinedly resisted all attempts at the preventative destruction of Germany. At the same time Great Britain has put pressure on Germany with the help of the anti-Hitler debates in the House of Commons in the summer of 1933. At the beginning of October, 1933, British policy took a line in the direction of France on the question of German armaments, and it was decided to revise the plan of MacDonald in a direction which was worse for Germany. When Germany resigned from the League of Nations and left the Disarmament Conference, this placed Britain in a difficult

position, depriving it of the rôle of arbitrator and transforming it into one of the participants in the struggle being conducted on the question of armaments. In its memorandum of January 29th, 1934, Great Britain took the line of equality of rights for Germany in armaments.

Under the pressure of Great Britain and also of Italy, France became convinced that it could not reckon on Poland, which was adopting a waiting policy and was playing a double game. France decided to enter into direct negotiations with Germany on the question of armaments. These negotiations, which took the form of concessions between Francois Poncier and Hitler, and also the exchange of notes and memorandums, lasted until April 16th, 1934, when the French Government in its note to Great Britain stated its decision to break off negotiations and to refuse to legalise German armaments. At the same time France attempted to obtain from Great Britain an extension of its Locarno guarantees. According to the French conception, Britain should guarantee the safety not only of France and Belgium, but of all France's allies. Further, Britain should guarantee the fulfilment of a convention on German armaments if this should be signed. The British undertakings should be fixed in the form of automatic sanctions—economic, diplomatic and military.

Great Britain absolutely refused to widen the framework of the Locarno undertakings which it was rather trying to narrow down. The refusal of Great Britain to give guarantees and sanctions fully corresponds to British foreign policy in Europe. Great Britain considers that the only way out is the re-arming of Germany and the restoration of German military power within certain limits. France must not be subject to attack from Germany but must sacrifice its allies, at whose expense the annexationist appetite of German imperialism will be partly satisfied. After this, though France preserves its military power, it will be isolated, and be completely dependent on British support and aid. Thus, Britain is trying to solve its basic continental task, namely, the establishment of the balance of power, by means of which Great Britain will play the rôle of super-arbiter.

At the same time, British imperialism reckons with the fact that Germany must be compensated and supplied with territory, even if only temporarily. This must partly be done through the Anschluss and at the expense of Czecho-Slovakian territory, but in the main at the expense of the "Eastern territories" (the famous "Ostraum"). On this point certain circles of the British bourgeoisie give full support to the Hitler-Rosenburg plan. This line in British foreign policy was shown fairly plainly during the June session of the general commission and of the bureau of the disarmament

conference. Nevertheless, France decided once more to try to force Great Britain to change its policy and at Geneva was prepared to compromise on the question of security and regional pacts. This policy, as later events showed, brought some positive results to France.

Germany is carrying out a reckless policy of arming itself, by taking advantage of Poland's manoeuvres and the support of Great Britain and Italy. Without waiting for the time when the equality of Germany will be recognised in some official document, Germany is arming itself at a most intense speed. For a whole year, hundreds of industrial enterprises have been re-equipping themselves, mobilisation reserves of military raw materials have been established, a tremendous amount of work is being performed for the development of military aviation, and extensive underground airports are being established in a number of points, especially in East Prussia. At the same time, preparations are being made to enlarge the Reichswehr to 300,000, and at the same time it is proposed to set up a so-called "big" army on the principle of combining the volunteer army with one based on conscription.

The core of the Reichswehr have to remain the professional cadres. The National Socialists are attempting to win the sympathy of the Reichswehr by the policy which its régime is pursuing of arming the country, advancing war credits and preparing to enlarge the army. The National Socialists have further been able to attract the young officers to themselves by cutting down the period required for promotion. Simultaneously for a year and a half, purely military preparations have been going on in the form of intensive psychological preparations for war through the inflaming of animal nationalism and the racial theory, which justify the right of the German race to conquer and subject other peoples.

The task of Germany on the question of armaments is by no means to reach the level of military power of France. Fascist Germany needs the creation of such a volume of human and military technical resources for two or three months as would enable it to carry on a "defensive" war so that by the end of this period she could fully utilise the enormous possibilities of her war industry to take up the offensive. The National Socialists are consistently carrying out this plan, and the negotiations which they are conducting on the question of armaments have a double aim, namely, either German armaments will be legalised or the negotiations will serve as a smokescreen to hide the feverish rearming of Germany. **IN TWO OR THREE YEARS GERMAN IMPERIALISM WILL NOT NEED ANY CONVENTIONS OR LEGALISATION, AS IT WILL SECURE**

EQUALITY OF ARMAMENTS BY DIRECT ACTION, WITHOUT REGARD TO LEGAL FORMS.

There can be no doubt that German imperialism has some very powerful levers in its hands. First of all, there is the feeling that it is immune from punishment, thanks to the fear of the capitalist powers that a proletarian revolution may take place in Germany. Further a tremendous rôle is played by the tremendous industrial possibilities of Germany for war production. Finally, international conditions favour Germany's aggressive plans to a certain extent. The manoeuvres of Great Britain, which has decided to utilise the German armaments in its own interests, the policy of Poland, in which adventurist tendencies are growing stronger, the support of Italy to Germany—all these things in certain conditions may create a state of affairs in Europe resembling that in the Pacific. Just as Japan is incomparably weaker than the U.S.A. and Great Britain as an imperialist power, but is carrying out its policy of annexation and not meeting with resistance, so German imperialism in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, in the heated atmosphere of the preparations for war, is bringing about that which German imperialism was unable to secure in 1914-18. The strength of German imperialism lies in the fact that while a number of imperialist countries do not expect to win anything from war and wish to avoid it, while others are trying to switch the war danger on to lines more profitable to them, German imperialism knows what it wants and will not stop at anything, ignoring all its international undertakings, to burst through on to the broad highroad of imperialist aggression. The German imperialists are trying to utilise the experience of their Japanese confederates, and it is not surprising that the latter are so dear to the National Socialist leaders. In such circumstances, Germany is becoming just such a centre of the war danger in Europe as imperialist Japan is in the Far East.

As we have already mentioned, German imperialism has a number of useful levers at its disposal in its policy of preparing to remake the map of Europe, a policy which is only to serve as the prelude to the remaking of the map of the world. At the same time, however, there are extremely vulnerable spots in the foreign political line of German imperialism. Firstly it should be remembered that all the economic experiments of the German Government have collapsed. The country stands on the brink of financial catastrophe. The complete stoppage of the payment of all debts, including the Dawes and Young loans, places the financial boycott of Germany on the order of the day. The British reply note on the question of the German moratorium caused a tremendous impres-

sion among leading circles of the German bourgeoisie and has compelled the German Government to capitulate. Simultaneously, so-called radical sentiments among the National Socialist rank and file, have begun to grow up, and the talk of the "second revolution" is growing louder. Vice-Chancellor Papen on June 17th made a speech in Marburg which caused such a furore. In passing, we may remark that the speech was composed not by him but by a journalist Jung, closely connected with leading industrial circles. Two days later Goering made the same proposals. They both demanded that the Government should cease its dangerous economic experiments and carry on a so-called "sound policy" which would consist of a decided attack on the standards of living of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie; the artificial policy of struggle against unemployment and the support of hundreds of thousands of storm troops by the Government must be stopped; there must be no more talk of parcelling up the big estates, and the law on the inheritance of peasant farms must be repealed.

Decisive pressure was simultaneously put on Hitler from several points—from the Junkers and the heavy industrial magnates, especially Krupp, von Bollen and Thyssen, and also the Reichswehr, which came out on to the political foreground and which saw in the Storm Detachments a severe threat to their vital interests, especially as regards the rearmament of Germany. It is no chance that not a single commander of the S.A. was admitted into the Reichswehr for several months, whereas every patronage was given to the Steel Helmets. It is no chance that the bayonets and machine guns of the Reichswehr stood behind the carbines and mausers of the police.

Carrying out the will of their masters, Goering and Hitler carried through a new St. Bartholomew's Eve on June 30th, and shot the leaders of the Storm Troops. The version about a plot in which Roehm, Schleicher and Strasser took part is a fairy tale with which the National Socialist leaders are trying to cover up their real plans. By shooting Roehm, Strasser and scores of other Storm Troop commanders, Hitler struck a blow at the main bulwark of fascism. German monopolist capital is compelled to rely more than ever on the bayonets of the Reichswehr and the Praetorian Guards, the Defence Guard Detachments.

German fascism had entered on the path of catastrophe and a further intensification of the internal struggle. June 30th is followed by new bloody events, new plots and shootings. German fascism had not solved a single one of the tasks facing German capitalism, and is unable to solve them.

The Communist Party is reaching ever wider

masses of the proletariat and is marching towards victory. It is no chance that in his speech in the Reichstag on July 13th, Hitler spoke of the necessity of carrying on a hundred years' struggle against Communism.

The German bourgeoisie reckoned on utilising the events of June 30th as a big positive factor in its foreign policy. The Third Empire would demonstrate its victory over the radical elements, its stability and its capability to negotiate regarding rearmaments. Reality has completely upset these calculations. The leading bourgeois circles not only in France, but in Great Britain, are taking account of the instability of the fascist régime in Germany, and are afraid of the possibility that it may go in for adventures. Before the June events and the negotiations between Simon and Barthou, British imperialism thought it possible to begin to carry out its plan for ensuring the leading rôle of Britain as super-arbitrator in Europe. It has soon, however, become clear that such a policy is fraught with the most dangerous consequences for British interests, and in Parliament, Sir John Simon has spoken in favour of the U.S.S.R. joining the League of Nations, while the British Ambassador in Berlin has made a demarche to the German Government on the question of regional pacts. As a result Fascist Germany HAS FOUND ITSELF IN AN EXCEPTIONALLY DIFFICULT POSITION.

All this together does not mean that British imperialism has abandoned its plans and above all its anti-Soviet aims. It is only trying to gain time and is waiting for the moment when the relationship of forces becomes clear, when the direction of development in Germany becomes more plain.

Just as Sir Edward Grey on the eve of the World War gave significant hints of support to the German and the French ambassadors, so at the present time British diplomacy supports German policy as regards armaments and is at the same time making concessions to France.

However complicated the international situation may be, of one thing there can be no doubt whatever, and that is that the foreign policy of the Third Empire will fully preserve its aggressive character after the events of June 30th as well. The German fascist régime stands forth in all its nakedness, unconcealed by any mask, before the working class and the toiling masses. The question "where next" will arise before the leaders of the German bourgeoisie with ever more menacing and insistent force. The crumbling of the mass base of the fascist dictatorship will force the German bourgeoisie to attempt ever new twists and turns. The events which have taken place are a manifestation of the internal weakness of the counter-revolution, which is frantic with terror. The impossibility of finding a way out of the impasse along economic lines will continue to drive German imperialism as before or with still greater force along the path of foreign political adventures. In its foreign policy German monopolist capital has many strong levers at its disposal. However, to carry out this policy, German fascism needs time and delay, which it is not granted. The growth of the revolutionary forces inside the country, and the struggle for power in the fascist camp, will compel the German bourgeoisie to hasten the speed of the preparations for war. German imperialism will try to save itself in the flames of a new world conflagration, and place the fate of capitalism in the melting pot.

(Continued from page 614.)

lifted the prohibition,* empty articles appear in the papers calculated to arouse sensation and to frighten the philistines.

But the Communist Party of Japan bravely conducts its heroic work in the army, at the front and inside the country. The Japanese Bolsheviks are, for the third year, holding high the banner of struggle to turn the imperialist war into a civil war, into a national revolution against the monarchy, for rice, land and liberty.

* It is customary to forbid the publication of any information about arrests until the end of the enquiry.

It was they who stood at the head of the memorable soldiers' riots in Kakey, in Shanghai and in Dzinkoo. It is they who conduct inconspicuous, painstaking work on board the men-of-war and in the barracks to disintegrate the most powerful apparatus of the Japanese imperialism—the "Emperor's Army."

Their experience, accumulated at the price of hundreds of the best revolutionary lives and of thousands of years of hard labour and imprisonment, deserves to be studied and popularised by the fraternal Communist Parties.

ON THE ROAD TO A MASS COMMUNIST PARTY IN AUSTRIA

THE working-class movement in Austria has entered a new stage in its development. The liquidation of the last remnants of parliamentarianism by the Dollfuss Government has dealt a **DECISIVE BLOW AT THE DEMOCRATIC AND REFORMIST ILLUSIONS OF THE WORKING MASSES.** The artillery bombardment of the fine workers' tenements which were built by the Vienna social-democratic municipality destroyed not only these homes, but also the illusions about **MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM.** The defeat of the Austrian proletariat in the February fights has convinced many who not long ago were active members of the social-democratic party that although their party was a mass party in the past **IT WAS NOT THE KIND OF PARTY THAT THE WORKING CLASS NEEDS.** They have been convinced that it is not enough for the proletariat only to have a mass party, but that what is necessary is that this mass party is a revolutionary party and that it possess revolutionary theory, strategy and tactics. The February defeat of the Austrian proletariat has convinced many people that "Austro-Marxism" does not exist and never has done, that it is only Austro-reformism that has been in existence and that it led to the bankruptcy of social-democracy.

This bankruptcy is not only of an organisational character, but is primarily bankruptcy in policy, theory, strategy and tactics. A deep ideological crisis is now shaking social-democracy from top to bottom. Not a single one of its theoreticians or leaders can make a case out any farther for their old line. The entire huge system of its mass organisations has collapsed. The **REVOLUTIONARY CORRECTNESS OF THE COMMUNISTS** has become clear. A beginning has been made of the passage of masses of social-democratic workers and party functionaries to support for the Communist Party. The most revolutionary groups and those least affected by Austro-reformist "theories" have **ALREADY JOINED** the Communist Party, others are coming close to it, and still others **ARE STRIVING TO SAVE THE REMNANTS OF THE OLD SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY,** but are revising some of the theoretical and tactical theses of the Austro-reformists, in order to adapt themselves to the moods of the masses.

History has also compelled Otto Bauer to acknowledge a number of elementary truths which the Communist Party propagated in Austria for fifteen years. We will not polemise with Bauer here. We will not for the moment search for

what is and what is not honest. We will only at this point take note of what he says now, even though he does so in a very confused manner.

(1) "Our legal mass Party which was created on the basis of democracy was not as yet and could not be a real revolutionary party.

(2) "As long as the means of production remain the private property of the capitalists, so long therefore as none other than the capitalist mode of production exists, a proletarian (social-democratic—Ed.) government is compelled (?) **TO DEFEND AND DEVELOP CAPITALIST PRODUCTION, AND THEREBY SERVES THE INTERESTS OF THE CAPITALISTS,** for otherwise the **WHOLE** (underlined by author—Ed.) of production will be destroyed, the workers become unemployed and the State bankrupt. This contradiction between the politically dominant situation (?) of the proletariat and the economically dominant position of the bourgeoisie **MUST VERY SOON LEAD TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE POLITICAL DOMINATION (?)** of the working class if it does not prior to this utilise the State power to expropriate the capitalists . . .

(3) "The revolution against fascism cannot be a bourgeois revolution, which the proletariat only later might attempt to develop into a proletarian revolution, but must from the very outset be a proletarian revolution.

(4) "It is impossible to overthrow fascism by legal methods. It **CAN ONLY BE OVERTHROWN BY VIOLENCE.** Its inheritor can only be a **REVOLUTIONARY DICTATORSHIP.**

(5) "We will not be able to mobilise the working class **FOR THE STRUGGLE TO RE-ESTABLISH BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY, BUT FOR THE STRUGGLE TO ESTABLISH A REVOLUTIONARY DICTATORSHIP** which will destroy capitalism and by expropriating the bourgeoisie and the landowners will create the conditions for the socialist reorganisation of society.

(6) "The dictatorship of the proletariat **IS THE MEANS WHICH THE PROLETARIAT MUST ADOPT IN ORDER TO DESTROY THE DIVISION OF SOCIETY INTO classes,** and thereby to create the prerequisites for socialist democracy as well."^{*}

In making these statements, Otto Bauer noticeably parted with the Second International, whose point of view has been formulated by Fritz Adler.

Fritz Adler states that:

"The task facing our movement always was to break all the illusions held by the proletarian masses, illusions reformist as well as revolutionary, democratic as well as socialist."

And what is this Second International "spirit of the destruction" of all illusions aiming at?

He desires but one thing, namely, to destroy the revolutionary "illusions" of the Austrian proletariat, and on those points where Otto Bauer has come closer to the proletariat, to destroy Otto Bauer as well. He is against the slogan of proletarian revolution in Austria, he is against "illu-

^{*} See *Strategy of the Class Struggle* by O. Bauer in No. 1 *Der Kampf* for May, 1934, pages 8, 9, and 10, and his article *Democracy and Socialism* in No. 2 *Der Kampf* for June, 1934, pp. 59, 63. Unless otherwise stated, the emphasis is ours.—Ed.

sions" about revolution in general. It is clear that we are faced with a basic difference between the declarations made by Otto Bauer and Fritz Adler.

We do not know what has evoked these declarations by Otto Bauer. We do not know whether they have been evoked ONLY by his desire to save himself from being isolated from the masses, an attempt to accept everything in the period when the masses are on the move, including the uprising, the dictatorship of the proletariat and "illegal methods" of struggle in order later to repudiate it all. For we remember the times when Otto Bauer was ready to write the word "struggle" in capital letters, and pronounce the words "revolutionary dictatorship" with much rolling of the r's.

Or have these declarations on the part of Otto Bauer been called forth by a CERTAIN TURN on his part towards the proletarian revolution? We do not exclude this possibility. But if Otto Bauer takes his declarations seriously, then he should have drawn the logical tactical and organisational conclusions. He should have broken with the Second International in which there are people who, according to his own words, "serve the bourgeoisie with a view to preserving its class domination"; and should establish a MILITANT UNITED FRONT in Austria, and in the last analysis PROCEED TO UNIFICATION WITH THE COMMUNISTS. But the whole point is that Otto Bauer DOES NOT DRAW THESE CONCLUSIONS! On the contrary. In his article, *The New Heinfeld*, he proposes the task of uniting all the socialist groups and of breaking away those one-time social democrats from the Communist Party who have passed into its ranks, UNDER THE OLD S.D. LEADERSHIP, under the leadership of Bauer and Deutsch and the Second International. But it is just this leadership and its policy that have gone bankrupt. The masses do not want to repeat what has gone past. The Communists are for unity, but for revolutionary unity. The attempt being made by Otto Bauer to rehabilitate Social-Democracy is an attempt to preserve the split in the Austrian proletariat which has turned to the Communist International. In so far as Otto Bauer is attempting to rehabilitate the old Social-Democracy, his "revolutionary theory" remains idle chatter, and the "revolutionary theses" which he advances DO NOT HELP THE AUSTRIAN PROLETARIAT TO FIND ITS WAY TO REVOLUTIONARY FIGHTING UNITY for the struggle against fascism, but keeps it back from this only correct path. The line of demarcation between the revolutionaries and reformists is now the question of their relation to the Communist Party and the Communist International. There can be no turn to the revolution without a turn to

Communism. The masses no longer believe in "revolutionary" phrases.

WE CONSIDER THAT THE PRESENT POSITION ADOPTED BY OTTO BAUER WILL LEAD TO HIS ISOLATION FROM THE AUSTRIAN PROLETARIAT in the same degree as his previous position did. Victor Adler's *Heinfeld* led to unification, while Otto Bauer's *Heinfeld* is an attempt to continue the split in the Austrian proletariat.

A step much further than that taken by OTTO BAUER has already been taken by the CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS which is working in Austria itself. In a letter dated May 20th, 1934, read at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Second International, it writes:

"The fascist dictatorship has destroyed ALL THE DEMOCRATIC AND REFORMIST ILLUSIONS AMONG US, the proletarian masses. The workers know now that fascist violence can only be broken by PROLETARIAN VIOLENCE—only through an uprising of the people. To prepare for this revolution of the people is the task which the Austrian socialists have set themselves. The aim of this revolution can only be the CONQUEST OF STATE POWER, THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT which will destroy the political basis of capitalist society in order to bring about a classless society, social democracy.

"We have no doubt that the International will approve these principles, which, in the hell of the fascist dictatorship have become the common property of all proletarian fighters, of the countries under fascist dictatorship. But the socialist future will come very much nearer if the International and its parties will the more decisively make these principles the PRINCIPLES OF THEIR OWN ACTIVITIES.

"But the Austrian socialists want in the International to be the interpreters of this passionate thirst for PROLETARIAN UNITY which has seized the working masses. In the struggle against the fascist dictatorship socialist workers in no way differ from their class comrades in the Communist organisations. They are subjected to the same kind of persecution and suffering, and if the aims towards which they are striving be the same, then now under the oppression of the fascist dictatorship there are no longer any contradictions between them on the tactics of the struggle.

"We are fully aware of all the difficulties which from both sides face the path leading to agreement between the Labour and Socialist International and the Communist International. Nevertheless, we demand that everything should be done on the part of the socialists in order to establish unity. Our minimum demand is that the L.S.I. make a proposal to the Communist International to sign an honest PACT OF NON-AGGRESSION, at least in the fascist countries. But in addition to this, there should be a continuation of the efforts to remove the hindrances and misunderstandings which have interfered with unity up till now. The aim is worth fighting for with the greatest passion!

"From the fascist hell, from the torture chambers of the dictatorship we call to the workers of the entire world! May they respond to our call!"

It is well known that the Executive Committee of the Second International not only did not decide to make this appeal of the Austrian socialists the

basis of their policy, but that they DID NOT EVEN SERIOUSLY DISCUSS it, only instructing Fritz Adler to write a letter in reply. It is known that after this appeal had been made, a number of socialist parties TURNED DOWN the proposals of the Communists for a united front in the struggle to defend Comrade Thaelmann and the other prisoners of fascism. It is also well known that Swiss social-democracy has just FORBIDDEN social-democrats to participate in the united front organs for struggle against fascism along with the Communists. We are only surprised at the naïveté of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Socialists, which imagined that the Second International "would do all to establish unity."

As far as the Communist International and its sections are concerned, THEY ARE REALLY DOING ALL WITHIN THEIR POWER, and in spite of the refusals of the social-democratic parties; are approaching them again and again with the most insistent proposals for the establishment of the united front of struggle (for example, France). We think that quite important disagreements both in principle and in tactics still divide the Communists and the "revolutionary socialists." But if the Party of the "revolutionary socialists" really and seriously thinks that in the struggle against fascism "socialist workers in no way differ from their class comrades in the Communist organisations" and that "there are no contradictions between them on the tactics of struggle," then, in our opinion, it is not sufficient to conclude a "pact of non-aggression," but what is needed is to carry on JOINT REVOLUTIONARY ACTION, AND TO CREATE A REAL UNITED FRONT BETWEEN THE COMMUNISTS AND THE PRESENT REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS. The Austrian Communist Party on its part is doing all that it can in order to achieve just such a real militant united front.

As regards a "pact of non-aggression," that is, a mutual suspension of criticism, then we have to state that as far back as March 5th, 1933, the Communist International recommended to all Communist Parties that they cease attacks on those social-democratic organisations which participate in a joint revolutionary struggle with the Communists on the basis of a concrete programme of action, but at the same time expose as strike-breakers those who break up this united front of struggle. If we examine the pages of the illegal Austrian *Rote Fahne*, we DO NOT FIND any uncomradely polemics there directed against the organisation of the Revolutionary Socialists, in spite of the fact that there is no agreement or "pact of non-aggression" in existence between the Austrian Communists and the revolutionary social-

ists. And this is not accidental. The Austrian revolutionary socialists are carrying on a revolutionary struggle against Fascism in a number of places. The Communists, of course, are bound to point out a number of shortcomings, and to indicate the inconsistency and indecisiveness of the revolutionary socialists. It would harm the working-class movement if the Communists were to be silent, if they did not point out that the revolutionary socialists have not as yet broken their connections with the opportunists and reformists, which fact represents a tremendous danger for the Austrian working-class movement.

But even the present, embryonic rapprochement between the "revolutionary socialists" and the Communists has already called forth friction between the "revolutionary socialists" and the foreign Committee of the Austrian social-democratic party, abroad. Otto Bauer is polemicising against the "revolutionary socialists" quite sharply on questions of theory and tactics. But, as Fritz Adler's letter shows, the Second International comes out still more decisively against the line of principle and tactics of the "revolutionary socialists." And we consider this quite natural, because the Second International is an organisation of reformists and not of revolutionaries. As an organisation of reformists it carries and will continue to carry on a struggle against proletarian revolutionaries. On the other hand, we also consider it natural and useful that the conference of "revolutionary socialists" discussed the question of a break with the foreign committee (Brun) of the Austrian social-democracy. At the same time we consider that the "revolutionary socialists" were inconsistent in raising the question of their relations with the Second International. We consider that the "revolutionary socialists" in Austria will not be able to refrain from criticising Bauer and Deutsch and the entire Second International, IF THEY MAINTAIN THEIR POSITION OF JOINT STRUGGLE WITH THE COMMUNISTS, WHILE OTTO BAUER AND CO. DO NOT ADOPT THIS POSITION OF THE REAL REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE PROLETARIAT. Still less have the Communists now grounds for refraining from criticising Otto Bauer, not to speak of criticising the Second International, and particularly the line of Adler. Still less have we now grounds for refraining from criticising Swiss social-democracy which turned down the proposal of the Communist Party of Switzerland to form a united front for the struggle to free Thaelmann and the other prisoners in fascist jails, which has adopted the position of defending the bourgeois fatherland, and which has adopted the tactics of non-resistance to fascist demonstrations. Still less have we any

grounds for refraining from criticising the Czechish social-democrats who, as members of the government, carry through the banning of the Communist Party and the cutting of the wages of workers and employees. Still less grounds have we for not criticising the Danish, Swedish and other social-democratic parties which, to use the words of Otto Bauer himself, are preserving the capitalist mode of production and serve the interests of the capitalists. In the case of those organisations which cease to be guardians of the interests of the capitalists and who pass over to the class struggle, the Communists consider it possible not only to establish a united front from time to time, but to permanently co-operate with them on the basis of the revolutionary class struggle.

Especially during the period following the February armed struggles has the Austrian Communist Party shown that it stands for the real unity of the working class. Thousands of Austrian workers, social-democrats, have understood that there is no other way than by strengthening the Communist Party, by transforming it into a revolutionary mass party, into the only party leading the struggles of the Austrian proletariat for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the victory of socialism. If the "revolutionary socialists" in Austria wish to follow the line of closer co-operation with the Austrian Communists, then they will be met most cordially by the Austrian Communist Party, two-thirds of the membership of which already consists of comrades who prior to the February battles were in the ranks of social-democracy. They will only meet with condemnation from the Second International, as Fritz Adler's letter shows. But now the Austrian Communists, and particularly those who five months ago were still in the same party as the present "revolutionary socialists," are in duty bound to point out to these "revolutionaries" who are still in the ranks of the social-democracy, their inconsistency and indecisiveness.

If a successful struggle is to be waged for the victory of the proletarian revolution, for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, what is necessary is that a UNITED, SINGLE AND STRICTLY CENTRALISED AND DISCIPLINED MASS COMMUNIST PARTY BE ESTABLISHED WHICH IS BOUNDLESSLY DEVOTED TO THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM. The Paris Commune perished because its leadership did not belong to one party. The Austrian February battles suffered defeat because they were led by AN OPPORTUNIST NON-REVOLUTIONARY PARTY. The Russian October revolution was VICTORIOUS because it

was led BY A SINGLE STRICTLY CENTRALISED AND DISCIPLINED REVOLUTIONARY PARTY OF BOLSHEVIKS WHICH had rallied around itself the entire revolutionary proletariat, and had ISOLATED SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY FROM THE MASSES. For a period of fifteen years the Austrian Communist Party defended and propagated the principles of Communism, the proletarian revolution and the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. History has proven that the C.P. of Austria and not Austrian social-democracy was correct. The theory and tactics of the Austrian Communists, headed by the worker-shoemaker, Kopenig, have proved to be TRUE, while the theory and tactics of Austrian social-democracy led by the doctors of science, BAUER, ADLER, RENNER, etc., have proved to be INCORRECT. It is useless for Fritz Adler to want to defend the old reformist, socialist programme and tactics for "democratic countries." He thereby only prepares the defeat of the proletariat in these countries. History has proven that there is only one way to achieve the unification of the Austrian proletariat and to bring about a revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and that is unification around the Communist Party, under the leadership of the Communist International.

The Austrian Communists and the entire Communist International understand quite well that many social-democratic workers, and in particular the "revolutionary socialists," who are disappointed with the old social-democracy, have not as yet outlived their prejudices against the Communist International. They consider that the final unification of all the revolutionary elements of Austria is not a question of a single day. They demand one thing first and foremost, of all "revolutionary socialists," namely, REVOLUTIONARY CLASS STRUGGLE TOGETHER WITH THE COMMUNISTS, AND SELFLESS STRUGGLE AGAINST THE FASCIST DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE, AND FOR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

The February battles have so shaken the basis of social-democracy that it is possible that entire groups and organisations of previous supporters of the Second International will pass over to the side of the revolutionary class struggle and become united with the Communists. Under the present circumstances not only the rank and file members of the social-democratic party, but also a whole number of most important functionaries of the Austrian social-democratic party have moved away from reformism and come closer to the position of the Communist Party, to such a degree that their passage to the side of the Communist Party has become a possibility and a

reality. The Communists know of different forms of co-operation with revolutionary workers, who have not as yet finally broken with social-democracy—from separate agreements to jointly carry out some definite campaign, to sympathetic affiliation to the Communist International. But the Communists are trying with all their power to ensure that out of this more or less accidental co-operation in Austria there should arise organisational and political unification, namely, one UNITED Communist Party. There are not, and there cannot be, any hindrances to direct negotiations in Austria or outside of it, between the Communists and any social-democratic organisation or party as a whole regarding unity of action, unity of programme and tactics in struggle and in the last analysis regarding organisational unification on the basis of Communism.

If the “revolutionary socialists” are REALLY SERIOUS in thinking that there are no longer any programmatic or tactical differences between them and the Communists, then the path leading to rapprochement and unification is the only correct path. If they WISH to go along this path, then this will lead to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Austria being speeded up. But if they DO NOT WANT to go along this path, and listen to the shouts of the Second International and stop half-way, then they will become a hindrance to the development of the revolutionary struggle against fascism, and will isolate themselves within a short time from the wide mass movement of the proletariat.

In order to overthrow the fascist dictatorship it is necessary to unite the widest masses of the proletariat and of the peasants and petty-bourgeois under the revolutionary leadership of a united centralised Communist Party.

At the present time an enormous responsibility is placed upon the Austrian Communists for the fate of the Austrian proletariat. The Communist Party of Austria is the inheritor of all that was really revolutionary in the Austrian working-class movement from the very beginning of its existence. The Communists are the only inheritors of the best traditions of the working class mass organisations which social-democracy directed along the false path of class collaboration, and which are now broken up by the fascists. The main slogan which the Austrian Communists have given the masses is as follows:—

“Do not let the fascist dictatorship destroy a single proletarian organisation, but continue their work illegally.”

“NOT A SINGLE ONE OF THE MASS ORGANISATIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS WHICH HAVE EXISTED HITHERTO MUST BE BROKEN UP OR DISSOLVED. WE are directing our

activity to the end that the workers should remain solid, and that their organisations should continue to exist illegally under the correct revolutionary leadership of the Communist Party. Only if we succeed in rallying these mass organisations around our Party, will it become possible to carry on new struggles under firm revolutionary leadership. Without revolutionary leadership—the proletariat will be destroyed.” (*Vienna, Rote Fahne*, June, 1934.)

The free trade unions were, in their time, created as organisations of class struggle. The social-democratic leadership ate away their revolutionary essence. The social-democratic leadership thereby weakened the trade unions and lessened their significance. But the many years’ history of the organised working class movement has left a deep impression on the consciousness of the working masses. The workers consider the trade unions as their organisations. That is why it is so difficult for fascism to liquidate the free trade unions. Social-democracy considers that the existence of the trade unions has come to an end by the fact that the trade unions have been banned by the fascist dictatorship and that the right to conclude collective agreements has been abolished. Social-democracy considers that the “independent self-governing trade unions,” which defend the economic and social interests of the workers and employees generally, can be re-established only after the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship (see *Arbeiter Zeitung*, March 11th). They propose that the fascist trade union organisations be boycotted, but do not indicate any other way of organising those who were members of the free trade unions. Taking into account the deep-rooted connections of the working masses with their trade unions over many tens of years, taking into account that the reformist leaders either fled from or went over to the fascists, and that only a few of them remained with the masses, the Austrian Communists call upon all the revolutionary workers to undertake the task of re-establishing the free trade unions, banned by the fascists, as organs of revolutionary class struggle. However, the Communists are ready to co-operate with all individual persons and organisations striving to re-establish the trade unions as organs of class struggle. The important successes achieved by the Communist Party of Austria in this field shows that the tactics of the Austrian Communist Party correspond to the interests of the broad masses of workers.

The “Schutzbund” organisation was created by the Austrian Social-Democratic Party as a militant organisation for the defence of the bourgeois “democratic” republic, while the Austrian workers regarded the Schutzbund as their militant organisation, their armed force. The Social-Democratic leaders weakened the Schutzbund by their policy and led it to defeat in the February armed battles.

During the February battles a number of the leaders of the Schutzbund went over to the side of the fascists, while others of them fled. But the main mass of the Schutzbundlers and their officers fought against the fascists. In spite of the defeat of the Schutzbundlers, the fascists did not succeed in destroying their organisation. The Schutzbund has remained an organisation, to organise a new struggle against the fascist dictatorship. But in their study of the causes of the February defeat, they have more and more had to recognise that this defeat is the result of the social-democratic policy, and of its leadership. This has led to an important section of the Schutzbundlers coming over to the side of Communism. The Austrian Communist Party is assisting by all means in preserving and restoring the Schutzbund organisations, and in transforming them from a democratic republican into a revolutionary army of the proletariat for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The tactics of the Austrian Communist Party in the free trade unions and in the Schutzbund show that it has taken upon itself the task of preserving all that is of worth, all that was created by the Austrian working-class movement over a period of tens of years, carrying on a struggle against what was reformist in their organisations. It has taken upon itself the task of creating a real mass basis for the proletarian revolution.

Social democracy betrayed the Austrian working class. It betrayed its mass organisation. The workers have convinced themselves that the Social-Democratic Party is not the party which the working class needs. They have also convinced themselves that the trade unions and the Schutzbund organisations, as led by social-democracy, cannot defend their class interests. Therefore the whole of the social-democratic system of working-class organisations has fallen to pieces. The cadres of the Social-Democratic Party which have remained in the country have, under the pressure of the masses, been compelled to make a turn to new methods of work. Taking into account that the very name of social-democracy has become unpopular among the masses, and ashamed to call themselves the Social-Democratic Party, they have renamed themselves The Party of "Revolutionary Socialists." The foreign committee of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party is in being abroad, but there is no Social-Democratic Party in Austria itself. But the "Revolutionary Socialist" Party has not yet finally broken with the foreign committee of the Social-Democratic Party, and still belongs to the Second International, and wishes to be the inheritor of the "riches" left by Bauer and Deutsch. It has to convince itself that it is impossible to sit between two stools. A

choice must be made; either a break must be made with the Second International, with the foreign committee, and a move made to the left, to Communism, or else it must go with the foreign committee and maintain the line of Austro-reformism.

The foreign committee which sees the mass leaving it, is at a loss, but wishes to show how "revolutionary" it is in words, but not in deeds. It has agreed to "revolutionise" its ideological line, but it does not wish to take the path of the proletarian class struggle. It has lost its sense of direction. In its confusion it is taking a path where only isolation from the masses awaits it.

In their confusion the representatives of the foreign committee can find nothing better than to popularise a kind of boycott in Austria, similar to "Gandhism." In the *Arbeiter Zeitung* of June 10 they publish the following call to the masses:—

"Boycott municipal enterprises!"

"Don't put your savings in the Vienna Central Savings Bank!"

"Don't patronise the municipal baths!"

"Don't drink municipally brewed beer!"

"Fascism proposes that you economise. Economise in your expenditure on water, gas, electric light, and in the use of the tramways!"

"Don't smoke!"

When these methods of struggle give rise to laughter among the masses of the workers, the social-democrats turn to support of individual terror and though they are ashamed to do so, they even resort to joint action with the Hitlerites.

"After the bloody punishment of the Austrian workers in February, the hatred of the masses of the workers towards the Dollfuss system has become so great that on occasion, even social-democratic workers who are hostile to the Nazis undertake joint action with the latter against the Dollfuss dictatorship." (*Social-Democrat*, dated June 12, 1934.)

These "tactics" of the leaders who have lost their heads cannot, of course, win them the workers. It is just because of the fact that social-democracy has lost its head that the masses are quickly losing their last illusions with regard to social-democracy, and that their will to unity with Communism is growing.

While social-democracy is casting itself from one adventure to another, and in the last analysis is building all its prospects on disagreements in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and on clashes between the imperialist interests in Austria, the Communist Party is carrying on a struggle to win over the majority of the working class.

The Communists belong to that party which is basing itself on the forces of the Austrian working class itself, and is gathering these forces for the revolutionary class struggle, is the Party which is carrying on the struggle to win the majority of the working class, and is preparing the last decisive struggle against the Austrian bourgeoisie

THROUGH THE GENERAL POLITICAL STRIKE AND ARMED UPRISING.

All the revolutionary workers in Austria, members of the social democratic organisations, trade unions, *Schutzbund*, and other mass organisations, must support the revolu-

tionary proletarian tactics of the Austrian Communist Party. It alone can lead the Austrian proletariat to victory over fascism, to the victory of the Austrian revolution, to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Austria.

THE WORK OF THE C.P. OF JAPAN IN THE JAPANESE ARMY

(Conclusion.)

For instance:—

"The armed workers and peasants, who are waging a stubborn struggle against the occupation of Manchuria by the Japanese troops and against the puppet Manchurian state, are organising partisan detachments and are developing a movement throughout the whole of Manchuria.

"From August 1 to 20—a period of 20 days—the partisans made 68 attacks on the South Manchurian Railway line, and on August 21 they destroyed the railway bridge on the Kodzen river. A partisan detachment of 1,000 men attacked Eihan and destroyed the whole of the enemy's forces. On August 28, the partisans raided Mukden. They seized airplanes, set fire to warehouses and airplanes, and disarmed a police detachment. In the morning of the 29th, a bitter fight followed, with the Japanese-Manchurian troops. On September 1, the partisans raided Mukden and Dainanmon for the second time. They surrounded the arsenal and gave battle. They were only armed with shotguns, rifles and machine guns. A four thousand strong partisan detachment was operating on the South Manchurian railway near Sokston. On September 2, about 3,000 partisans attacked Kanto Sujka and engaged the Japanese-Manchurian troops in a fierce battle. Nine partisans raided Deieskio; the railway track is broken. An armoured train sent to the assistance of the Japanese units was compelled to retreat. This is how the partisans are fighting against the Japanese invasion in Manchuria and Mongolia, without sparing themselves." (*Soldier's Friend*, 10/3/1933.)

Despite all its achievements the Party press had nevertheless a number of weak links in its activity. It is not enough to show the defeats that took place at the front. It is necessary that the C.P. of Japan explains systematically and intelligibly to the masses of soldiers and to the workers and peasants, the political meaning of revolutionary defeatism. Efforts should be made to ensure that the masses grasp that the military defeat of the Japanese monarchy is to the advantage of the proletariat and the peasantry, for it shatters the ground under the feet of the ruling classes and creates extensive opportunities for the toiling masses to attack the monarchy and to develop the revolutionary struggle. The propaganda of revolutionary defeatism is all the more necessary since the ruling classes of Japan, as well as all their agents are increasingly scaring the masses with

the danger of defeat, alleging that in such a case Japan would suffer the fate of China, colonial slavery, etc. The ruling classes skilfully utilise this argument for the military mobilisation of the masses, for the suppression of the mass discontent of the workers at the enterprises and deftly deceiving inexperienced workers sometimes, who though not at all anxious to fight, nevertheless think that it is always better to choose the lesser evil.

The struggle against fascism and social-fascism continues to remain the weak link in the activity of the press. In the issues of the *Sekki* which have reached us, we find directives issued to the Party organisations stating that the struggle against the fascists and social-fascists must be developed in the process of carrying out this or that campaign. But there are hardly any popular articles addressed to the mass reader, in which the paper attacks the concrete actions, activity and manoeuvres of the fascists or exposes the fasciation of the social-democratic upper stratum, although by their activity both these groups provide the richest material that could be used against themselves.

As regards the organisational work of the Communist Party in the army and navy, very little is mentioned due to the particularly conspirative nature of this work. In the same number of the *Soldier's Friend* we find an article of a Communist who tells about his experiences in organisational work in the barracks. Judging from this article* the Party members who work in the army, transfer the experience they have of the work of the revolutionary representatives at the enterprises.

When he landed in the barracks, the comrade first of all tried to find out the causes of discontent and the demands of the soldiers. They were found

* See also the article from the *Soldier's Friend*, published in the C.I. No. 1, for 1934, p. 28.

to be as follows: free exit from the barracks; better food; the opportunity to read favourite books and newspapers; supply of three sets of clothes; mechanical laundry; abolition of compulsory training for bayonet fighting; complete abolition of work as domestic servants; wages at the rate of 1 Yen per day; restitution of articles lost without any deduction or penalty; freedom of assembly and organisations. These were part of the common demands of all the soldiers. In addition to these, there were a number of other demands depending upon the category of the units (infantry, cavalry, sapper troops, transport troops, etc.).

Then, the comrade became acquainted with the men and won authority among them.

"I began my work," he wrote, "by mapping out the following:—

1. To live on good terms with everybody, and gradually in the course of conversations to find out their moods and their biography.

2. To strike up a close acquaintanceship, to enjoy the confidence of everybody and to gain their esteem (like the revolutionary representatives in the factories).

3. Gradually I began to notice the results. Then in the process of getting to know them closer I proceeded to agitation and propaganda. For instance, when a great deal of laundering was to be done, I helped in the washing, saying that more time should be given for laundry, that washing should be done by machinery, and led the conversation from washing to the exposure of the essence of the army."

The comrade very soon observed the results. All kinds of questions which troubled the recruits in the company were discussed with him and when any difficulties arose as to what was to be done, they applied to him, while disputes arising between the recruits and the old soldiers were referred to him.

Then the comrade became the leader of the masses.

"I set myself," he wrote, "the task of always being head of everybody. This had to be carried out in the army with the greatest caution. You must not be either an extreme left or an opportunist. You must without fail reflect the mood of everybody, linking up the common interests with the everyday requirements. I will give an example. On Sunday, this joyful day for the army, when the soldiers went on furlough, the young soldiers had a lot of work left. And it frequently happened that notwithstanding their great desire to go out, the new recruits refused to go out because they did not want to be together with the sergeants and the two-year-service men. They would have been more courageous had they been in larger numbers. Therefore, in spite of the abuse of the sergeants and of the two-year service men, I began to go out on leave each time, attracting the timorous ones with me. This joint leave, which lasted several hours, made it possible to make the proper use of the time."

This was the ground prepared for the setting up of a soldiers' committee.

The Communists and the revolutionary workers who conducted anti-war work in the army units,

showed a great deal of courage and inventiveness. Last January in the 3rd battalion of the 7th regiment stationed in the city of Iticava, two soldiers were arrested, who were formerly workers, functionaries of the Dsenkaio. Not only did they themselves conduct work with the recruits, but they succeeded in making the barracks accessible to other comrades. The bourgeois newspapers which reported their arrest, wrote: "Their daring went so far, that the Communists used to visit them directly in the battalion, as their friends, and thus the meetings took place openly in front of everybody."

In such places where it was not yet possible to penetrate right into the very unit, the work was carried on from outside; they found out where the soldiers of the given barracks were in the habit of going on Sundays, such as the favourite soldiers' saloons, etc., acquaintances were made, and connections were established. One bourgeois newspaper tells of this kind of work of a group of Communists and of young Communists in Tsiba:

"They directed their efforts to the bolshevisation of the army units. They tried to strike up acquaintances with the soldiers, who went on furlough on Sundays, invited them to the restaurants, and conducted conversations and agitated." (*Sutz*, July 18, 1933.)

Along with their activity in the units in the barracks, the Communists organised activity among the workers and the village youth, who were soon to enter the barracks. Reports about this appear in the bourgeois press from time to time, which publishes police information about the investigations into the cases of arrested Party members. Several teachers of primary schools were arrested in the Ibrarski prefecture last June. They made use of the opportunity to penetrate to the points where new recruits received preliminary training (where the teachers are generally invited to teach in addition to their basic occupation, and sometimes gratis, as a "social duty") and develop anti-war agitation among the recruits there. (*Sikai undo Simbun* of July 1st, 1933.)

The same newspaper reports that in the Ivskuney district the Party members and the members of proletarian cultural organisations carried on work among the youth of recruiting age: "They organised gatherings of the youth leaving for military service. At these gatherings they recited anti-army poems and anti-war songs. They urged the peasants to participate in the joint tilling of the land of the recruits' families, and so forth (*Sikai undo Simbun* of 9/1, 1934). The bourgeois Japanese press hushes up the activity of the Communists in the army. Later on, sometimes a half a year, or even a year later, when the police have

(Continued on page 606.)

MATERIALS OF THE 13th PLENUM E.C.C.I.

Theses and Decisions	- - -	32 pages	2d.
Fascism, the War Danger, and the Tasks of the Communist Parties	(O. W. Kuusinen)	120 „	6d.
We are Fighting for a Soviet Germany	(Wilhelm Pieck)	100 „	4d.
The Communist Parties in the Fight for the Masses	(O. Piatnitsky)	100 „	4d.
Revolutionary China To-day	(Wang Min and Kan Sing)	128 „	6d.
Fascism, Social-Democracy and the Com- munists	(W. Knorin)	52 „	3d.
Revolutionary Crisis, Fascism and War	(D. Z. Manuisky)	44 „	3d.

Strongly bound in cloth - 3/6 complete, post free

THE ONLY VERBATIM REPORTS AVAILABLE

Civil War in Austria (the full facts) - - 3d.

Order from Workers' Bookshop, 38 Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.1

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

is the world's finest political and economic Review.

Its contributors include world-famous experts.

It is carefully followed by almost every important Foreign Editor.

The Press Agencies, Government Ministries, The Royal Institute for Foreign Affairs, the leading Universities and the world's best Libraries are regular subscribers.

Every article a masterpiece. The C.I. gives information, especially on Germany, U.S.S.R. and China, including the Soviet Regions, simply unobtainable elsewhere.

Packed with explicit and valuable information and statistical material, with no fancy-type padding or "comic cuts."

Controversial articles giving authentic Marxist-Leninist interpretation of programmes and policies, and criticism of contemporaries.

Chronicle of Events regularly commentating current British affairs.

Published fortnightly in six language editions (French, German, Spanish, Russian and Chinese as well as English).

First-class translation, plain clear English. All foreign terms copiously annotated.

Usually 48 pages. Fortnightly, 3d. The very best value to-day.

Subscription rates—1 year, post free 6s.

6 months, post free 3s.

3 months, post free 1s. 6d.

By subscribing you get the magazine delivered to your door free of charge.

Workers' Bookshop, 38 Clerkenwell Green, London.

Please send me the COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL for months,
for which I enclose

Name

Address

.....