

The Provocative Anti-Soviet Campaign of the "Nichon"

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts — Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL



Vol. 12 No. 24

PRESS

2nd June 1932

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered post: International Press Correspondence, Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Berlin. Telephone: Dönhoff 2856 and 2867.

CONTENTS

Th. Neubauer: Brüning's Overthrow—Hitler Demands Power	478	How the First World War Was Prepared.	
Politics.		The Balkan War Threatens to Develop into a European War	487
J. Bullejos: The Spanish Government in the Service of French Imperialism	479	The White Terror.	
The World "Disarmament" Conference.		J. Louis Engdahl: The Scottsboro Mother in Austria	491
Nemo: The Achievements of the World "Disarmament" Conference to Date	480	International Solidarity Day.	
Fascism in Germany.		F. Emmerich: The Revolutionary Trade Union Movement and the Fourth International Solidarity Day of the W.I.R.	492
Hans Jäger: The German National Socialist Labour Party	481	From the Country of the Proletarian Dictatorship.	
The War.		The German Writer Emil Ludwig Interviews Comrade Stalin	493
Down with the Provokers of War in the Far East!	483	Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union.	
War and Social Fascism.		Speech of Comrade Piatnitzky at the IX. All-Union Congress of Trade Unions	496
T. Altwirt: The II. International and the War of Intervention	486		

Increased Mass Struggle against Imperialist War.

By J. Schmidt (Berlin).

There are indubitable signs that the proletariat of the big European and American countries is realising the immediate threatening danger of war and is proceeding to action for the purpose of averting war. The demonstrations against war and fascism in Germany, the demonstrations in Czechoslovakia and Austria, the increased anti-war actions in France, the demonstrations in Poland, which have already led to bloody collisions between the military and the workers (in which connection it should be specially noted that a Uhlan regiment refused to fire on the workers), the increased interest in concrete anti-war actions in England and the United States of America, the news from Japan, the advance-guard of imperialism, regarding the ever-growing anti-war movement not only in the factories and on the land but also in the barracks and even among the troops sent to the front—all this is not only a symptom of the awakening of the working class for the fight against war, but the action of the working class is already becoming a factor which the imperialists have seriously to take into account in their war-preparations.

This is one of the reasons why the present stage of immediate war-preparations coincides with a rapid fascisation and employment of fascist methods for the purpose of crushing the workers. The pace of the anti-war actions of the workers is still exceeded by the pace of the war-preparations and the introduction of fascist measures. Precisely at the moment

when bigger anti-war actions are taking place, when the movement is spreading beyond the ranks of the proletariat and is beginning to seize strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, whom the immediate prospect of the horrors of war causes to join in the anti-war actions of the proletariat—precisely at this moment, world imperialism is seeking by increasingly mad combinations to accelerate the outbreak of war before the movement of the masses is fully developed.

If anything hitherto could prevent the outbreak of war and frustrate the diabolical provocations of the imperialists, it was undoubtedly the peace policy of the Soviet Union, which in the most difficult situations when threatened with the danger of war, opposed these provocations so energetically and consistently that even the worst enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat have to pay acknowledgment to this peaceful policy. Yes, there arises the almost paradoxical situation that even leaders of the II. International, as Vandervelde for example, are resorting to a new "argument" in order to lull the attention of the proletariat, namely that the Soviet Union itself (i. e., without proletarian action) will know how to avoid war.

Nothing could be more dangerous than such a diversion of the attention of the proletariat from its interests and duties. The peaceful policy of the proletariat of the Soviet Union is being submitted by the imperialists to increasingly hard tests.

The imperialists go so far in their provocations that they do not even shrink from giving a direct rebuff to the Soviet Union's readiness for peace, as is shown, for example, by two striking facts: the flat refusal by Japan to enter into a Pact of non-aggression proposed by the Soviet Union, and the refusal of Poland to put its final signature to the Soviet-Polish non-aggression pact.

Very much depends upon the understanding between the different imperialist Powers regarding the manner and time of launching a joint attack against the Soviet Union. But this understanding is possible at any moment. At any moment the brutality of the provocations against the Soviet Union can be increased to an open violation of the Soviet frontiers, to open intervention against the Soviet Union. The consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union alone, however, cannot prevent war. For if the imperialists are prepared to wage war under any circumstances, they will not shrink from commencing war against the Soviet Union in spite of the peaceful policy of the Soviet government.

Mass action is therefore necessary precisely in order to prevent this increase of intervention incitement, of intervention preparations, this slipping into a new world war. It is not sufficient to record for the thousandth time that the Soviet Union's will to peace holds the imperialists in check. It is not sufficient to point to the contradictions among the imperialist Powers, which are becoming more acute in spite of all the endeavours to set up the united front against the Soviet Union. It does not suffice to describe the horrors of the coming war and to reiterate that this war means for the

masses no way out of their misery but still greater sufferings and deprivations. It also does not suffice to be content with those mass actions which have taken place up to now.

More than ever everything depends in the coming decisive weeks and months upon the extent, the intensity and the tempo of the anti-war movement. The more powerful the concentration of means, of armaments, of diplomatic combinations on the side of the enemy, the more united and determined the proletariat must come forward in order to expose the war-machinations and the war preparations. The clearer the connection between the rapid advance of fascism in the various countries and the rapid approach of the war danger, especially the acute danger of intervention against the Soviet Union, the more intensively must work be carried on in every country in order to set up the Red united front, to carry out anti-fascist action, which cannot be separated from anti-war action. The more concrete forms the war actions assume, the more concretely must the fight against these actions be directed (Prevention of the delivery of war material, of transport of munitions etc.)

The anti-war wave is rising. There can be no doubt about that. In order, however, that this factor shall become decisive, in order that the anti-war actions shall be raised to the necessary level, **it must thoroughly seize the broad masses.** The approaching anti-war Congress will only fulfil its mission and be more than a demonstration, if the preparations for it are extended to the factories, to the Labour Exchanges, in a word, extended to the broad masses themselves. **Our slogan is: Still stronger anti-war wave, fight of the broadest masses against imperialist war!**

Bloody Strike Struggles in Gdynia against War Transports to Japan.

Berlin, 29th May 1932.

The strict censorship has been unable to conceal news of the fact that serious disturbances and bloodshed have occurred in the Polish war harbour Gdynia near Danzig in the Polish corridor. The dockers in Gdynia refused to load phosgene and other gas munition supplied by the Polish nitrogen works in Horzow to Japanese imperialism.

Singing the "Internationale" and cheering the Soviet Union and shouting their demands for higher wages, the dockers marched to the offices of the harbour commandant. When the latter refused to negotiate with the men they stormed his offices and broke all the windows.

Armed sailors were called out and ordered to fire on the

dockers, but they refused to do so. The men of the 11th Ulan Regiment which is stationed in Gdynia also refused to proceed against the dockers. In the end a special troop was formed of officers, cadets of the naval college and N.C.O.'s and these men opened fire on the workers killing two outright and wounding thirty others.

The harbour commandant has declared a state of martial law and dissolved the trade union of the dockers. The strike of the dockers which began immediately after the bloodbath, has been declared illegal, but the great majority of the dockers are on strike in defiance of the authorities. Hundreds of dockers have been arrested and further collisions have since occurred.

Brüning's Overthrow—Hitler Demands Power!

By Th. Neubauer (Berlin).

Berlin, June 1, 1932.

The Brüning Cabinet has resigned, Reichs-President Hindenburg has entrusted the task of forming a Cabinet to **Freherr von Papen**, the leader of the outspokenly fascist wing of the Centre Party, who already at the Presidential election, against his own party, openly supported Hitler. Von Papen who is regarded as a fanatical anti-Communist, is the proprietor of the Berlin organ of the Centre Party "Germania", which has been conducting a shameful incitement against the Soviet Union.

*

Brüning's overthrow did not come as a surprise. Since May 12, the day on which General **Groener** the Reichswehrminister was overthrown by the rebellion of the Reichswehr Generals, it was known that the Brüning Cabinet was fighting for its existence.

Brüning was overthrown by those same circles which brought about Groener's resignation: the military camarilla gathered round General **von Schleicher**, the heavy industrial and big agrarian group gathered round **Hugenberg** and **Krupp**. These circles were able to make full use of the two weeks which the Reichs-president spent at Neudeck, his country estate in East Prussia, in order to convince him of the necessity of a complete re-formation of the Government.

The press which is in close connection with the Reichschancellor was able already in the last few days to publish interesting reports regarding the intrigues which were being

carried on at Neudeck. "Der Deutsche", the organ of the Centre trade unions, reported on May 27 that the "Right parties", i. e. the German Nationalists and National Socialists, had negotiated in Paris regarding the basis of an "understanding", and that in spite of the warnings which the Chancellor had given them in his recent speech in the Reichstag, they had continued negotiating:

"This plain warning from the Chancellor was in vain. Negotiations were continued regarding increased armaments and a **Franco-German military agreement**. According to this agreement, Germany may set up an army of 300,000 men, equipped with modern weapons, with the **collaboration of the French General Staff**. An economic understanding is to follow the military understanding; **reparations** shall be reduced to a debt of 9,000 million Marks etc."

These revelations of the Centre paper reveal the background of the present action and show clearly the basis on which German fascism is seeking an understanding with French imperialism: a military agreement as a prerequisite to a joint war of intervention against the Soviet Union!

Brüning was certainly a fanatical hater of Bolshevism; he would even have been prepared to take part in a crusade against the godless Soviet Union. He was clever enough, however, to disregard the enticements with which French imperialism has been able to catch the "national opposition".

The manner in which Brüning was overthrown throws a glaring light on the situation in Germany. The Reichstag had no word to say in it. The part played by the military camarilla in the overthrow of Groener had made plain to the whole world what factors of political power are decisive in Germany to-day. The Reichswehr could dictate because it could rely upon the Reichspräsident. Reichspräsident von Hindenburg has played a role both in Groener's resignation and the present overthrow of Brüning which is in sharp contradiction to his "constitutional position". That which is taking place in Germany at the present time contains all the features of a coup d'état, although everything is done apparently quite "constitutionally".

The Reichs-President caused it to be announced that he would first attempt to undertake the re-formation of the government in the usual Parliamentary way. This, of course, is only a farce. They want to preserve appearances.

The plans of the Hindenburg circle have as their aim the formation of a "national concentration", in which there shall be brought together all the reactionary and fascist forces. The strongest pressure is being exerted on the Centre in order that it shall join this front. Such a government would thereby already to-day have a majority in the Reichstag. The national socialists demand the immediate dissolution of the Reichstag, because they hope that as a result of the elections they will obtain such an increase in their seats that they will either no longer need the Centre in order to have a majority, or they could at least greatly reduce the influence of the Centre. It is therefore possible that the new government will immediately dissolve the Reichstag.

On the other hand, the circles connected with Schleicher, Hugenberg and Dingeldey are already fighting against the "immoderate" claims of the national socialists. The Hitler party is demanding for itself the leadership in the new Cabinet. Its Berlin organ "Angriff" wrote in its issue of May 30:

"Now or never the moment has come when the Reichs-President is meeting a historical hour. The right of the national socialist labour party to the leadership of the State is confirmed doubly and afresh. Will the Reichs-President simply evade this inevitable development? That is impossible!"

The "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung", the mouthpiece of heavy industry, is endeavouring to make it clear to the Hitler party that they "need the co-operation of tried and prominent practical men in politics and economic life", and insist that Brüning must retain the position of foreign Minister.

The social democracy stands perfectly passive in face of this development. The "Vorwärts" is so "bold" as to declare:

"The path which is now being adopted leads to a situation which can hardly be covered by the Constitution."

But it still stands protectingly before the Reichs-President, who has "undoubtedly acted with the most honest intentions and probably also in the consciousness of the immeasurably great consequences"! Hindenburg, whom the social democracy only six weeks ago elected Reichs-President as the "bulwark against Hitler" and "the protection against fascism", now goes quite openly over to the side of the fascist dictatorship. But the social fascist leaders still want to make out to the working masses that Hindenburg will "prevent the worst from happening".

The fascist dictatorship is now on the threshold of power. But what are the social democratic leaders doing? We read in the "Vorwärts" of May 31:

"The social democratic party has the best prospects of being freed from all, including indirect, responsibility for the conduct of the government. It has no reason to be annoyed with the Reichs President. The reproach: Why did you elect Hindenburg who is now steering to the Right? would be exceedingly out of place. As things were, the only choice was to help either Hitler or Hindenburg to victory; and faced with this choice the social democratic party would have to decide even to-day just as it decided then. The Reichs President, although elected by the Centre and the Left, by no means pledged himself to form a government only from the centre and the Lefts. But he undertook the obligation to protect the constitutional rights of the Opposition . . ."

"It does not require many words in order to show the question at issue. The loud-mouthed impotence of the Communists can in no way help the workers. Those who drive

the unemployed against the police play the game of reaction. No victory has ever been won by panic-mongering and outbreaks of desperation. What is necessary is calmness and confidence in spite of the clearest recognition of the dangers threatening . . ."

"At the present moment it is necessary to hold ourselves ready for a new Reichstag election campaign, which will perhaps commence in a few days."

No word summoning the masses to fight! No, the sole care, the sole concern of these criminal party leaders is the "Reichstag struggle". The social democratic workers are not to know how great is the danger which threatens them.

A week ago the Communist Party of Germany summoned the working masses to anti-fascist action. This parole at once aroused an eager response in all parts of the country. The policy of the C. P. of Germany, with its unswerving general line against fascism and social fascism, is completely confirmed and justified by the latest developments.

There is no doubt that the "new era" will be introduced by a tremendous intensification of the terror against the Communist Party and the whole of the revolutionary labour movement. The German working class must be prepared for everything and adapt its defensive action accordingly. The great wave of revolutionary movements which has swept the whole country in the last few weeks, and in Berlin, Hamburg, Düsseldorf, Wuppertal and many other places has led to serious collisions with the apparatus of power of the bourgeoisie, proves that the resistance of the proletariat is growing. It is now necessary to strengthen the ranks of the anti-fascist united front, above all to draw into it the social democratic workers, and to organise the counter-attack.

POLITICS

The Spanish Government in the Service of French Imperialism.

By J. Bullejos (Madrid).

The appointment of M. Herbettes as Ambassador of French imperialism at Madrid marks the beginning of a new phase in the international policy of the Spanish bourgeoisie, the main characteristic of which is immediate active participation in the fight against the Soviet Union. The counter-revolutionary alliance of the two imperialisms has as its chief aim the crushing of the Spanish revolution and the fight against the fatherland of the workers. The Spanish counter-revolution finds in the French bourgeoisie its most valuable auxiliary and most capable leader. The Azana government is therefore converting itself into a pliable and willing tool in the plans of French imperialism, above all of its bellicose intentions against the Soviet Union.

After the counter-revolutionary alliance of the two imperialisms has been solidly sealed, with the immediate participation of the French socialist Ministers, we witness the commencement of a big press campaign of calumnies against the Soviet Union. At the same time the Ministry of the Interior, in connection with the strike of 25th and 26th of January last, accused the government of the Soviet Union in Parliament of immediate participation in organising the revolutionary movement in Spain. Fernando de los Rios, the social fascist Minister, after having received the necessary hints at a breakfast he had with M. Herbettes in the French Embassy, talks of the fabulous sums which the Soviets are spending on Communist propaganda.

For the first time for a considerable number of years there is open talk in Parliament of a policy of war and of conquest. Azana considers himself a small Napoleon, and expresses his intention to employ the Spanish army in great international undertakings, which of course are the undertakings of French imperialism against the Soviet Union. And in connection with his declarations, which are taken up with enthusiasm by all the servile Parliamentary cretins of the counter-revolution, the army is being equipped with modern weapons and material so that it can be adapted to the warlike plans of French and Spanish imperialism.

Finally, a French naval squadron is visiting the Spanish ports and examining the possibilities of utilising the Spanish Mediterranean ports.

French imperialism is attempting to make use of the strike of 1st and 2nd May in its fight against the Soviet Union. A comprehensive policy of provocations has been commenced in order to strengthen the counter-revolutionary alliance with the Spanish bourgeoisie and also to enhance the hostile policy of the latter against the Soviet Union. In French diplomatic circles, efforts are being made to represent the strikes of May 1st and 2nd, and also the movement of 25th and 26th January, as a widespread revolutionary conspiracy, which is to be revealed at a suitable moment.

The main line of this alleged conspiracy could not be more phantastic. The Communist Party of Spain, of course in agreement with the Russians, is alleged to have prepared for the first half of May a big coup which was to begin on May first and end on May 15. According to this story, large quantities of weapons, about 5000 rifles and 300 machine-guns, were imported into the country over the French frontier from the Soviet Union. In order to complete the possibilities of action, it is stated, 170 million Pesetas in notes were forged. The general line of the revolutionary plan was drawn up in Moscow, from where it was brought to Spain by "Muscovite leaders", who were to carry it out. Fortunately the Spanish government was informed regarding everything and knows already the general line and the plan of attack.

This palpable attempt at provocation was to have been made during the strike of May 1st and 2nd. The mass character of this movement and the political importance which it assumed, undoubtedly compelled the government to retreat. It is now waiting for a more favourable moment in order to put this phantastic story into circulation.

Meanwhile, the press campaign against the Soviet Union is continued, the military policy is assuming a more pronouncedly anti-Soviet character, and the armament factories and works are increasing their output. According to the latest press reports, the output of potash has doubled, and this year amounts to 120,000 tons whilst in the previous year it amounted to 60,000 tons.

The C.C. of the Communist Party of Germany on the Overthrow of the Brüning Government.

The Berlin "Rote Fahne", of May 31st, published a communiqué on the occasion of the overthrow of the Brüning Cabinet from which we print the following extract:

"The Brüning government has been overthrown. The ruling finance capitalists, the junkers and generals have given the Brüning-Groener government the sack, Reichs President Hindenburg, the candidate of the social democrats and of the other Brüning parties, a few weeks after his re-election, has carried out the wishes of the trust bourgeoisie, the big agrarians and Reichswehr generals, who by overthrowing the present Cabinet wish to open the path for a new offensive of fascist reaction, for a tremendous intensification of the methods of fascist suppression of the working class and for an increased war policy of the German bourgeoisie.

"For two years the social democracy has attempted to persuade the masses of the German proletariat that its boundless toleration of the Brüning government, the policy of its Ministers Braun and Severing in Prussia, and its unlimited support of the policy of emergency decrees in the Reich, its open Parliamentary and extra-Parliamentary support of the Brüning policy, meant a "lesser evil" for the working class.

"For two years the social democracy has lied to the masses by telling that this policy would protect them from fascism. Today it is obvious that the Communist Party was perfectly right. The Communists told the masses that the policy of accelerated fascisation, which was carried on by the Brüning government and its Braun-Severing branch in Prussia, paved the way for those forces which wish to establish the open fascist dictatorship in Germany.

"The fascist deadly enemy is rising more threateningly than ever against the German proletariat. The Central Committee of the C.P. of Germany, in this serious hour, again calls to all class-conscious working men and women, to the young workers, to the exploited employees, the impoverished middle classes, the poor peasants, to unite for an anti-fascist action and to take up the mass fight against fascism for the proletarian demands.

"The Central Committee of the C.P. of Germany renews its offer and its honest appeal to the social democratic workers, to the workers in the free and christian trade unions, the workers in the Reichsbanner and all mass organisations, to set up, shoulder to shoulder with the Communists, side by side with the Red Trade Union Opposition, under the slogan of the anti-fascist action, the fighting red united front against the class enemy.

"The Central Committee appeals to the toilers who up to now have been drawn by the deceitful promises and the national and social demagoguery of the Hitler party into supporting the fascist terror organisation of finance capital. They too must recognise that only the Communist Party defends the interests of all workers and impoverished toilers. They also must take up the fight, side by side with the militant red united front, against the capitalist exploiters and oppressors.

"The Central Committee of the C.P. of Germany appeals to the whole of the German working class and stigmatises the new incitement for a prohibition of the Party of the German proletariat, the Communist Party and the Young Communist League, which has been commenced during the last few days by the national socialist and the rest of the bourgeois press with the active support of the social democratic press. The insolent incitement which describes the Communists as the 'trustees of a foreign Power', which ascribes to the Communists, who are conducting in the whole of Germany the fight against the bloody terror, 'acts of terror and brutalities', is an inseparable part of the general offensive of the capitalist class against the working class and all toilers. It is necessary that the whole of the German working class and the toiling people unanimously and determinedly rally round their Party, the Party of the German workers, the Communist Party of Germany and support it with the power of the million masses in its fight against the attacks of the class enemy.

"The intensified fascist policy of the German bourgeoisie increases at the same time the danger of an imperialist war. The Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany calls upon all German workers and toilers to take up the revolutionary mass fight against imperialist war. Every attack upon the country of Socialism, the Soviet Union, every threat to the country of the proletarian dictatorship is at the same time a threat to the German working class and its fight for emancipation from the fetters of the Versailles slavery.

"The mobilisation of the millions for the setting up of the common fighting front in the factories, at the Labour Exchanges, in town and country, for the anti-fascist action is the imperative command of the hour. It is necessary to set up everywhere united front committees of the anti-fascist action which must be supported by the fighting will of the masses!"

THE WORLD "DISARMAMENT" CONFERENCE

The Achievements of the World "Disarmament" Conference to Date.

By Nemo.

Of the seven months which the World "Disarmament" Conference is calculated to last, four have already passed without the heroes of bourgeois diplomacy gathered in Geneva having adopted any decisive measures which would lead to the melting down of one gun, the discharge of even one soldier and the saving of one item of expenditure on armaments. After the League of Nations has taken fully seven years in preparing disarmament, the world Conference has arrived at an impasse from which it is seeking a way out solely in the direction of increased military securities. If one examines the proceedings of the Disarmament Conference, it becomes evident that the more obvious the fact of a new war becomes, the more openly the wirepullers of imperialist war abandon their pacifist phrases. The struggle for armaments and the preparation of a new war is carried on openly; the fire of the guns in the Far East has dispersed the Geneva peace-fog.

After the World Congress had been meeting for six weeks,

it was adjourned on March 18. Of these first six weeks, eight days were devoted to greetings and organisational questions, a week and a half to the setting up of commissions, and two and a half weeks to a general discussion, which consisted of solemn speeches of all government representatives. After this activity, in which the only positive thing achieved was **the rejection of the radical disarmament proposals brought forward by the Soviet representatives**, the Conference was adjourned for three weeks in order to enable the delegates to recover from their strenuous exertions. Not even the draft convention drawn up by the Preparatory Disarmament Commission, and representing the result of five years' work, could be adopted by the World Conference as the fundamental method of its further activity.

The declarations of the leaders of the different delegations invariably contained disarmament proposals which were cleverly calculated to be rejected by the other delegates or, as the plan for the setting up of a League of Nations' army, would be bound to give rise to endless discussions. **Japan** advocated the abolition of aircraft-carriers in order to meet the superiority of America in this respect; **America** opposed submarines in order to protect its trade routes; **England** fought for the abolition of bombing planes, wisely realising its particular vulnerability to air attacks; **Italy** opposed heavy weapons of attack, because it is unable to keep up with French armaments. The Geneva delegates all endeavoured to put forward demands which would weaken their opponents and strengthen the military position of their own countries, as this will always be the case under capitalism. The result of this method was that the work of the World Disarmament Conference did not advance one step. In his closing speech before the Conference adjourned, **Arthur Henderson** admitted that in the first six weeks the Conference had not even approached its main tasks.

When the World Conference met again in the middle of April, there commenced a game, which was interrupted by the Whitsun holidays, and was then resumed and is being continued up to the present time. If an important question demanded a concrete answer, it was referred by the General Commission to the appropriate Technical Commission, from which it came back unanswered. Under the pretext "unclearness of technical detail", the General Commission referred the question to be solved by them to a technical Commission, which politely sent the question back with the remark: "question one of political principle." In this way the most elementary questions remained open, as for instance, "shall only gas warfare or also its preparations be prohibited?"

The technical committees of experts at the Geneva World Conference, who should only play a subordinate role, have proved to be the actual brake on the machinery at the Geneva proceedings. The Technical Committees, consisting of Generals and Admirals, have been given the task of determining the limits of disarmament. That is to say, the generals shall dig their own graves. Even the **„Neue Zürcher Zeitung“** declared that the members of these Committees **„theoretically always consider themselves at war with the armed forces of the country with whose hostility they reckon“**, so that from the standpoint of the military experts the Conference will be successful "if the measures jointly decided on are calculated to strengthen their own relative positions rather than that of their opponents". According to the **„Neue Zürcher Zeitung“**, the disputes and discussions in the Experts' Commissions have **a great similarity with the war-games which are based on the very real war-hypotheses of the various General Staffs.**

The most important result of the Geneva negotiations is without doubt the motion adopted on April 19, according to which disarmament should take place on the basis of the notorious article 8 of the League of Nations' Covenant, "on that minimum which is compatible with national security and with the carrying out of the obligations rendered necessary as a result of international action", at the same time taking into account the geographical situation and the special conditions of each State. The World Conference decided that its work should represent only the first step on the path to disarmament, and that further disarmament Conferences must follow. With the adoption of these decisions, which represent a victory of the French security thesis, there was put through the principle of a limitation of armaments spread over a number of years. At the same time the reservations regarding the countries bordering on the Soviet Union made disarma-

ment completely illusory. It should be remarked that the German representative also voted for these decisions.

The negotiations at Geneva up to the present have surpassed the most pessimistic expectations. All hopes of a fulfilment of the disarmament promises made seven years ago have long since been buried. It was characteristic of the attitude of the Geneva peace prophets that the Danish Foreign Minister **„Mr. Munch“**, could submit a memorandum from his government demanding the carrying out of disarmament in several stages, between each of which there should intervene a period of five years. There can be no doubt that the actual application of the above resolution of the League of Nations more than justifies the demand of Denmark, which was inspired by the big imperialist Powers.

"The Conference as such, i. e. as a body representative of all governments, which, under the control of the public, should investigate and solve the disarmament question, has long since disappeared", reports the Geneva correspondent of the **„Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung“**. As a matter of fact the most important questions of the Conference have been kept out of the public debates and discussed behind closed doors, where they form the object of political bargaining between the imperialist Powers. At the same time strong forces are at work in order to bring about a fresh postponement of the negotiations. Significant in this respect is an article published in the Paris **„Matin“** of May 17, suggesting a postponement of the World Conference until November. According to the **„Matin“**, the Geneva Conference is leading only a shadow existence, so that merely a long postponement would suffice to bring this comedy of a Conference to a conclusion.

The desire for a postponement of the World Disarmament Conference is as old as the Conference itself. No delegate, however, has the courage to make such a proposal openly, because they are all hoping daily for **an ending of their peace-comedy by the outbreak of a new world war.**

FASCISM IN GERMANY

The National Socialist German Workers Party*).

By Hans Jaeger (Berlin).

I.

The Leaders

The knowledge of the international working class concerning the so-called national socialist movement in Germany is still very unclear and in part one-sided. Some people have the idea that the fascist movement consists exclusively of aggressive sluggers. However, this idea cannot explain the fact that on the 10th April, at the Reich's Presidential election, the fascists succeeded in polling thirteen million votes. How did the fascists succeed in penetrating into all sections of the population? Other people think that the aim of the fascist dictatorship is the decisive thing, or the campaign against the Jews, or the opposition to the Versailles Treaty. All this is not enough to explain the unparalleled success, to explain why millions regard Hitler as the "Saviour".

Let us first of all take a look at the "whippers-in" of the movement. Who is **Hitler**? If one examines his development and his social career, one must come to the conclusion that the German bourgeoisie needed just such a type as its pied piper. The following incident is eloquent: In the Vienna Academy of Arts the sixteen year old Hitler presents certain drawings to a professor who asks him rather superciliously whether he has passed through a technical building course. Hitler replies in the negative, whereupon the professor asks him brutally what on earth he is doing in the school, particularly as Hitler has not matriculated, and all Hitler's hopes are roughly dashed to the ground. Poor Hitler, the son of an Austrian custom official, whose whole ambition was to possess a house of his own, is compelled to earn his living as an unskilled labourer. His biographer Czech-Jochburg records this incident and comments indignantly: "He did not want

* This article is the first of a series which we intend publishing on the most important aspects of Fascism in Germany and which will give a brief description of German Fascism in all its forms. Ed.

to, no, no, but he had to." This little incident tells us very much about Hitler and about his followers, if not everything. It is the story of the proletarian whose aim is **not** to emancipate his class, who does not want to be free as a part of his class, but who seeks a way for personal advancement, the proletarian who is everywhere (according to information from the same source) despised as a "yellow" and who is compelled to wander from job to job. Such a proletarian is at heart a petty-bourgeois, and in consequence he does not want to fight side by side with his fellow workers. He therefore hates every form of proletarian activity, class-struggle, strike, trade unions and other organisational forms of working class action. Above all he hates internationalism and the reds who try to drag him down to them, the workers with whom he is compelled to associate, but from whom he seeks to break away at the first possible moment.

This is the type which the ruling class can use, a type with the proper mixture of hatred against the working class, as though his fellow sufferers were responsible for his lot, hatred which he naturally does not admit, but which he camouflages into a hatred against the "Internationalists", the "class fighters", and a residue of resentment against those who prevent him rising, a resentment which can be guided into useful channels and exploited in demagogic agitation.

After the war Hitler, whose nationalism and fanatical hatred of the "reds", had been intensified by the lost war, came into contact in Munich with a small group which called itself "The German Workers Party". Under the instructions of the Reichswehr he was to "report" the activities of this group, in other words, he came as a spy into their ranks. Here he learned the theories of Feder concerning "the breaking of interest-slavery". That was what he needed! This was the key to conduct himself "anti-capitalistically" without hurting the ruling class, to present himself as a "friend of the workers" without coming into contact with the working class movement. This is thoroughly in accordance with the character of the petty-bourgeoisie which is being proletarianised by the capitalist development, but which is unwilling to admit the change in its social situation, which is unwilling to sink into the ranks of the proletariat and which is proud to be still counted among the ranks of the bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeoisie which is unable to find the real cause of things because it does not seek for it in the system, but in individuals, individual politicians. The petty-bourgeoisie which deals in wild radicalism without summoning up sufficient courage to be really revolutionary. The petty-bourgeoisie which is prepared to flirt with the working class if it thinks it can thereby win back its lost positions, but which is basically vacillating and prepared to give ear to all sorts of prophets.

Hitler botches up a theory perfectly suited for the existing situation of the hard-pressed petty-bourgeoisie: capitalism is not guilty, but loan capital, "predatory" capital. With this theory there is less danger of causing annoyance above. It admitted the existence of good, solid and decent capitalists, and where is the petty bourgeois who does not harbour the ambition to climb up into their ranks? Thus the banks were divided from the industrialists and the agrarians. The bankers were foreigners, the Jews! At least, they said so. The "native" capitalists in industry and agriculture, the hand-workers and the small traders were placed in opposition to a "foreign body" in the economic system. This "foreign body" was the banks, the foreign concerns in Germany (General Motors, Pecek, Bata), the stock exchange, the big stores, just according to the circles to which fascism happened to be appealing with its agitation. Thus anti-semitism and nationalism became the centre of the new theory. The banks exploit the industrialists just as much as they do the workers, announced Hitler under Feder's influence. Industrialists and workers therefore belong together. This is real national unity. Whoever incites them against each other, as the Marxists do, he serves the interests of the bankers. Marxism is therefore the lackey of the banks and the connecting links are—the Jews! The golden and the red international work together.

This was the decisive theory with which the so-called national socialists presented themselves as anti-capitalists whilst at the same time attempting to bring Marxism into disrepute by declaring it to be pro-capitalist. The activity of the social democracy, which was termed Marxist despite the fact that it had definitely abandoned Marxism, supplied enough agitation material to support this cunning misrepre-

sentation; and the foreign policy of the social democracy with its capitalist policy of fulfilling the Versailles Treaty supported this still more. (Was this not apparently a proof of the co-operation of the red (if the social democracy were still red!) with the golden international? In reality, of course, it proved only the co-operation of the social democracy with capitalism, whilst the existence of the Communist International is the strongest refutation of this primitive argument of the national socialists.)

These cunning manoeuvres of the national socialists were much assisted by the foreign political situation. The situation of Germany after the war, the annexation of territories with German populations (Alsace-Lorraine and parts of Upper Silesia, Memel, Eupen-Malmedy, Danzig, the Saar), the cutting off of East Prussia from the rest of Germany by the Polish corridor, the tribute payments, the way in which promises were repeatedly made and then afterwards all relief was refused, the occupation of the Rhineland, in short, the oppression of Germany by the foreign imperialist powers which caused a wave of unparalleled chauvinism, all this not only assisted the national socialist agitation, but as a result of the pro-Versailles treaty policy of the social democracy, it made possible the denunciation of Marxism (which was always deliberately represented as the social democracy) as the lackey of international finance capitalism.

Thus national socialism grew on a demagogic basis with a pseudo-struggle against capitalism satisfactory to the petty-bourgeoisie (along the lines of, "make an omelet but don't break any eggs") without damaging capitalism and serving to detract the anti-capitalist tendencies in the working masses, whilst conducting itself as wildly nationalist and—in accordance with the double nature of the petty-bourgeoisie—directing itself against the revolutionary working class movement. These ideas of Hitler were taken up enthusiastically by petty-bourgeois like the apothecary **Gregor Strasser**, the official **Frick**, the clerical worker **Stoehr** and others. The crude ideas which placed Jews, Frenchmen, department stores owners, stock exchange jobbers, war profiteers, speculators, grain dealers, bankers and Marxists on the same level suited their mentality.

Another type which joined the fascists and added a few more patches to the crazy quilt was the intellectual. Rosenberg, a man from the Baltic States and a fanatical enemy of the Soviet Union, took care to see that the anti-Soviet tendencies in fascism got the upper hand and disposed, at least in the circles of the leaders, of the idea of a war of revenge against France, which still plays a role in the minds of the rank and file, in favour of a crusade against world communism. Formerly Great Britain was regarded as being eaten up by Jewry, but Rosenberg took care to alter this attitude into one friendly to Great Britain. The friendliness of fascism in Germany for Italy resulted as a matter of course from the enthusiasm for the fascist programme of Mussolini. Later on, when France took the leading role in the anti-soviet front, the fanatical enemies of Moscow in the fascist movement caused a change of attitude towards France. Goering declared himself in favour of coming to an agreement with France, and Hitler opened up a correspondence with Hervé and only the rank and file fascists still continued to sing their hymn of hate against France. Count Reventlow, who was in favour of turning towards the east, was pressed to the wall, and in the South Tyrol question the nationalist principle was abandoned as a concession to the fascists in Italy. National emancipation remained a phrase to deceive the rank and file, and in reality it meant nothing more than a struggle against the revolutionary working class and against world communism, and in the background there was the idea of a fascist international.

Feder's services to fascism lay in his creation of the "interest slavery" theory. The service of **Goebbels** to the fascist movement was that he was the first to win workers to any extent for fascism, first of all in the Ruhr district and later on in Berlin. Since 1926 Hitler had more and more abandoned this field. Goebbels, however, concentrated his chief activities here. Here fascist demagoguery practised quite different tricks from those used for the petty-bourgeoisie and the peasants. The sins of the social democracy was what made this propaganda at all possible. The methods used by the fascists were participation in strikes (where it was "unavoidable"), a fact which did not damage the general strike-breaking proclivities of the party and which was regularly accompanied by apologies to the industrialists, attempts to

claim even the May Day celebrations for the fascists, reckless demagoguery with regard to unenlightened sections of the workers such as the landworkers, home workers, young workers, and a tactic of corruption, which will be dealt with in greater detail later. In part this demagoguery had unpleasant results, for a section of the workers took it seriously and later on when they saw through it they went over to the communists, and a section was caught up by the oppositional fascist Otto Strasser who formed a group, essentially not less fascist than the Hitler party, and serving to catch just such elements. Although in the meantime the fascist party has abandoned even the appearance of socialism, Goebbels' demagoguery continues to have its effect, and Goebbels is doing his best to repair what Hitler damages with his open exposure of the pro-capitalist nature of the fascist movement. Goebbels was opposed to the too open alliance with the reaction at the Harzburg conference (German nationalists and Stahlhelm); he conceals the connections of the fascists with the industrialists and the monarchists, and attempts to

prevent the coming coalition with the Centre (Catholic) Party, in order to prevent the workers abandoning the fascist movement. Hitler's chief efforts, on the other hand, are directed to seeing that the bourgeois members do not abandon the movement. This is the tactical difference between the two.

Then there are the officers. There are those who believe in nationalism and those who aim solely at the civil war and the struggle against the Soviet Union, old Generals and young officers who were robbed of their occupations by the Versailles Treaty, mercenaries like Captain Roehm, who sought his daily bread in the Bolivian army, fême murderers like Heinz, and terrorists like Killinger, experts in civil war like General von Epp who crushed the Soviet Republic in Munich in 1919. All these types need no "theory". Their aim is too clear for that. And in the background of the movement are the industrialists Thyssen and Kirdorf, and rich agrarians like Wangenheim and Corswandt and—the ex-Crown Prince. That is the patchwork which calls itself the National Socialist German Workers Party, viewed from above.

The War

Down with the Provokers of War in the Far East!

Moscow, May, 1932.

The Japanese ultra-reactionary newspaper "Nichon" has published a provocative, anti-Soviet article by Kamaizi, whom the editor describes as an "expert on the Russian question".

To-day's "Pravda", in its article: "Down with the Provokers of War in the Far East", exposes the imperialist robber tendencies of the Japanese fascist press hack and opposes the new attempt to provoke the Soviet Union.

The "Pravda" writes:

The newspaper "Nichon" needs no recommendation. It is well known in and outside of Japan as a mouthpiece of the aspirations of the most reactionary adventurist circles of Japanese imperialism. In addition it is utterly without talent. Its correspondent Kamaizi who is termed "an expert on the Russian question" by the newspaper, is in possession of the same qualities. What is the aim of this "expert"? To judge by his article in the "Nichon" which is entitled, "Japanese-American or Japanese-Soviet War" he is aiming at war with the Soviet Union. Actually it is not necessary to go into details concerning the "discoveries" of Kamaizi, the expert for anti-Soviet provocations. Such attacks on the Soviet Union and such appeals for war against the Soviet Union have come repeatedly and openly from various arch-reactionary circles. When we nevertheless deal with Kamaizi's writings, we do so only because in certain Japanese circles, which have long ago lost all sense of humour and reality, Kamaizi's remarks are treated seriously. It is necessary to analyse the "conception" of the correspondent of the "Nichon". It is also not necessary to examine his "plan" for the establishment of peace and harmony in the Far East (for the moment it has got no further than the columns of the "Nichon"). We are interested in the programme of action put forward by Kamaizi, his arguments and his conclusions.

The "expert" of the "Nichon" writes with his own untrammelled ignorance:

"There can be no friendship between Japan and the Soviet Union because their ideals are diametrically opposed."

We are not prepared to quarrel about ideals. The contradiction which exists between the two countries is known by all the workers and by all honest people all over the world, and even by Japan itself when they compare the policy of the two countries. As far as "friendship", in other words good neighbourly relations, is concerned, there is no hindrance to its existence and consolidation from the side of the Soviet Union. This, however, is just what Kamaizi and those who guide his hand, do not want. Kamaizi does not need the friendship of the Soviet Union. He needs—Siberia! And in order to get it he calls for a war against the Soviet Union. Explaining his ideas, he declares:

"Japan is a monarchy which strives for the peaceful co-existence (!!) and respect of the mutual interests of the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union, on the other hand,

is a republic which is striving for disorder, civil war and revolution and for dominance over the whole world."

Kamaizi then comes to the unexpected conclusions from all this:

"But there can be no talk of establishing a paradise in Manchuria before the Soviet question is solved. The solution of the Manchurian problem depends on the solution of the Siberian problem. Manchurian means life or death to Japan, and in the same way Eastern Siberian means life or death to Manchuria and Mongolia."

Naturally, it is not a question of "Manchuria". Kamaizi has something quite different in mind. Paradise—that is a fine word. The actual cause of our worthy "expert" drawing such unexpected conclusions, he makes quite clear himself when he writes:

"By an independent Siberia Japan secures its complete economic independence from the rest of the world. If Manchuria, Mongolia and Siberia are independent, then Japan has nothing to fear even should it be attacked by the whole world." "If Japan obtains Siberia it will be able to forget unemployment and economic crisis for ever." "The sooner this programme against the Soviet Union is carried through the better it will be."

This open appeal for war against the Soviet Union is apparently in the opinion of Kamaizi a confirmation of his contention that "Japan strives for peaceful co-existence". By the way, it must be pointed out that the arguments of Kamaizi show no superfluity of logic and healthy commonsense. However, the "expert" of the "Nichon" is firmly convinced that neither the one nor the other is necessary providing it can be replaced by the necessary number of cannons.

The pogrom article of Kamaizi, whose author has not even built it up logically, is the result of the great difficulties which are driving certain Japanese imperialist circles into a blind alley; it is also the result of the poverty of thought which is characteristic of the Russian white guardists. Kamaizi has no logic at his disposal, but his insolence is therefore all the greater. On what does this "expert on the Russian Question" base his contention that the Soviet Union "wishes to subjugate the whole world"? We could ask where and when the Soviet Union has ever taken part in an intervention against Japan; where and when the Soviet Union has ever attempted to seize a part of Japan, or indeed of any territory outside its own frontiers; where and when the Soviet Union has ever made any attack on Japan's possessions on the Asiatic mainland. By the way Kamaizi, who is it that has occupied Manchuria? Is it the Soviet Union? And in conclusion, you gentlemen of the editorial staff of the "Nichon", permit us to ask you where and when an article even faintly reminiscent of this article of Kamaizi has ever appeared in the Soviet press? Where and when has the Soviet press ever appealed for a war against Japan and for the severance of any part of Japan's possessions, as this provoker and "expert" Kamaizi does towards the Soviet Union? With all their

cleverness, the warmongers of the "Nichon" would not be able to offer a single fact to serve as a basis for the provocative assertions of their correspondent Kamaizi.

This gentlemen, whose pen, we may assume, is paid by those circles which are thirsting for new adventures, has quite different ideas. He writes:

"There is no need to fear that anyone will protest against the independence of Siberia."

Indeed, one must really possess the general lack of talents which characterised the reactionary circles of Czarist Russia of glorious memory in order to rise to a self-deception of this sort. If Kamaizi hopes to win the sympathy of the United States and of the other capitalist countries, that is his business. We are inclined to think that the imperialist contradictions in the Pacific Ocean form a rather more complicated knot than the gentlemen on the editorial staff of the "Nichon" imagine. There are sufficient people in Japan who are well aware that Japanese-American relations are a very complicated problem, in the last resort a world problem, and that their solution would demand something a little more weighty than the provocative anti-Soviet manoeuvres of Kamaizi.

The provocative assertion of Kamaizi that "the outrage in Shanghai was the work of a Korean puppet of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" will assist in this respect. Or, such arguments, not without originality, as "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the general enemy of the whole world". All these "topical slogans" of Kamaizi are undoubtedly borrowed from white guardist leaflets or, in the best case, copied out of some anti-Soviet pogrom leaflet. Urged on by someone, Kamaizi repeats, on several occasions in his article:

"Are the Japanese authorities really hesitating? Now is the best time to carry out this programme (the occupation of Siberia. Ed. "Pravda"). We must not miss a moment which will perhaps never come again."

This whole hysterical outburst is interesting from another point of view. It is reminiscent of the arguments brought forward by the colleagues of Kamaizi almost a year ago during the occupation of Mukden. However, we are nevertheless compelled to disappoint the "expert" of the "Nichon". The moment has been missed. It was missed long ago, namely on the 7th November 1917.

"Fascism cannot help Japan", writes Kamaizi. "The only thing which can help Japan would be to open the doors of Siberia."

Whether fascism will help Japanese imperialism or not we can leave to Kamaizi. We are, however, firmly convinced that this pogrom agitation and incitement against the Soviet Union in the "Nichon" will under no circumstances assist Japan and the world about whose interests the venal and corrupt "expert" Kamaizi is so anxious. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, this wild and irresponsible orgy of another warmonger is nothing new. It reminds us only once again of the necessity of being always on the alert. In expectation of further outbursts, we should like to point out to Kamaizi that he will no more see "the open doors of Siberia" than he will be privileged to see his own ears.

The Provocative Anti-Soviet Campaign of the "Nichon".

Tokyo, May 27th 1932.

The newspaper "Nichon", which is connected with the extreme Right, concludes the publication of a series of articles by its "Expert in the Russian question" Kamaizi, by publishing a concluding article under the heading: "Japanese-American or Japanese-Soviet war?" The main idea of the article is as follows: America, which formerly was a teacher of Japan at the beginning of the Meiji epoch, in the second half of the XIX. century, became the rival of Japan in the Far East, and since the Peace of Portsmouth has exerted all possible pressure on Japan, especially at the Washington Conference and at the London Conference, as well as by passing a law restricting Japanese emigration. As a result of this there increased in strength a tendency in influential Japanese circles which is in favour of accelerating war with America, the more so as after 1935 the position of Japan in relation to America will be much more disadvantageous.

Kamaizi rejects this standpoint, as in his opinion, in the event of a Japanese-American war, there can come about "collaboration between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union in China". Even if Japan fights America alone,—writes the author,—there can be no hope of victory (as even the defeat of the United States fleet would not be accompanied by an economic victory) although "the U.S.A., owing to the intervening Pacific Ocean, could not inflict a final defeat on Japan".

Kamaizi points out that the Chinese market is the chief cause of the antagonism between the U.S.A. and Japan. Therefore it is necessary to strive for a compromise "by dividing the Chinese market between the U.S.A. and Japan".

"This task", declares the author, "is not an easy one. But it is to be solved if one takes into account the existence of the antagonisms between the United States and England and also the sentiments of the American cotton planters, who do not want to lose the Japanese market."

The situation is quite different as regards a war between Japan and the Soviet Union, continues the author. There can exist no friendship between Japan and the Soviet Union, "as their ideals are diametrically opposed. Japan is a monarchy which strives for the peaceful co-existence and respect of the mutual interests of the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is a Republic, which is striving for disorder, civil war and revolution and wishes to subjugate the whole world".

Public opinion in Japan, says Kamaizi, is concentrated at present on Manchuria and Mongolia. But there can be no talk of "establishing a paradise in Manchuria before the Soviet question is solved". According to Kamaizi, the solution of the Manchurian-Mongolian problem depends upon the solution of the Siberian problem.

"The Manchurian State must solve the Siberian problem, otherwise it will be threatened from the Siberian frontier. On the Chinese Eastern Railway there still exists a danger which prevents the consolidation of the Manchurian State. One must not be deceived by the friendly speeches of the Soviet government. The solution of the Siberian problem means "supporting the Siberian people, which has settled in the district East of Lake Baikal, by achieving its independence and laying down the principle of the open door in Siberia for the whole world".

"Japan", continues Kamaizi, "is terribly afraid of the public opinion of the U.S.A., England and other Powers. None of them really raises any objection to Japan's policy in Siberia. Japan helped the people of Manchuria to achieve its independence. The C.P.S.U. is the enemy of the whole world. One need not therefore be afraid that anybody will protest against the independence of Siberia". The countries bordering on the Soviet Union, writes Kamaizi, are preparing the anti-Soviet bloc. Japan, so writes the Tokyo arch-reactionary, by elaborating its plans secures itself, when it has an independent Siberia, "complete economic independence from the rest of the world".

"With the existence of an independent Manchuria, Mongolia and Siberia, Japan has nothing to fear even if it should be attacked by the whole world."

From the territory traversed by the railway line from Ussurisk alone it is possible to obtain 30 million koku of rice a year. Eastern Siberia has gold, iron, timber, fish, coal and fruitful soil in abundance. If Japan obtains Siberia it will be able to forget unemployment and economic crisis for ever. The independence of Siberia means that Japan kills not two, but five birds with one stone.

In Japan, continues Kamaizi, there is much talk of fascism, but no fascism will help Japan. There is only one means which will help Japan, and that is: to open the doors to Siberia. Now is the best time in order to carry out this programme. We must not miss a moment which may never come again.

In conclusion, declares Kamaizi, the outrage in Shanghai was carried out by a "Korean, a puppet of the C.P.S.U."; and he insinuates that a number of outrages on the Chinese Eastern railway was the "handiwork of Russian Communists".

Are the Japanese authorities, exclaims Kamaizi, really undecided to adopt decisive measures in connection with the outrage of 12th of April out of fear of the power of the Red Army? The sooner this programme against the Soviet Union is carried through the better—that is the concluding note of this exceedingly insolent and provocative article written by a corrupt press hack of the insane adventurist circles of Japanese imperialism.

Norway and the War Danger.

By Edith Rudquist.

About the beginning of the year, trade relations between the Soviet Union and the Kolstad-Quisling ("peasant") government were broken off. The large landowners and farmer groups of Norway were being more and more affected by the world economic crisis. They looked to the government for aid, and they were told that their troubles were due to the heavy Soviets imports to Norway. A campaign was conducted by this Kolstad-Quisling group whereby the Soviet Union was held up to the Norwegian working masses much the same as one holds a bogey-man up to a child. Trade relations were severed. The industrial workers, forestry and farm workers, were to be scared; their bread was being taken away from them by the Soviet "bear". Then suddenly the shoe pinched the wrong foot. The Soviet Union, its trade agreement with Norway broken, contracted for carrying and freighting service from other countries, and the Norwegian merchant fleet became more idle, throwing thousands of seamen out of employment. The Soviet Union contracted for herring and fish products elsewhere, and tens of thousands of fishers and conserve workers were laid off, the fishing fleet lay idle. Chemical products, machinery, aluminum, etc. had also been heavily purchased by the Soviet Union in Norway; these industries suffered too. These workers were added to the already large unemployed army. They were among the most class conscious and the Norwegian government was faced with another problem: to hold in check these workers who saw their bread and butter taken from them, not by the "big black Russian bear", but by the political manoeuvres of the Kolstad-Quisling group. Negotiations with the Soviet Union were again taken up, but in the meanwhile tons of slanderous lies were printed about the Soviet Union and broadcasted. The campaign of the enemies of the Soviet Union had partly achieved its aim.

Early in April Quisling made a speech in the Storting where he accused a "foreign power" of lending aid for the purpose of overthrowing the Norwegian Constitution, and tried to prove that both money and instructions for this purpose had been sent to Norway by this "foreign power". He dramatically stated to the Storting that "secret documents" are in the government's possession. Acting as a partner in the Quisling political intrigue, Nygaardsvold, the social democratic leader in the Storting, demanded that the documents be produced at once, so that no one should think that the Norwegian Labour Party (N.A.P.) was the "workers" organisation referred to by Quisling. But the communist organ "Ny Tid" the following day, relieved the injured feelings of the Tranmaelites, by printing the "secret" documents, which consisted of telegrams sent at the time of the Menstad affair by a member of the C.C. of N.C.P., who at that time happened to be in Moscow. The sham battle, in order to deceive the workers, between the government and the N.A.P. goes merrily on, Nygaardsvold demanding the proofs and Quisling stating that they cannot be produced until they have been carefully read, "affairs of state do not permit all of them being made public now".

Tranmael stands behind Quisling in this anti-Soviet move. "Arbeiderbladet", the same as the rest of the II International press, prints all the telegrams coming from the whiteguard nests in Bucharest, Riga, Paris, etc. In addition the N.A.P. press also gives space to such "news" as the arrival of Emma Goldman to Oslo, and devotes many columns to a report of her speech.

Each day there appears in the Norwegian press more examples of the preparatory campaign for war and for intervention against the Soviet Union, a war wherein the workers of Norway will not only act as spectators, but as participants. We have for example the discussions in the book "Skandinaviens Sikkerhet" (Scandinavia's Security) written by a staff officer where he takes up the question of Scandinavia's position in the coming war, particularly in relationship to the Soviet Union. Then we have the anti-soviet articles by Julian Huxley, outstanding I.L.P. man, in the theoretical organ of the Tranmaelites, "Twentieth Century"; the whole last issue in which this article appears, is edited as a broad frontal attack against Marxism-Leninism.

It is the task of the Norwegian Communist Party, of the Norwegian Friends of Soviet Union Society, to combat the slanderous anti-Soviet propaganda conducted by Tranmael, Emma Goldman and Co.

INTERNATIONAL FIGHT AGAINST WAR AND INTERVENTION

International Anti-War Congress in Geneva.

Berlin, 25th May 1932.

The appeal of Maxim Gorki, Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, Theodore Dreiser and others for an international congress against war in Geneva on the 28th July has met with an enthusiastic response in many countries and preparations are proceeding to make the congress a success.

Madame Sun Yat-sen has telegraphed to the preparatory committee that every effort will be made in China, so far as conditions permit, to support the work of the committee and send a Chinese delegation to the congress. She will do her utmost to be present and speak at the congress.

The veteran leader of the revolutionary working class movement in Japan, Sen Katayama, has sent a letter to the preparatory committee promising the support of the revolutionary workers of Japan and declaring that he will be present at the congress.

In Bulgaria a national preparatory committee has been formed to organise the sending of a strong delegation. A number of prominent intellectuals are members of the committee. In addition many working class and peasant organisations have expressed their intention of giving the committee every possible support and of being represented at Geneva.

Ten prominent left-wing authors have joined the preparatory committee which has been formed in Poland to support the congress.

In Germany a preparatory committee has been formed, including Ex-Colonel Lange of the Prussian police, Ernst Toller, Bert Brecht, Bernard von Brentano, Ernst Glaeser, Kaethe Kollwitz, Anna Seegers, ex-General von Schoenaich and Dr. Max Hodann.

Prominent Women Support Anti-War Congress.

Paris, 27th May 1932.

The bureau of the international committee for the preparation of the anti-war congress in Geneva has received an appeal against war and in support of the congress signed by numerous prominent women, including Clara Viebig, Dr. Camilla Drevet, Professor Käthe Kollwitz, Dr. Helene Stoecker, Renée Stobrava the actress, Charlotte Despard, Clara Zetkin, Elsbeth Bruck and Alice Dullo in the name of the World League of Mothers and Teachers.

The appeal points out that in particular the wives and mothers are called upon to suffer the brutalities of war, and calls upon them to remember the horrors of the last war which slaughtered and crippled their nearest and dearest. The appeal points out that to-day the danger of war is closer than at any time since the world war. Many thousands of men and women had already been killed in China and Manchuria. A new world war would result in mass misery and mass murder to an unprecedented extent for millions and millions of men, women and children. The appeal calls upon the women of all countries to support the International Anti-war Congress in Geneva and to do everything possible to conduct the agitation in its favour in their own countries.

C. G. T. U. Supports Anti - War Congress.

Paris, 29th May 1932.

The Central Council of the revolutionary trade union federation (C.G.T.U.) met yesterday and welcomed the appeal for an international anti-war congress issued by Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Maxim Gorki, Theodore Dreiser and others. The council decided to support the work of the preparatory committee in every possible way and to be represented at the congress in Geneva. The C.G.T.U. has issued an appeal to the workers of France calling upon them to rally to the struggle against the makers of imperialist war and in defence of the Soviet Union.

WAR AND SOCIAL FASCISM

The II. International and the War of Intervention.

By T. Altwirt (Berlin).

In the organ of the Belgian social democracy "**Le Peuple**" (29.5.1932), **M. Vandervelde**, the chairman of the II. International, once again deals with the danger of an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. After pointing to the aggravation of the situation in the Far East, and in spite of the fact that he has everywhere found only very pessimistic views among the diplomats and politicians, he nevertheless arrives at the following conclusion:

"Does it follow from this that, as many, and especially our Russian friends (the Mensheviks T. A.) believe, an armed conflict between Japan and the Soviets is immediately imminent and almost unavoidable? To tell the truth, I refuse to believe this."

What are the reasons for this optimism on the part of Mr. Vandervelde? First, he is convinced that the Moscow government are determined and even resigned (!) to do everything in order to avoid war. Does he mean to say by that the Soviet Union will renounce a part of its territory as is asserted, for very obvious reasons, by the international of war-mongers? Secondly, Vandervelde doubts whether Japan would be so insane as to attack the U.S.S.R. and thereby kindle the new world conflagration. But whilst he attempts in this way to belittle the threatening danger of war, as a cautious man he still leaves all possibilities open; when a storm is brewing, there may come a flash of lightning; it was out of this situation that the resolution of the II. International opposing the Japanese war was born.

M. Vandervelde is not at all pleased with the reception which this decision was given in the ranks of the Communist labour movement. He complains that the Communists regard the oath of friendship made in the camp of the II. International as dishonest and hypocritical. He particularly opposes Comrade **Jacquemotte**, who, in the Brussels "**Drapeau Rouge**", accused the II. International of having been ready in the Far East, as elsewhere, to lend the imperialists moral support against the Soviets. This is not true. It is dishonest and politically unwise, declares Vandervelde, as the reproach is directed precisely against those who in Europe would stand definitely on the side of the Russian revolution if it were attacked.

We must refresh the worthy M. Vandervelde's memory a little. Has he already quite forgotten how the II. International, three years ago, when the allied Manchurian reactionaries and Tsarist white-guardists advanced over the Manchurian frontier against the Soviet Union and were swept away by the Red Army—how the II. International took the side of the beaten bandits? Does not M. Vandervelde remember that on the occasion of his visit to China he praised the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang and the hangman Chiang-Kai-shek in the highest terms and abused the Chinese Soviets, describing them as robber bands? Was it not precisely the "China specialist" Vandervelde who, at the commencement of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, described China as a geographical conception and Manchuria as a no-man's land, thereby providing the Japanese imperialists with a justification for their plans for the division of China and the conquest of Manchuria as a base for launching an attack against Soviet Russia?

Whilst, however, the worthy chairman of the II. International thinks he can dispose of this first reproach made by Comrade Jacquemotte with a mere wave of the hand, he deals in detail with the second reproach that the Japanese social democracy, by going over to the side of imperialism and fascism, furnishes a proof of the attitude of the II. International. This is an untruth, declares M. Vandervelde, for the social democratic party of Japan never belonged officially to the II. International; steps were taken for its affiliation to the II. International but it was never actually completed.

A wonderful excuse! M. Vandervelde himself endeavoured, while staying in Japan in 1930, to induce this party to affiliate to the II. International; he was in constant contact with it, as he himself admits. Probably this party would have been today in one rank with the German, French, Belgian and English social democracy, if the outbreak of the war in Manchuria had not caused it to appear inopportune to the Japa-

nese social democrats to connect themselves with these parties at a time when they had decided to go over precipitately into the imperialist camp.

Vandervelde admits that he was already informed by a letter written on April 8 this year, that the cadre of the Japanese social democracy was on the point of going over to fascism. Why did the II. International say no word regarding its attitude to these happenings, which must have concerned it very closely? In a second letter, dated April 20, so relates Vandervelde himself, he was informed that the party of the Japanese social democrats had split and that a part had gone over to the fascists. Was this not sufficient reason why the II. International, which otherwise is so fond of issuing manifestoes, should come forward openly and declare its attitude to the events in Japan?

Vandervelde makes no attempt whatever to justify this silence on the part of the II. International. Instead of this, he declares that what took place in the case of the Japanese social democrats can also occur in the case of the other parties of the II. International. He writes:

"What is occurring in Japan is, briefly stated, the same thing that occurred in Italy, that is occurring in Poland and that threatens to occur in Germany."

This confession by the chairman of the II. International deserves to be brought to the notice of the masses. The Japanese social democracy has, for the greater part, gone over to fascism, just like the Italian social democracy! But the same thing is taking place in the camp of the Polish social democracy (Vandervelde appears to be ashamed to mention the English Labour Party with its MacDonald and Thomas), and Vandervelde expects the same thing in the case of the German social democracy.

How the social democratic papers raged when the Communists declared that social fascism and national fascism are twin brothers! How furious they were when the Communists foretold to the working masses precisely that which M. Vandervelde now says. We are grateful to the chairman of the II. International for his candid confession and would like to ask him only one question: What value are we to attach to the "honest" declarations of support for Soviet Russia made by parties of whom Vandervelde himself expects that tomorrow will find them in the camp of fascism and imperialism?

No Sign of Ruegg Trial Visible.

Shanghai, 27th May 1932.

The Nanking government again announces that the trial of the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretary, Paul Ruegg and his wife, will begin "this week". There can no longer be any doubt that these announcements of the Nanking authorities have no other aim than to confuse and put off world public opinion. The Nanking authorities are continuously receiving protests on behalf of Ruegg and his wife from all parts of the world.

What sort of a "trial" it will be when it does begin can be seen from the sparse reports which are to hand from the columns of the Nanking press. According to these newspapers the authorities have no intention of permitting European lawyers to take part in the proceedings as counsel for the defence. They also intend to prevent Shanghai Chinese lawyers defending the accused on the ground that Chinese law demands that the defending lawyer be registered in the town in which the trial is taking place, i. e. in this case Nanking. Prominent Chinese lawyers in Shanghai have now requested that their names be entered into the Nanking rolls in order that they may be able to undertake the defence of the Rueggs. It is interesting to note that the evening newspaper "**Wang Chu-hi**" announces that the sentence of the court will be one of hard labour for life in both cases.

Demonstrations for Ruegg in Nanking.

Shanghai, 23rd May 1932.

Unusually powerful demonstrations of workers and peasants took place in Nanking on the 20th May to demand the release of **Paul Ruegg** and his wife. Despite great police brutality the masses collected again and again. Hundreds of leaflets were distributed calling for the immediate release of the two and the organisation of a mass political strike. The police made mass arrests, but were unable to prevent the demonstrations or clear the streets.

How the First World War was Prepared

Peace Talk as a Cloak for War Preparations.

Documents from the Period Preceding the First Imperialist World War.

The Balkan War Threatens to Develop into a European War.

Peace Negotiations.

Constantinople, November 14, 1912. It is officially confirmed that Kemal Pasha has directly approached the king of Bulgaria regarding the conclusion of an armistice and the commencement of peace negotiations. (Havas.)

*

Constantinople, December 3. An armistice has been signed between Turkey on the one side and Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro on the other. (Telegraph Correspondence Bureau, Vienna.)

*

London, December 14. The peace plenipotentiaries of Turkey, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro have arrived in London. On the evening of the 13th there took place an unofficial conference of the representatives of the four States. (Reuter.)

European War on the Agenda.

Peace Asseverations . . .

London, December 1. Prince Lichnovsky, the German Ambassador, delivered his first official speech in England at the Annual banquet of the Royal Society, in the course of which he stated that he gladly made use of the opportunity of declaring that England and Germany are working side by side for the maintenance of European peace, and that the political relations between the two powers were never more cordial and sincere than at the present time. ("Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.")

*

London, November 31. The First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, expressed the hope that after the conclusion of the Balkan war all nations would agree in deciding that the affairs which had given rise to the present war must not for the second time be a cause of war. Nevertheless, Great Britain must be armed for all eventualities. (Reuter.)

Bethmann Hollweg Rattles the Sabre.

"The exchange of opinion between the governments has hitherto been carried out in a friendly spirit and offers prospect of success. Should in the meantime, which we hope not, insoluble antagonisms arise, it will be the business of the Powers directly interested to assert their claims. This also applies to our allies. If however, in defending their interests they are, quite unexpectedly, attacked by a third party, as a result of which their existence is threatened, then we shall remain true to our obligations and range ourselves definitely on their side. And then we should fight for the preservation of our own position in Europe and for the defence of our own future and security." (Speech in the Reichstag on December 2, 1912.)

The Repercussion of the Chancellor's Speech in Russia.

Petersburg, December 4. The speech of the German Chancellor is a new and very important fact characterising the

international situation at the present moment, which is fraught with the danger of a European war. ("Rjetch.")

From the Secret Archives of the Diplomats.

The Turkish Straits.

On November 4, 1912, the Russian Foreign Minister Sassinov sent to Isvolski, the Russian Ambassador in Paris, the following cypher telegram:

"I request you to inform Poincaré in confidence that the occupation of Constantinople by the Allies would result at the same time in the appearance of the whole of our Black-Sea fleet before the Turkish capital. In order to avoid the great danger of European complications which such a step would involve, it is important that France should bring the whole of its influence to bear.

Common War Programme against Austria-Hungary.

Poincaré replied on the same day:

"As I already told you, the mysterious attitude of Austria fills the French government with the same misgivings as it does the Russian government. In agreement with the Ministerial Council I consider it expedient to agree now to a common programme should Austria attempt to extend its territory. I should like to know whether the imperial Russian government, like ours, is definitely opposed to any annexation of Turkish territory by a great Power, and whether it would be inclined to confer with France and England regarding what means should be adopted in order to avert such a danger.

Russia Shall Act First and France will Follow.

On 17th and 18th November, Isvolski reported to his chief regarding his conversations with Poincaré:

Paris, November 17. Poincaré said to me that it was for Russia to take the initiative in the question as it is the chief party interested, whilst it is for France to grant it active support. If the French government, on its part, were to take the initiative, it would run the danger of going beyond the interests of the allies in this or that direction. On the whole, Poincaré added the thing was, that if Russia makes war, France would also go to war, as we know that in this question Germany is behind Austria.

*

Paris, November 18. In view of the importance of the question I considered it my duty, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, to read to M. Poincaré my telegram No. 369 (quoted above Ed.), the wording of which he fully approved. Of course he told me that in a definite case where the *casus foederis* stipulated in the alliance arose, i. e. in the event of Germany giving armed support to Austria against Russia, France would come to the aid of Russia.

Anglo-French Military Measures.

Secret Correspondence between Sir Edward Grey and the French Ambassador in London, M. Paul Cambon.

Sir Edward Grey to M. Cambon, French Ambassador in London.

Foreign Office, November 22, 1912.

My dear Ambassador.

From time to time in recent years the French and British naval and military experts have consulted together. It has always been understood that such consultation does not restrict the freedom of either Government to decide at any future time whether or not to assist the other by armed force. We have agreed that consultation between experts is not, and ought not to be regarded as, an engagement that commits either Government to action in a contingency that has not arisen and may never arise. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to co-operate in war.

You have, however, pointed out that if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, it might become essential to know whether it could in that event depend upon the armed assistance of the other.

I agree that, if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, or something that threatened the general peace, it should immediately discuss with the other whether both Governments should act together to prevent aggression and to preserve peace, and, if so, what measures they would be prepared to take in common. If these measures involved action, the plans of the General Staffs would at once be taken into consideration, and the Governments would then decide what effect should be given to them.

Yours etc.

E. Grey.

*

M. Cambon, French Ambassador in London, to Sir Edward Grey.

French Embassy, London.

November 23, 1912.

Dear Sir Edward,

You reminded me in your letter of yesterday, 22nd November, that during the last few years the military and naval authorities of France and Great Britain had consulted with each other from time to time; that it had always been understood that these consultations should not restrict the liberty of either Government to decide in future whether they should lend each other the support of their armed forces; that, on either side, these consultations between experts were not and should not be considered as engagements binding our Governments to take action in certain eventualities; that, however, I had remarked to you that, if one or other of the two Governments had grave reasons to fear an unprovoked attack on the part of a third Power, it would become essential to know whether it could count on the armed support of the other.

Your letter answers that point, and I am authorised to state that, in the event of one of our two Governments having grave reasons to fear either an act of aggression from a third Power, or some event threatening the general peace, that Government would immediately examine with the other the question whether both Governments should act together in order to prevent the act of aggression or preserve peace. If so, the two Governments would deliberate as to the measures which they would be prepared to take in common; if those measures involved action, the two Governments would take into immediate consideration the plans of their general staffs and would then decide as to the effect to be given to those plans.

Yours etc.

Paul Cambon.

*

M. Sazanov, the Russian Foreign Minister, reported to the Tsar in 1912:

England promised to support France on land by sending an expedition of 100,000 to the Belgian border to repel the invasion of France by the German army through Belgium, expected by the French General Staff.

Government Denials.

Lord Hugh Cecil, in the course of a question in the House of Commons, on March 10, 1913, stated:

There is a very general belief that this country is under an obligation, not a treaty obligation, but an obligation arising owing to an assurance given by the Ministry in the course of diplomatic negotiations to send a very large force out of this country to operate in Europe.

Mr. Asquith (the Prime Minister): I ought to say that it is not true.

The Proletariat in the Fight against War.

Paris, November 25. The General Confederation of Labour, which in its sovereign contempt for Parliamentaryism refused to co-operate with the Socialist Party, yesterday held an extraordinary conference convened against war. There were present at the conference 1540 delegates from the whole of France, an attendance which, as the organ of the Federation "La Bataille syndicaliste" declared, had never been reached by any former congress of the Federation. As the chairman declared in his opening speech, the Congress had the task of deciding the ways and means of preventing the participation of France in a war. The attempt of a delegate to submit for discussion a motion providing that the action of the Federation should be conditional on the proletariat of other countries acting in the same manner, was fiercely rejected by the congress. The resolution submitted by the Executive was as follows: "The Congress decides on a 24-hour general strike on December 16 in order to resist any declaration of war." The platform explained that this general strike should serve as a first act proving to the government that the workers are ready to adopt the most extreme measures against war.

("Kölnische Zeitung.")

Convocation of the Basle Congress.

Brüssels, October 28. The International Socialist Bureau adopted the following motion:

"The International Socialist Bureau decides that there shall take place at the earliest possible date an extraordinary Congress of the affiliated parties, the sole item on the agenda of which shall be: The International situation and agreement regarding the attitude to war."

The motion was unanimously adopted. ("Vorwärts.")

Lenin: The Social Importance of the Serbo-Bulgarian Victories.

The revolution of 1789 in France and the revolutions in 1848 in Germany and other countries were bourgeois revolutions, because they emancipated the countries from absolutism and from feudal privileges and really freed the path for the development of capital. Of course, the interests of the working class demanded such a revolution in the most urgent manner, and even the workers of 1789 and 1848, who were not yet organised as a class, were champions of the French and the German revolutions.

Macedonia, like all Balkan countries, is economically very backward. There still exist there considerable remnants of serfdom, of mediaeval dependence of the peasants upon the feudal big landowners...

The victories of the Serbians and Bulgarians mean, therefore, an undermining of the rule of feudalism in Macedonia and the creation of a more or less free class of peasant proprietors; they mean a guarantee of the whole social development of the Balkan countries, which was hampered by absolutism and feudal relations...

If the emancipation of Macedonia had proceeded by means of revolution, i. e., by the fight of the Serbian, the Bulgarian and also the Turkish peasants against the landowners of all nationalities (and also against the Balkan governments of landowners), then the emancipation of the Balkan peoples would certainly not have cost one hundredth of the sacrifice of human life, as the present war is costing. Emancipation would have been achieved at a far smaller price and would have been immeasurably more complete.

The question now arises, what historical causes determined that the question is solved by war and not by revolution. The most important historical cause is the weakness, the scattered

character, the backward development, the ignorance of the peasant masses of all Balkan countries, and also the numerical weakness of the workers, who correctly grasped the state of affairs and demanded a federal Balkan Republic.

The workers' democracy alone defends the real and complete emancipation of the Balkan peoples. Only the complete economic and political emancipation of the peasants of all the Balkan countries can destroy all possibility of any national oppression.

(“Pravda” No. 162, November 7, 1912.)

The London „Peace Conference” Begins.

London, December 16, 1932. That the Peace Conference in London is arousing unusual interest is to be seen from the fact that in spite of the unfavourable hour of the opening session, a fairly large crowd of people had gathered in front of St. James's Palace. The session was opened by Sir Edward Grey with a speech in French, in which he welcomed the delegates on behalf of the King and the Government.

(„Berliner Tageblatt.”)

“A Work of Peace and Reconciliation.”

London, December 16. In his opening speech Sir Edward Grey declared: “You will find here in England a calm, impartial atmosphere favourable to your task, and in these halls you will be, so to speak, on really neutral ground . . . All peace negotiations following a war involve difficulties. It is not my business to speak of the nature of these difficulties in the present case . . . No task can be nobler than the one entrusted to you, to overcome these obstacles and happily end your labours and endeavours with a work of peace and reconciliation. (Official Communiqué.)

But if Bulgaria Does Not Get Adrianople, Then the War will Go On.

London, December 16. Mr. Danev, interviewed by our representative, the leader of the Bulgarian delegation declared: Bulgaria's position is quite clear. It has to fulfil a national task with the aid of the big Powers . . . The Albanian question and the question of the Aegean ports are of general European interest. The small States represented at this conference could accomplish a useful and permanent work if the interests of Europe were taken into consideration.

That at any rate is very reasonable language, and one can only congratulate Danev on adopting this standpoint. The negotiations regarding the settlement of the Bulgarian-Turkish frontiers however appear less hopeful in view of what Danev said a moment before, regarding the settlement of the Bulgarian-Turkish frontiers. In his opinion such a settlement naturally assumes that Adrianople would be ceded to Bulgaria. A strong Bulgaria, he continued, was urgently necessary also in the interests of Turkey. Turkey could then count on Bulgaria to defend all its interests in Europe and Asia. If Turkey however, refused to concede this demand, there was only one thing left: war. (Reuter.)

Behind the Scenes.

Preparation for the World War.

On December 5, 1912, the renewed Triple Alliance was signed in Vienna by representatives of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. Its main contents were as follows:

Article II. In the event of Italy, without any immediate provocation on its part, being attacked for any reason by France, the two other contracting parties are pledged to come

to the aid of the attacked party with all their forces. The same obligation rests on Italy in the event of an unprovoked attack by France on Germany.

Article III. If one or two of the high contracting parties, without immediate provocation on their part, are attacked and involved in a war with two or more big Powers which have not signed the present treaty, then the *casus foederis* arises for all the high contracting parties.

Article IV. The high contracting parties undertake now, in any case of a common participation in a war, not to conclude any armistice or treaty of peace except on the basis of common agreement.

Article VII. Austria-Hungary and Italy undertake to use their influence in order to oppose any alteration of territory which could adversely affect one or other of the signatory powers to the present treaty.

Article IX. Germany and Italy undertake to work for the maintenance of the territorial status quo in the North African territories on the Mediterranean namely in Cyrenaica, in Tripolis and Tunisia.

Article XI. Should the vicissitudes of a war jointly undertaken against France by the two Powers lead Italy to strive for territorial securities from France for the purpose of securing the frontiers of the kingdom of Italy and its power at sea, as well as with a view to maintenance of peace, Germany will not put any obstacles in the way and according to needs and circumstances, will facilitate the means for achieving such an object.

England Intervenes.

On December 3, 1912, Prince von Lichnovsky, the German Ambassador in London, sent the following secret communication to Bethmann-Hollweg:

London, December 3, 1912.

Lord Haldane visited me to-day in order to discuss the political situation. During a long conversation he repeatedly emphasised the necessity of achieving a settlement of the differences in the Eastern question, as it was impossible to foretell what would be the consequences of a warlike development into which one or several of the big Powers could be drawn. England, he said, was absolutely for peace and, for economic reasons, nobody here wanted war. But it was hardly probable that Great Britain would remain a passive spectator in the general European confusion which could result from Austria's invasion of Serbia, in the event of Serbia not willingly evacuating the occupied Adriatic coast.

I replied I would not ask him whether that was as much as to say that England would then undertake hostilities against us. He replied that that would certainly not be the necessary but nevertheless the possible result of a war between the two Continental groups. The roots, so he expressed it, of English policy, lay in the feeling which was generally prevalent here, that the balance of power must be maintained. England, therefore, could under no circumstances tolerate a defeat of the French which he, a great admirer of our army and our military institutions, regarded, as fairly certain. England could not and would not permit herself to be faced afterwards by a uniform Continental group under the leadership of a single Power.

Should, therefore, Germany be drawn by Austria into this dispute and thereby become involved in a war with France, tendencies would arise in England which no government could withstand and the consequences of which were quite incalculable.

The Basle Congress.

The extraordinary Socialist Congress was held in Basle Minster on 24th and 25th November 1912. The sole item on the agenda was: The international situation and the united action of the social democracy against the danger of war.

The Resolution of the Basle Congress.

Jaurès:

I have to bring before you the resolution which the International Bureau, after the most careful study, have adopted

unanimously and recommend to you for approval. (The speaker reads the resolution.)

“The International, at its Congresses in Stuttgart and Copenhagen, laid down for the proletariat of all countries as the guiding principle for the fight against war:

Manifesto of the International on the present Situation

“If war threatens to break out it is the duty of the working class in the countries concerned and of their Par-

liamentary representatives, with the help of the International Bureau as a means of co-ordinating their actions, to use every effort to prevent war by all means which seem to them the most appropriate, having regard to the sharpness of the class war and to the general political situation.

Should war none the less break out, their duty is to intervene to bring it promptly to an end and with all their energies to use the political and economic crisis created by the war to rouse the populace from its slumbers and to hasten the fall of capitalist domination."

"Recent events have rendered it the duty of the proletariat more than ever to lend the greatest force and energy to its systematic and common actions . . ."

"The Balkan crisis, which has already caused such frightful horrors, will if it spreads further be the most terrible danger to civilisation and the proletariat . . ."

"The Congress therefore records with satisfaction the complete unanimity of the Socialist parties and of the trade unions of all countries in the fight against war . . ."

"The Congress therefore calls upon the social democratic parties to continue their action with all the means which appear suitable to them. In this common action the Congress allots to every socialist party its task . . ."

"The Congress joyfully welcomes the protest strikes of the Russian workers as an indication that the proletariat of Russia and Poland is beginning to recover from the blows which have been given it by the Tsarist counter-revolution . . ."

"The most important task within the action of the International falls, however, to the working class of Germany, France and England. At the moment it is the task of the workers of these countries to demand of their government that they refuse to support Austria-Hungary or Russia, refrain from any intervention in the Balkan affairs, and preserve absolute neutrality . . ."

"The overcoming of the antagonisms between Germany on the one side and France and England on the other would remove the greatest danger to world peace, shake the power of the Tsar, which takes advantage of this antagonism, render impossible an attack by Austria-Hungary on Serbia and secure peace to the world. The efforts of the International are in the first place directed towards this end . . ."

"The International will redouble its efforts in order to prevent this crisis; it will raise its protest with increasing emphasis; it will conduct its propaganda more energetically and comprehensively. The Congress therefore instructs the International Socialist Bureau to follow events with the greatest attention and, whatever may occur, maintain and strengthen the connection between the proletarian parties . . ."

"The Congress thus appeals to you, proletarians and socialists of all countries, to let your voice be heard in this decisive hour. Proclaim your will in all forms and all places! Raise your protests in the Parliaments, hold mass demonstrations, use every means which the organisation and the strength of the proletariat places in your hands, see that the governments have constantly before their eyes the proletariat's watchful and passionate will to peace! Oppose to the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder the proletarian world of peace and the fraternisation of the peoples!"

Solemn Promises.

Jaurès:

Comrades, this Congress is a magnificent spectacle and a historical fact. It does not confine itself to laying down the principles which are common to the whole International, but before all emphasises the necessity and unity of our action . . . We do not speak lightly but declare from the very depths of our being: we are ready for every sacrifice!

Keir Hardie:

May the power of the proletariat succeed in preventing war, but if not, achieving through it the social revolution.

Haase:

The German social democratic party and the German trade unions have at tremendous meetings demonstrated with burning passion for peace. Is it not a really grotesque idea that a world war, with its indescribable horrors, could break out over the question whether Serbia shall obtain a port, or a corridor to a port, or a window on the Adriatic Sea? To call forth such a war would be madness, nay more, would be a shameful, inexpressible crime against humanity. That is the unanimous conviction of the German proletarians and the proletarians of all countries . . .

Clara Zetkin:

(received with loud applause) . . . War is nothing else but an extension of the mass murder which capitalism, in so-called peace times, commits every hour against the proletariat. As wives and mothers we oppose this crime. Therefore we turn to the proletarian mothers in the hour of greatest conflict and dangers to remind them above all of their proletarian and human duties. This will be to them their highest law.

Vaillant:

In the name of the French Section I declare their complete approval of the work of the Congress. A revolt against war or a general strike are by no means impossible. Should however capitalism, to its own misfortune, be able to plunge into war, then it will have to bear the whole responsibility for all the consequences, which the will of the proletariat would draw. They would be seen in the social revolution.

Greulich (Chairman):

The representatives of the national sections have now spoken. We come to the vote:

All delegates rise from their seats and hold up their hands as a sign of approval. The overfilled hall presents an impressive picture. At the same time deafening applause breaks out among the guests and public in the galleries. The delegates sing the "Internationale". The whole gathering is filled with enthusiasm.

The "Pravda" on the Basle Congress.

The proletarian International has just concluded its powerful international demonstration in favour of peace . . .

There was need for haste as the crisis caused by the Balkan war, is becoming increasingly acute . . .

The working class of the whole world must exert all its forces in order to prevent war . . .

The Basle Congress shows once again to the whole world with what energy, with what solidarity, with what determination the workers of the whole world are fighting for the maintenance of peace. Nationalism and chauvinism in all its forms meets in the united proletariat its unrelenting enemy. ("Pravda" No. 112, 18/31st November 1912.)

Lenin: A Great Step Forwards: From Political Strike to Mass Demonstrations.

On November 15, the 4th Duma was opened. On the same day, demonstrations of workers were held in Petersburg. In connection with the earlier political strikes, and on the basis of these strikes, this demonstration plays the role of a great historical event. The transition from strikes to demonstrations has been made. The movement of the masses has reached a higher stage: from political strikes to street demonstrations. Every conscious leader of the proletariat must emphasise this great step forward and appraise its importance. (Lenin: Collected Works, volume XVI, page 207.)

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Strike of the Agricultural Workers in Slovakia.

By A. Volavka (Prague).

Following the great fight of the North Bohemian miners, 6000 agricultural workers in Slovakia and some hundreds of vineyard workers in Carpatho-Ukraine have gone on strike.

The signal for the fight against the starvation wages, intolerable working conditions, against the agreements concluded between the agrarians and the social fascist trade union leaders, and against Czech imperialism in Slovakia was given by the workers in the **Galánta** district, in which is situated the village of **Kossuth**, where last year three workers were killed and five wounded by the bullets of the gendarmes.

The conditions of work of the Slovakian agricultural workers, in the meantime, became still worse: their wages were reduced by 15 to 20 per cent, the working day prolonged, and lasted from sunrise until dark. The progressive rationalisation introduced on the estates, and the reduction by 70 per cent of the area given over to beet cultivation in the South Slovakia excluded the majority of the seasonal workers from the fields altogether. In this situation the big landowners, behind the backs of the agricultural workers, concluded treaties with the agrarian and social fascist leaders providing for a daily wage of only 6.— to 7.— Czechish crowns.

Under the leadership of the red trade unions of the land and forest workers, the agricultural labourers are beginning to show that all these provisions are only a scrap of paper, when the striking workers display militancy and stick together. The first victorious phase of the agricultural workers' strike, the strike in Galánta, caused the landowners and the social fascist leaders to recognise this. Within three days over 3600 workers, or about 90 per cent of the agricultural labourers of this district, went on strike.

In spite of the fact that preparations for this struggle were made somewhat late in the day, contrary to last year, the greater part of those workers whose wages are paid mainly in kind, joined the strike. On the big estates nearly all the workers went on strike. The whole of the seasonal workers took part in the strike.

The rapid extension of the strike, the determination of the strikers who are organised not only in the red trade unions but also in the social democratic and agrarian unions, the connection of their fight with the unemployed demonstrations and with the movement for the demands of the peasantry, surprised the State apparatus and rendered it helpless.

The firm strike leadership, with the authoritative strike committees on the different estates, threatened those employers who showed the least obduracy, that they would withdraw the stock-feeders. When even the workers organised in the social-democratic and agrarian organisations emphatically opposed the proposal of the employers to invite the social-democratic and agrarian leaders to negotiations, when they all unanimously declared that they recognised no organisation which concluded treaties behind their backs, and when finally they declared that the red union of land and forest workers was their only leader and representative, the success of the strike was assured.

The wages of the agricultural workers have been increased by 30 per cent. All workers are granted double pay for overtime and work on Sundays and holidays. In addition a number of partial demands have been fulfilled. This success, which confirms the revolutionary organisation as being the only representative of the agricultural workers, is of extraordinary importance for Czechoslovakia precisely at the present moment when various revolutionary organisations are being dissolved by fascist methods. This success shows that the legality of the revolutionary organisations can be won by united strike struggle.

The victorious example of the agricultural workers in the Galánta district will promote the extension of the strike to the surrounding districts, where 3000 agricultural workers are again engaged in a strike.

The successful strike of the agricultural workers in the Galánta district shows that it is possible to gain that demand which is now becoming the slogan of the whole of the Czechoslovakian proletariat: „Not a man sent away, not a penny off the pay“, provided the other slogan of the proletarian fighting tactic: „unity—strike—victory“, is realised.

THE WHITE TERROR

The Scottsboro Mother in Austria.

By J. Louis Engdahl.

The Nazi (Hitlerite) press (Kampfruf, Vienna) had savagely declared that it would be a good thing if the Scottsboro Negro boys were burned alive in the electric chair. It argued that they were members of an inferior race which would thus be lessened in its numbers, making for the strengthening of Nordic superiority and purity.

But the toiling masses thought differently. After having demonstrated their solidarity with the oppressed Negro masses in the United States on the Scottsboro issue, both on International May Day, May First, and on Scottsboro Day, May 7th, they poured out in unexpected numbers to greet the Scottsboro Negro Mother, **Ada Wright**, in Vienna. Not only workers, however, but intellectuals and other middle class elements joined the thousands, of whom 234 joined the International Red Aid.

Unlike Germany, where the greater part of the bourgeois and social-democratic press sought to ignore the message of struggle that the Scottsboro Mother had brought to Europe, the Viennese press, from Nazi to Communist, carried a tremendous broadside of publicity. This, with the exception of the Hitlerite organs, was mostly favourable, a tribute to the tremendous mass appeal of the Scottsboro issue. The social-fascist press, the mouthpiece of the Austrian left social-democrats, who are peculiarly adept in the use of social-demagogy, sought to exploit the Scottsboro issue to the utmost, just as they had brazenly raised the slogan of „Defend the Soviet Union!“ on May Day.

Thus the Social-Democratic „Der Abend“ had Ada Wright's picture on the front page on the day of her visit to Vienna. It had probably not heard of the unwritten law of the American press that the likeness of no Negro is to appear on its first pages, or on almost any other page for that matter.

In the great mass meetings, however, attended by great numbers of Social-Democratic workers, the speakers placed the question, „But what does the Social-Democratic Party actually do to help free the Scottsboro boys?“ and the thundering answer came back, especially from the Social-Democratic workers, „Nothing!“

In fact, on the very day of Ada Wright's visit to Vienna, the Social-Democratic Party was putting the finishing touches to the programme for the opening of one of its municipal apartment houses to be christened „The George Washington“, in memory of the first American president, who was a Negro slave-owner. Thus the social-democrats, in the days when Austria is going hat in hand to French and British imperialisms for financial assistance to bolster up its poverty-stricken shilling, also beg at the door of Wall Street imperialism for American favours, inviting the American ambassador and his whole diplomatic staff with the tourist colony to lead in the dedication ceremonies.

The Austrian International Red Aid secretary had been arrested at the May Seventh demonstration, the charge being put forward that she had mentioned that in some countries the workers had stoned the windows of American embassies. Ada Wright received greater police attention in „Socialist“ Vienna than in any city yet visited. Plainclothes police at the station who followed her in a taxi to the hotel where she was taken. The same police sat at a nearby table as she lunched in the hotel's dining room. They were at the demonstration in the evening and followed her to the café where she was taken later by some of Vienna's workers. Then they again followed her to the hotel. The next day they called for inspection of passports and detailed questioning. They were without doubt in an excellent position to give full information to the

nervous American ambassador who has already been forced to listen to the demands of several delegations of Austria's workers. Vienna's demonstration selected another such delegation.

In Vienna Mrs. Wright conferred with **Ernest Toller**, world-famous author and playwright, **Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld**, Germany's famous physician and others on the development of the work of the **Committee for the Liberation of the Scottsboro Negro Boys**, which is carrying on a tremendous activity in Austria as well as in Czechoslovakia and Germany. They both pledged themselves to continue their activities with greater energy. Toller had just come from Budapest where he had attended a Writers' Congress. Young Communists had just carried through a Scottsboro demonstration before the American embassy and were being hounded by the police. Toller created a furore in the congress by declaring that instead of persecuting the young Communists, a protest should be launched against the proposed Scottsboro murders.

INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY DAY

The Revolutionary Trade Union Movement and the Fourth International Solidarity Day of the W. I. R.

By F. Emmerich

The Fourth International Solidarity Day of the Workers International Relief will be held in a situation, when permanent wagecuts, increasing mass unemployment and growing facism are threatening the international proletariat. Never since July 1914 and the events of Sarajewo has the immediate danger of a new imperialist world war been so acute as at the moment of the fourth international manifestation of international proletarian solidarity. **48 millions unemployed** in the most important capitalist countries are the characteristic symptom of the crisis of the capitalist system which has now entered the phase of war. The Solidarity Day of the W.I.R. therefore must be a mass demonstration which will bring us a step nearer to the red united front of all workers.

The significance of the Workers International Relief as an organisation of aid in the mass struggles of the toilers was strongly stressed in a resolution of the Red Trade Union International of April 1931. In this resolution the relations between the Red Trade Unions and Oppositions on one hand and the W.I.R. organisations on the other hand were clearly set forth. On the occasion of the 4th International Solidarity Day, we as adherents of the R.I.L.U. must state, that in view of the sharpening of the crisis the consolidation and extension of the front of mass solidarity is a question of highest importance by the solution of which the organisation of a successful mass resistance and, moreover, the counter-offensive against capitalism is strongly influenced. The Revolutionary Trade Unions have no intention to make the organisation and conduct of economic struggles dependent upon the state of the treasury of the trade union organisation as the social-democratic and christian trade union leaders do. But the experiences of the strike struggles in all countries in 1931, and especially the sharp struggles of the American miners in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, etc., clearly show that the organisation and realisation of successful mass struggles is impossible without material aid. The W.I.R. as the organiser of mass solidarity acquires increasing importance for the international proletariat after the experiences made in the strike struggles of 1931. In accordance with the lessons given by the strike struggles since the 3rd International Solidarity Day, we must clearly point out that all those struggles which collapse because of the lack of a piece of bread or of a warm meal, can have extremely dangerous effects from the trade union as well as from the political view point. The sharpening of the crisis with its ever growing army of millions of unemployed, requires more than ever before from the class-conscious trade-unionists that they give their fullest attention to the organisation of mass

solidarity. If the capitalists in almost all countries often succeeded in putting through their wage cuts and cuts in unemployment benefit etc. without meeting the mass resistance both of the employed and unemployed workers, this, in addition to other failures and shortcomings of the revolutionary trade unions, in many cases was due to the absence of relief institutions and possibilities which seem indispensable to the average worker for carrying through a struggle. The under-estimation of the organisation of actions for material aid, which is still often to be found in the ranks of the revolutionary trade union movement, must be put an end to. In this question the revolutionary trade unions and oppositions must change their attitude entirely. The growing offensive of the capitalists and the tasks confronting the revolutionary trade unions and the W.I.R. in connection with material aid for the employed and unemployed, can only be overcome if new millions of workers are drawn into the front of solidarity.

In its resolution of April 1931, the R.I.L.U. stated that "the W.I.R. will only be able to fulfil its increased tasks if all sections of the R.I.L.U. and the organisations affiliated to it, from the highest direction to the last supporter in the workshop, establish a close alliance with the W.I.R. and assist it by all means". True, the mutual relations, the collaboration of both the organisations have improved in most countries. But we must state that there are still many revolutionary trade unions and the leadership of these organisations which theoretically recognize the importance of the W.I.R., but in practice reveal a political under-estimation of the significance of the organisation of a mass solidarity front under the direction of the W.I.R. This tendency in the ranks of the red trade unions and oppositions to underestimate the Workers International Relief must be decisively fought against on the basis of the creative mass work of the W.I.R. From general lip-acknowledgement and mere approval of resolutions we cannot expect a mass solidarity in the coming struggles.

The 4th International Solidarity Day should be an occasion for the adherents of the revolutionary trade unions and oppositions to examine how far the decisions of the R.I.L.U. resolution regarding close co-operation with the W.I.R. have been carried out. The Workers International Relief it is true, is an over party, but by no means a non-party organisation in the class struggles of the proletariat. All adherents of the R.I.L.U. are faced with the question, what have their organisations done in order, in accordance with the directives of the R.I.L.U. to adopt all measures to strengthen the W.I.R. organisationally. Are all revolutionary trade union organisations collectively affiliated to the W.I.R.? Are the questions of solidarity work regularly dealt with in the revolutionary trade union organisations and in their press? Have the adherents of the R.I.L.U. and the revolutionary trade unions given active aid to the W.I.R. in building-up its local and workshop organisations, as demanded in the resolution of April 1931?

The day of international proletarian solidarity must, before all, be the prelude for the revolutionary trade unionists in order to make up for all that has been neglected so far in regard to the reinforcement and development of the solidarity front of the masses and in order to strengthen the mutual relations between the W.I.R. and the revolutionary trade unions. All adherents of the red trade unions and oppositions who in the present situation are doing everything in order to organize a broad united front of the proletariat, in the workshops and at the labour exchanges shall at the same time be the most active organizers of the solidarity front among the workers. It is specially important to win over for the proletarian solidarity work of the W.I.R. those reformist workers who still stand aloof from us. This is still one of the weakest spots of the W.I.R. Especially on the solidarity front can we more easily penetrate the large masses of the workers not yet reached. Also from the organisational view point the W.I.R. must be supported in the most efficient manner. Every red trade unionist a militant fighter for the W.I.R.! Every red trade union branch a collective fighter in the solidarity front! The consolidation and broadening of the fighting alliance of the red trade unions and oppositions and the W.I.R., the joint mass demonstrations on International Anti-War Day, on June 12th means at the same time a step forward to the establishment of the great united front of the proletariat in the fight against the capitalist system and for the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

From the Country of the Proletarian Dictatorship

The German Writer Emil Ludwig Interviews Comrade Stalin.

The scientific organ of the C.P.S.U. "Bolshevik" published in its latest issue No. 8, a verbatim report of the conversation which took place on December 13, 1931, between Comrade Stalin and Emil Ludwig, which we publish below. Ed.

Ludwig: I appreciate it very much that you have found it possible to grant me an interview. For more than 20 years I have been studying the lives and activity of prominent historic personalities. It seems to me that I understand historic personalities very well, but on the other hand I understand nothing of social-economic conditions.

Stalin: You are modest.

Ludwig: No, that is really so. And for this very reason I shall ask you questions which will perhaps appear strange to you. To-day I saw here in the Kremlin some relics of Peter the Great, and the first question which I wish to ask you is the following: Do you admit that there exists a parallel between you and Peter the Great? Do you consider yourself to be continuing the work of Peter the Great?

Stalin: By no means. Historical parallels are always risky. This parallel is ridiculous.

Ludwig: Peter the Great, however, did a very great deal for the development of the country, in order to bring Western culture to Russia.

Stalin: Yes, of course. Peter the Great did very much to promote the landowning class and further the development of the rising merchant class. Peter did very much for the creation and the consolidation of the national State of the landowners and merchants. One must also say that all this took place at the cost of the peasantry, who were living in a state of serfdom and who were exploited in the most frightful manner. As regards myself, I am only a disciple of Lenin, and my aim is to be his worthy disciple. The task to which I have devoted my life consists in promoting another class, namely the working class. This task is not the consolidation of any national State but the consolidation of a socialist State, i. e., of an international State the consolidation of which means the consolidation of the whole of the international working class. I would regard my life as futile if the whole of my work did not aim at promoting the working class, at consolidating the socialist State of this class, at strengthening and improving the position of the working class. You see, your parallel does not exist.

As regards Lenin and Peter the Great, the last-named was only a drop in the sea; Lenin, however, was an entire ocean.

Ludwig: Marxism denies the outstanding role of personality in history. Do you not see a contradiction between the materialist conception of history and the fact that you, however, recognise the outstanding role of historical personalities?

Stalin: No, there is no contradiction here. Marxism does not by any means deny the role of outstanding personalities, or that human beings make history. You find it stated in Marx' "Poverty of Philosophy" and in other of his works that it is men who make history. But of course, men do not make history according to their imagination, as pictured by their minds. Every new generation encounters certain conditions which existed in completed form already at the moment this generation was born. And great men are only of value insofar as they know how rightly to grasp these conditions, to understand how they are to be changed. If they do not understand these conditions and seek to change them according to their own imagination, then these people find themselves in a position of Don Quixote. Therefore, according to Marx, one must not oppose men to conditions. It is men who make history, but only insofar as they rightly understand the conditions which existed already in a complete form and only insofar as they understand how these conditions are to be altered. That is at least how we, the Russian Bolsheviks, understand Marx. But we have studied Marx for more than one decade.

Ludwig: Thirty years ago, when I was studying at the university, numerous German professors who regarded themselves as supporters of the materialist conception of history, persuaded us that Marxism denies the role of heroes, the role of heroic personalities in history.

Stalin: These professors were vulgarisers of Marxism. Marxism has never denied the role of heroes. On the contrary, it recognises this role as being important, with the reservations, however, which I have already mentioned.

Ludwig: Round the table at which we are seated there are 16 chairs. It is stated abroad, on the one hand, that the Soviet Union is a country in which everything has to be decided collectively; on the other hand it is said that everything is decided by a single person. Who, then, really decides?

Stalin: No, a single person may not decide. Decisions made by one person are always, or nearly always, one-sided decisions. In every collective body there are people whose opinion must be taken into account. In every collective body there are people who can express incorrect opinions. We know from the experience of three revolutions, that out of a hundred decisions made by single persons which are not collectively tested and verified, ninety of these decisions are one-sided. In our leading organ, in the Central Committee of our Party, which leads all our Soviet and Party organisations, there are about 70 members. Among these 70 members of the C. C. are to be found our best leaders of industry our best co-operators, our best military leaders, our best propagandists, our best agitators, those who are best acquainted with our Soviet farms, those who have the best knowledge of the collective farms, and those comrades who are best acquainted with the individual peasant farms, those who are best acquainted with the nationalities and races of the Soviet Union. In this areopagus there is concentrated the wisdom of our Party. Everyone has the possibility of correcting or amending anybody else's individual opinion or proposal. Everybody possesses the possibility of bringing forward his experience. If this were not so, if decisions were made by a single person, we should make very serious mistakes in our work. Insofar, however, as everybody has the possibility of correcting the mistakes of individuals, and insofar as these corrections are taken to account, our decisions turn out more or less correct.

Ludwig: You have behind you decades of illegal work. You had to dispatch weapons illegally, as well as literature etc. Don't you think that the enemies of the Soviet Union can appropriate your experience and fight against the Soviet Union with the same methods?

Stalin: This is of course quite possible.

Ludwig: Is this not the reason of the strictness and the ruthlessness of your government in its fight against its enemies?

Stalin: No, this is not the main reason. One can quote a few historical examples. When the Bolsheviks came into power, they at first acted mildly towards their enemies. The Mensheviks continued to exist legally and to publish their newspaper. The social revolutionaries also continued to exist legally and had their newspaper. Even the Cadets continued to publish their newspaper. When General Krassnow organised the counter-revolutionary campaign against Leningrad and fell into our hands, we could have at least, in accordance with the rules of war, have made him prisoner. Nay more, we ought to have shot him. We released him, however, on his "word of honour". What happened. It soon became apparent that such mildness only served to undermine the Soviet Power. We committed a mistake when we showed such leniency towards the enemies of the working class. If we had persisted in these mistakes, we should have committed a crime against the working class, we should have betrayed its interests. And this became quite clear in a short space of time. It soon became

apparent the more mildly we behaved towards our enemies, the greater became the resistance of these enemies. A short time afterwards, the Right social revolutionaries, Gotz and others, and the Right Mensheviks organised in Leningrad a counter-revolutionary action of the junkers, as a result of which a great many of our revolutionary sailors were killed. The same Krassnow whom we had released on his "word of honour" organised the white-guardist Cossacks. He joined forces with Mamontov and for two years conducted an armed fight against the Soviet Power. It soon became evident that behind these white guardists there were agents of the Western capitalist States: France, England, America, Japan etc. We became convinced that we made a mistake when we ruled mildly. We learned from experience that we should only get the better of these enemies when we applied the most ruthless policy of suppression against them.

Ludwig: It seems to me that a considerable part of the population of the Soviet Union have a feeling of terror, of fear of the Soviet Power, and that the strength of the Soviet Power is to a certain extent based on this feeling of terror. I should like to know how you feel personally when realising that it is necessary in the interest of the consolidation of the Soviet Power to inspire fear? In intercourse with your comrades, with your friends, you employ quite other methods and not the method of inspiring fear, but you inspire the population with fear.

Stalin: You are mistaken. But your mistake is shared by many. You cannot really believe that we could maintain power for fourteen years and enjoy the support of masses numbering millions thanks to the methods of intimidation, of inspiring fear? No, that is impossible. The Tsarist government knew best how to intimidate the population; it had tremendous experience in this respect. The European, and in particular the French bourgeoisie, helped Tsarism in every way in this respect and taught it to intimidate the people. In spite of its experience, in spite of the aid of the European bourgeoisie, the policy of intimidation led to the smashing of Tsarism.

Ludwig: But the Romanoffs reigned for 300 years.

Stalin: Yes, but how many revolts and risings were there in the course of these 300 years? The revolt of Stenka Rasin, the revolt of Yemelyan Pugatchev, the revolt of the Decabrist, the revolution of 1905, the revolution in February 1917, the October revolution. I do not speak of the fact that political and cultural life of the country differs fundamentally from that of the old times, in which ignorance, lack of culture, submissiveness and political intimidation of the masses enabled the "rulers" at that time to remain in power for a more or less long period.

As regards the people, as regards the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, they are by no means such pliable, submissive, and terrified people as you imagine. In Europe there are many people who imagine that old patriarchal conditions prevail in the Soviet Union; they believe that the people in Russia firstly are submissive and secondly lazy. This is an obsolete and completely wrong idea. It arose in Europe at the time when Russian landowners made journeys to Paris and there squandered the money which they had squeezed out of the peasants and gave themselves over to idleness. These people were in fact characterless, useless people. From them conclusions were drawn regarding "Russian laziness". This, however, can in no way apply to the Russian workers and peasants who obtained and obtain the means of life by their own work. It is really strange to regard the Russian workers and peasants, who in a short period of time carried out three revolutions, smashed Tsarism and the bourgeoisie and are now successfully building up Socialism, as submissive and lazy.

You just asked me whether with us anything was decided by a single person. Never. Under no circumstances would our workers now tolerate the rule of one person. The greatest authorities with us become nothing as soon as the working masses cease to have confidence in them, as soon as they lose contact with the working masses. Plechanov enjoyed most extraordinary popularity. What happened, however? As soon as he displayed political weakness, the workers forgot him, turned away from him and thought no more of him. I give you another example: Trotzky. Trotzky, too, enjoyed a great authority, of course not as great by a long way as that of Plechanov. What happened however? As soon as he turned away from the workers, they forgot him.

Ludwig: Have they quite forgotten him?

Stalin: They often think of him with inward rage.

Ludwig: All with inward rage?

Stalin: As far as our conscious workers are concerned they remember Trotzky with inward rage, with fury and hatred.

Of course, there is a certain part of our population which actually fears and fights against the Soviet Power. I have in mind the remnants of the dying classes which are being liquidated, and before all an insignificant part of the peasantry, the kulaks. But here it is not only a policy of intimidation, a policy which actually exists. It is known to everybody that we, the Bolsheviks, do not confine ourselves to the policy of intimidation, but we go further, in that we are proceeding to liquidate this bourgeois stratum.

If, however, you take the working population of the Soviet Union, the workers and the working peasants, who comprise not less than 90 per cent. of the population, they stand for the Soviet Power, and the overwhelming majority of them actively support the Soviet regime. They support the Soviet order, however, because this order accords with the fundamental interests of the workers and peasants. This, and not the policy of so-called intimidation, is the firm basis of the Soviet Power.

Ludwig: I am very grateful to you for this answer. Pardon me, please, if I ask you a question which may appear strange to you. In the course of your life there were moments so to speak of so-called "predatory" actions. Have you been interested in the personality of Stenka Rasin? What is your attitude to him as to an "idealist robber"?

Stalin: We Bolsheviks have always been interested in such historical personalities as Bolotnikov, Rasin, Pugatchev and others. We saw in the actions of these people the reflection of the elementary indignation of the subjugated class, the elementary revolt of the peasantry against the feudal yoke. And the study of the history of the first attempts at such revolts by the peasantry has always been of interest to us. But of course, one cannot draw any analogy here with the Bolsheviks. Individual peasant revolts, even if they are not so robberlike and unorganised as that of Stenka Rasin, cannot lead to anything serious. Peasant revolts can lead to success only when they are connected with the revolts of the workers and when the workers lead the peasant revolts. Only a combined revolt headed by the working class can achieve its aim. In addition, when speaking of Rasin and Pugatchev one must never forget that they were followers of the Tsar. They opposed the big landowners, but they were for a "good Tsar". That was their slogan.

As you see, one cannot draw an analogy between them and the Bolsheviks.

Ludwig: Allow me to ask you a few questions regarding your own life. When I was with Masaryk he told me that already at the age of six years he felt himself to be a socialist. What made you a socialist, and when did you become a socialist?

Stalin: I cannot assert that there existed in me an inclination to Socialism already at the age of six years: not even at the age of 10 or 12 years. I joined the revolutionary movement at the age of 15 years, when I got into connection with illegal groups of Russian Marxists who were then living in Transcaucasia. These groups exercised a great influence on me and gave me a taste for illegal Marxist literature.

Ludwig: What made you a rebel? Was it bad treatment by your parents?

Stalin: No. My parents were people without means and did not by any means treat me badly. The Church seminary at which I studied then was another matter. Out of protest against the bad treatment and against the Jesuit methods which prevailed in the Church seminary I was ready to become a revolutionary, a follower of Marxism as a really revolutionary doctrine, and this I actually became.

Ludwig: But do you not recognise the positive qualities of the Jesuits?

Stalin: Yes, they are systematic and persistent in their work. But their main method is that of sniffing round, espionage, creeping into the soul, scorning. What is there positive in that? For instance, the prying around in our rooms: At 9 o'clock the bell rang for breakfast; we went into the refectory; as soon however as we went back to our rooms, we found that in the meantime all our trunks and bags had been rummaged through... What can there be positive in that?

Ludwig: I observe in the Soviet Union an extraordinary

respect for everything American, I might even say a veneration for everything American, that is to say for the land of dollars, for the most consistently capitalist country. And this feeling exists among the working class and relates not only to tractors and automobiles, but also to the Americans in general. How do you explain that?

Stalin: You exaggerate. With us there is no special respect for everything American. But we respect the American matter-of-factness in everything, in industry, in technique, in literature, in life. We never forget that the United States is a capitalist country. But among the Americans there are many people who are sound and healthy both in mind and body, healthy in their whole approach to work. For this matter-of-factness, for this simplicity we have sympathy. Although America is a highly developed capitalist country, the customs in industry, the usages in production, there contain something of democracy, a thing which one cannot say of the old European capitalist countries, in which there still lives the spirit of rule of the feudal aristocracy.

Ludwig: You have no idea how right you are.

Stalin: How can one know, perhaps I have an idea. In spite of the fact that feudalism as a social order has long since been destroyed in Europa, considerable remnants of it still continue to live in the customs and habits. From the feudal circles there still come in technicians, specialists, scholars and writers, who bring feudal habits into industry, technique, science and literature. The feudal traditions are not completely destroyed. One cannot say this of America, which is a country of "free colonisers", without big landowners, without aristocrats. Hence the powerful and comparatively simple American customs in production. Our economists from the ranks of the workers who have been in America have immediately recognised this characteristic. They have related, not without a certain agreeable surprise, that in the process of production in America one can only with difficulty outwardly distinguish the engineer from the worker. And of course they appreciate this. In Europe it is quite different.

But if we speak of our sympathy for any nation, or more correctly for the majority of any nation, we must speak of our sympathy for the Germans. Our feelings for the Americans cannot be compared with this sympathy.

Ludwig: Why precisely for the German nation?

Stalin: I record this as a fact.

Ludwig: Of late it has been possible to observe serious fears among certain German politicians that the policy of traditional friendship between the Soviet Union and Germany has been pushed into the background. These fears have arisen in connection with Russia's negotiations with Poland. If, as a result of these negotiations, the recognition of the present frontiers of Poland by the Soviet Union became a fact, this would mean a serious disappointment for the whole of the German people, which up to now is of the opinion that the Soviet Union is fighting against the Versailles system and does not think of recognising it.

Stalin: I know that there is to be observed among certain German statesmen a certain dissatisfaction and uneasiness on account of the fact that the Soviet Union could in its negotiations or in any treaty with Poland take a step which would mean that the Soviet Union gave its sanction and guarantee to the possessions and frontiers of Poland. In my opinion these fears are unfounded. We have always declared ourselves ready to conclude a pact of non-aggression with any State. We have already concluded such pacts with a number of States. We have openly declared our readiness to sign such a pact with Poland. If we declare that we are ready to sign a Pact of non-aggression with Poland, we do this not for the sake of a phrase but in order actually to sign such a Pact. We are, as you know, politicians of a peculiar kind. There are politicians who promise or declare one thing to-day but on the next day forget or deny what they declared without even blushing. We cannot act in such a manner. If we were to say one thing and do another, we should lose our authority. The moment the Poles declared themselves ready to enter into negotiations with us for concluding a Pact of non-aggression, we of course agreed and entered into negotiations with them.

What, from the standpoint of the Germans, appears as the most dangerous thing which could follow from this? A change, a worsening of our relations with the Germans? But there is no cause for this. We, just as the Poles, must declare in the Pact that we shall not undertake any act of violence or make any attack in order to change the frontiers of Poland and of the Soviet Union or to destroy their independence. Just

as we make these promises to Poland, Poland also will make us the same promises. Without such a clause stating that we do not think of making war in order to destroy the independence or the integrity of the frontiers of our States, without such a clause no Pact can be concluded. Without something to this effect there cannot even be any talk of a Pact. That is the most we can do. Is this a recognition of the Versailles system? No. We never were and never will be a guarantor of Poland, as Poland never was and never will be a guarantor of our frontiers. Our friendly relations with Germany remain the same as hitherto. That is my firm conviction.

Thus the fears of which you speak are quite unfounded. These fears arose on the basis of rumours which were spread by some Poles and French. These fears will disappear as soon as we publish the Pact, when Poland signs it. Everybody will see that it contains nothing against Germany.

Ludwig: I am very grateful to you for this declaration. Allow me to put you the following question: You speak of "equalitarianism", whereby this word has a certain ironical tendency towards general equality. But general equality is a socialist ideal.

Stalin: A socialism under which all men would receive the same pay, the same quantity of meat, the same quantity of bread, in which they would all wear the same kind of suits and receive the same products in equal quantities, would be a Socialism which knows nothing of Marxism. Marxism says only one thing: as long as classes are not finally abolished, and as long as labour has not developed, from a means of primitive existence to voluntary work for society, men will be paid for their work according to quantity and quality of output. "Each according to his abilities, each according to performance", that is the Marxist formula of Socialism, the formula of the first stage of Communism, of the first stage of Communist society. Only in a higher stage of Communism, only in the highest stage of Communism will everybody work according to his capacities and receive for his work according to his needs. "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

It is perfectly clear that under Socialism different people have and will have different requirements. Socialism has never denied the difference in taste, in the quantity and in the quality of requirements. Read how Karl Marx criticised Stirner on account of his tendency to equalitarianism. Read through Marx' criticism of the Gotha programme of 1875. Read the works which followed, by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and you will see with what sharpness they attacked equalitarianism. Equalitarianism has as its source the peasant way of thinking, the psychology of dividing all goods equally, the psychology of primitive peasant "Communism". Equalitarianism has nothing in common with Marxist Socialism. Only people who know nothing whatever of Marxism could have such a crude idea that the Russian Bolsheviks wish to collect all goods together and then divide them out equally. That is how people who have nothing in common with Marxism imagine things. That is how people of the type of the primitive "Communists" of the time of Cromwell and the French Revolution imagined Communism. But Marxism and the Russian Bolsheviks have nothing in common with these equalitarian "Communists".

Ludwig: I will ask you a question which may make a strong impression on you.

Stalin: We Russian Bolsheviks have long since forgotten how to be astonished.

Ludwig: And we in Germany too.

Stalin: Yes, in Germany you will soon cease to be astonished.

Ludwig: My question is the following: You have repeatedly exposed yourself to risk and danger; you have been persecuted and you have taken part in fights. A number of your close friends have been killed. But your life has been spared. How do you explain this? And do you believe in fate?

Stalin: No, I do not believe in fate. The Bolsheviks, the Marxists, do not believe in fate. The idea of fate is a prejudice, is nonsense, a remnant of mythology, of the type of mythology of the old Greeks with whom the goddesses of fate guided the destiny of men.

Ludwig: The fact that you have not been killed is therefore an accident?

Stalin: There are both inner and outer causes the coincidence of which resulted in my not being killed. But quite apart from this, another could be in my place, for somebody **must** sit here. "Fate" therefore is not something outside of law,

something mystic. I do not believe in mysticism. Of course, there are causes why the dangers passed over me. But a number of other chances, a number of other causes could have occurred, which could have led to the exactly contrary result. So-called fate has nothing whatever to do with this.

Ludwig: Lenin spent many years abroad in emigration. You were abroad only a very short time. Do you consider this a lack on your part? Are you of the opinion that the revolution has been rendered a greater service by those who lived in emigration abroad and had the possibility of studying Europe at close hand, but on the other hand were cut off from immediate contact with the people, or by those revolutionaries who worked here, who knew the mood of the people but had little knowledge of Europe?

Stalin: Lenin must be excluded from this comparison. Very few of those who remained in Russia were so closely connected with Russian reality, with the Labour movement in the country, as was Lenin, although he was for a long time abroad. Whenever I visited him abroad, in the years 1907, 1908 and 1912, I saw how he had heaps of letters from comrades in Russia; and Lenin always knew more than those who had remained in Russia. He always regarded his residence abroad as a burden.

In our Party and in its leadership there are, of course, more comrades who remained in Russia, who did not go abroad, than there are former emigrants; and the former, of course, had the possibility of better serving the revolution than the emigrants. Only a few emigrants are left in our Party. Of the two million members they number 100 to 200. Of the 70 members of the C. C., hardly more than 3 to 4 have been in emigration.

As regards acquaintance with Europe, the study of Europe, naturally those who wished to study Europe had more possibility of doing so when they were actually in Europe. And in this sense those who have not lived a long time abroad, have lost something. But residence abroad does not possess any decisive importance for the study of European economy, technique, cadres of the labour movement, literature of every kind: belles lettres or scientific. Other conditions being equal, it is, of course, easier to study Europe when one is staying there. But the disadvantage which people have who have not spent a long time in Europe, is of no great importance. On the other hand, I know many comrades who lived 20 years abroad, somewhere in Charlottenburg or in the Latin Quarter, sat in the café, drank beer, but nevertheless were not able to study Europe and did not understand it.

Ludwig: Do you not think that among the Germans, as a nation, the love of order is more developed than the love of freedom?

Stalin: At one time people in Germany did in fact have a great respect for law. In the year 1907, when I spent two or three months in Berlin, we Russian Bolsheviks frequently laughed at certain German friends on account of this respect for the law. For instance, a story is told that when the Berlin social democratic Party executive convened some demonstration or other on a certain day at a certain hour, to which members of the organisations were to come from all the suburbs, a group of 200 people from a suburb arrived in the city at the proper time, but did not come to the demonstration but stood two hours on the station platform unable to decide to leave it, because there was no ticket collector at the barrier and because there was nobody to whom they could give up their tickets. It was jokingly told that it was necessary for a Russian comrade to show the Germans the simple way out of the situation: to leave the platform without giving up their tickets!

Is there anything like this in Germany now? Are the laws respected in Germany now? Do not those same national socialists who, so it would appear, more than all others keep watch over bourgeois lawfulness, break the laws, destroy workers' clubs and kill workers without being punished? I do not speak of the workers who, it appears, have long lost all respect for bourgeois lawfulness. Yes, the Germans have changed considerably in the last few years.

Ludwig: Under what conditions is a final and complete unity of the working class under the leadership of a single Party possible? Why, as the Communists say, is such a union of the working class possible only after the proletarian revolution?

Stalin: Such a unity of the working class round the Communist Party can be realised the easiest as a result of a victorious proletarian revolution. But it will be realised, in the main, even before the revolution.

Ludwig: Is ambition a stimulus or a hindrance to the activity of a great historical personality?

Stalin: The role of ambition varies under different conditions. According to conditions, ambition can be a stimulus or a hindrance to the activity of a great historical personality. More frequently it is a hindrance.

Ludwig: Is the October Revolution in any way a continuation and completion of the Great French Revolution?

Stalin: The October revolution is neither a continuation nor a completion of the great French revolution. The aim of the French revolution was the liquidation of feudalism and the consolidation of capitalism. The aim of the October revolution, however, is the liquidation of capitalism and the consolidation of Socialism.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

Speech of Comrade Piatnitzky at the IX. All-Union Congress of Trade Unions.

The following is the full report of Comrade Piatnitzky's speech at the IX. All-Union Congress of Trade Unions, a brief summary of which was published in No. 19 of the "Inprecorr" (April 28th) Ed.

Comrades, I wish to make some self-critical remarks on the situation in the sections of the R.I.L.U. in the capitalist countries. Comrade Losovsky and other comrades have pointed out that the sections of the R.I.L.U. have achieved successes between the VIII and IX Congresses of the Soviet trade unions. During this period a red trade union of Ruhr miners was formed and a red union of Berlin metal workers, and a trade union opposition was set up in Germany and led independent strikes. Great successes were achieved in Poland. There also red trade unions and trade union oppositions in the P.P.S. trade unions were formed in various industrial centres and in various industries, and they genuinely led strikes, especially the last strikes. The only organisations which prepared, led and completely supported the spontaneous strikes of this period were in all capitalist countries the red trade unions and the trade union opposition. I do not wish to speak of this. I wish to emphasise the shortcomings which exist in the work of the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition.

In reality, the material and political situation of the working class throughout the world with the exception of the U.S.S.R. has grown considerably worse. There is a great upsurge of the revolutionary movement. The reformist trade unions betray the interests of the working class every day, but the sections of the R.I.L.U. have not yet succeeded in becoming real mass organisations or in organising resistance to the offensive of the bourgeoisie against the vital interests of the working class on a large scale.

Take the trade unions of legal countries. The French red trade unions have about 300,000 members, but there exist also reformist trade unions which have more a mass character than the red trade unions. In Czechoslovakia there are over a dozen trade union alliances of different types. Our red trade unions are nevertheless smaller than the reformist Czech and German unions together. If we take the American red T.U.s and the T.U. opposition, in spite of the fact that the American reactionary unions consist mostly of the well paid skilled workers, we are smaller in numbers than the A.F. of L.

As to England, I hardly need to mention it. The trade union Minority Movement is very weak and small in numbers.

In South Scotland we have 5,000 members in a red miner's union while the reformists have 25,000 (there are about 100,000 miners in Scotland) and a red tailors' union in London with 500 members. The reformists have 8-10,000 members while there are about 100,000 tailors in London.

In Germany, the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition are weaker than the Communist Party. In April the Communist Party had 332,000 members, while the T.U. opposition had 312,500 members. The reformist and Catholic unions in Germany have still about 5 million members.

The reasons why the sections of the R.I.L.U. in capitalist countries have not yet become mass organisations and have not succeeded in drawing the broad masses into the struggle against the capitalist offensive are as follows (I mention only the chief ones): Inability to respond promptly to the everyday needs of the workers, inability to prove by their daily work in the reformist trade unions that the adherents of the R.I.L.U. can not only call for a struggle but can also work. In many cases the red trade unions in their work, in leading strikes, in negotiating with the employers, in putting forward demands, in choosing the moment for the strike, in mobilising the masses to support a struggle which has commenced and by exposing the manoeuvres of the reformists have not succeeded, unfortunately, in proving that they do this better than the reformists. The absence of T.U. groups in the factories often brings about a state of affairs when the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition do not know what is taking place every day in the factories, and therefore they are late with their slogans and sometimes put forward unsuitable ones. Finally, they are weighed down with reformist traditions, because in most cases they are ex-members of the reformist trade unions. But there are difficulties in their work.

When, under the tsar, the workers struggled against the employers, there was not such a tendency among the workers in the factories to upset this struggle. The workers maintained a united front. Now in other countries in the factories there are agents of the reformist trade unions, members of the socialdemocratic party, members of the yellow trade unions, who do not strike because their trade unions do not recognise the strike. So the strike breaks down because not all the workers are struggling together. If some factory is organised for a struggle, the reformist trade union bureaucrats try to upset this struggle by all possible methods and do not allow it to go on to the end.

There is another important reason. In most cases the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition do not succeed in drawing the broad masses into the struggle, so that the strike will spread from factory to factory, from town to town. This is explained by the fact that strikes are prepared from above in the same way as the reformists prepare them. In spite of the fact that we have not the same apparatus as they have, in spite of the fact that our tactics are completely different from the reformist tactics, the reformists under the pressure of their members call for strikes chiefly at times when wage agreements are terminating so that they can betray the struggle while it is going on. We do not make wage agreements because the employers do not recognise us. The Red trade unions and the T.U. opposition very often have to organise a struggle while these wage agreements are in operation, and then the employer tries to crush this struggle by making arrangements with the reformists. Therefore we must commence the struggle from below in the factories, uniting all the workers, showing them the treachery of the reformists. Instead of this, the committees of Red trade unions and the T.U. opposition often organise the struggle by sending circulars, informing the members that the strike will be at such and such a time, without previously taking every step to organise this struggle in the factories. These strikes are mostly prepared from outside and not from inside the factories. There are often cases when the workers only hear that there will be a strike in their factory by reading the newspapers, and when spontaneous strikes break out in the factories, it frequently happens that the groups or individual adherents of the R.I.L.U. hear about them last of all. Here are some examples of the organisation and conducting of strikes in an incapable manner by the sections of the R.I.L.U.

In reply to a 10% wage-cut on the basis of the Emergency Decree in Germany, the T.U. opposition called on the miners of the Wurm Basin to strike. A central strike committee, unconnected with the pits, was appointed. The necessary work in the pits was not performed in advance. No meetings were

called and pit strike committees were not elected. Therefore only the revolutionary activists responded to the call to strike and the broad masses of miners took no part.

In two districts of France—Nord and Pas de Calais—in January 1932 a wage-cut of 6—8% for miners was announced. There are 180,000 miners in this district. The red miners' union has 15,000 members and the reformists have 60,000. But the red miners' union has a great influence on the miners. It was able to obtain 60 pit delegates against 48 of the reformists. These delegates are elected by the French workers to control the application of the law of working hours, child labour and safety measures.

The red trade unions decided to declare a strike on February 1st and the reformists put two questions to all miners:

a) To declare a strike, b) to instruct the trade union to negotiate with the employers.

Instead of exposing the reformists in the eyes of the miners, showing that they did not even state what they would demand from the employers, instead of demanding not to cut wages, the Red trade unions called for a boycott of the referendum instead of calling on the miners to take part in the referendum and vote for a strike. The result was that 60,000 miners voted for negotiations and 12,000 for a strike. The other miners boycotted the referendum. The strike was broken and the reformists agreed to a 6—8% wage-cut, not at once but in two instalments.

In addition to the poor leadership of strikes and their preparation, there are good strikes and good leadership. This shows that it is possible to organise the struggle. These good cases of carrying on strikes take place when Bolshevik methods are used, when the struggle is prepared in the factories, when the struggle is discussed in detail with the workers in advance and when the functions are distributed so that everyone knows what to do.

You have probably heard that in many countries there is a trade union opposition. Sometimes it exists parallel with the red trade unions, but in some countries there are no Red trade unions and only a trade union opposition. Its members are members of the reformist trade union, unorganised workers, Communists and their sympathisers, all those who are against the reformist leaders and the T.U. apparatus. The T.U. opposition is organised like the reformist trade unions in which it has to work.

What are the tasks of the T.U. opposition? To organise the union and unorganised workers for the struggle against the employers, to carry on the independent economic struggle as the reformists do not carry it on, to expose the reformists from outside, at meetings, in the press, wherever it is possible. This is one task. The second and very important task is work inside the reformist unions and other unions. The T.U. opposition differs from the red trade unions in the fact that it is an opposition inside the unions which are not red. Working from within, it must show that it is able to do the petty work, that it takes an interest in the everyday needs of the workers, that it makes suggestions which on the one hand expose the reformists and on the other hand prove to the workers that it is the only body defending the interests of the organised and unorganised workers. Inside the reformist and other unions it must rally the workers to the struggle against the employers and the T.U. bureaucrats. During strikes which are organised by the T.U. opposition and the red T.U.s, it must organise the mass of members of the reformist and other unions for the struggle which is being carried on by the revolutionary T.U. movement.

Though the first task of organising the reformist and unorganised workers, to lead independent strikes and form red trade unions is sometimes carried out, the second task is not fulfilled. In the reformist and other unions in most countries, work is carried on unsatisfactorily. In France, as I have mentioned, there are big red trade unions but they do not work among the members of the reformist unions. They have not organised any fractions or any trade union opposition in the reformist unions.

Why do they not work inside the reformist unions? Firstly, many adherents of the R.I.L.U. state that the reformist unions are treacherous and therefore revolutionary elements have no place in them. They do not understand that until extensive work is developed in the reformist trade unions to expose the policy of the reformists, we cannot count on considerable masses of the members of the reformist unions leaving reformism.

Secondly, the reformists expel the best functionaries, expel

the revolutionary elements from the unions, and in this way make it impossible to organise and carry on work inside the unions. But instead of overcoming these difficulties at all costs, many adherents of the R.I.L.U. swim with the stream and do not carry on energetic work against sectarian feelings and against the expulsion of revolutionary elements from the reformist unions. Practice shows that it is not possible to expose the reformists by working only from outside. The struggle against them must go on inside and outside the reformist unions.

Of course we must strengthen the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition, because this is the foundation on which we can carry out the tremendous tasks which face us and lead the masses to the struggle. But we cannot limit ourselves to this. At all costs we must work in the reformist unions and in other unions, and it is necessary for the Soviet trade unions to say clearly in their resolution with all their authority that they are supporters of the most extensive work by revolutionary elements in all kinds of trade unions, especially in reformist unions. Without this work we shall not be able to split away the broad masses of members of reformist unions from the reformist leaders and the T.U. bureaucrats. I must openly say that up to the present the R.I.L.U. has not succeeded in carrying out this task.

Now a few words about the unemployed movement. Comrade Losovsky mentioned in his report the figure of 48,000,000 unemployed. There is unemployment in every country except the Soviet Union, 45-50% of the members of the red trade unions and the T.U. opposition are unemployed. It would seem that this circumstance must compel Communists and workers of the revolutionary T.U. opposition to organise the work among the unemployed. The unemployed supporters of the R.I.L.U. have plenty of time and they often meet with the unemployed. However, things are not so good in the sphere of work among the unemployed. In most countries the red T.U.'s and the T.U. opposition have succeeded in organising unemployed committees. Together with the Communist Parties they have formulated the demands of the unemployed. They have organised unemployed demonstrations. In some places they have succeeded in getting temporary relief granted, but up to the present the Red T.U.'s and the revolutionary opposition have not succeeded in carrying on everyday work among the unemployed.

Take a matter like the eviction of unemployed from their houses. The bourgeois press states that in 1930-31 in New York alone, 370,000 families were evicted. Is not the eviction of the unemployed a factor around which it would be possible to develop an extensive campaign by the trade union opposition and the Red T.U.'s, to organise the employed and the unemployed for a struggle against evictions?

In America, in France, in many other countries, there are charitable societies which give a bit of bread and a bowl of watery soup to the unemployed. Thousands of workers stand in lines at these places. Is it impossible to carry on work in these queues in favour of the insurance of the unemployed at the expense of the employers and the government? It is quite possible to organise the unemployed for a struggle against reductions of relief in countries where it is given or for relief in countries where there is none.

Finally, there is the organisation of children's dining rooms. Is it impossible to organise the unemployed around all these questions? Is it impossible to unite the unemployed for a struggle against overtime work, which still exists in spite of the tremendous amount of unemployment? It is a fact that in spite of millions of workers working only two or three days a week, overtime work still goes on. Is it impossible to organise the unemployed for a struggle for the 7-hour day in the factories, for the struggle against overtime work and capitalist rationalisation which is being carried on alongside of unemployment? By good work among the unemployed it would be possible to carry on work in the reformist trade unions, because 30-35% of the members of all trade unions are unemployed and 20-22% of the members of the same unions are short time workers. It is easier to work among them. It would be possible to rally them for a struggle inside the trade unions against the T.U. bureaucrats and their treachery.

These are the causes which seem to me to explain why the Red T.U.'s and the T.U. opposition have so far seized only the advance guard and not the broad masses of the unemployed. There are symptoms that in some countries, by means of demagoguery, the fascists by using the slogans of the Communist Party, and sometimes feeding a small part of

the unemployed, abuse the unemployed in the struggle against the revolutionary workers' movement. We must radically change the methods of work among the unemployed, and in your resolution you must emphatically stress this fact, because the authority of the Soviet trade unions is very great and must be used to convince the other sections of the R.I.L.U., both the Red T.U.'s and the T.U. opposition, that they must change their methods, improve their work and stand at the head of the millions of unemployed.

The new leaders of the Central Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union pay a great deal of attention to the R.I.L.U., differing from the old Right wing opportunist leaders who were very little interested in the work of the R.I.L.U. The lines of the Trade Union Council and the R.I.L.U. do not differ but form one line. Owing to this, we have succeeded, in spite of the weaknesses of which I have spoken, in achieving some successes in the work between the VIII and IX Congresses of the Soviet trade unions. But this is still insufficient. We can demand more from the Central Trade Union Council. By its experience, the Trade Union Council can and must give more help to the R.I.L.U. and its sections than hitherto. I hope that you will instruct the Central Trade Union Council, in spite of the fact that it has tremendous tasks inside the Soviet Union, to pay more attention and give more energy through its delegation to the R.I.L.U. and its sections.

WORKERS SPORT MOVEMENT

Olympics Versus Counter-Olympics.

By Si Gerson (New York).

Two campaigns are going on today among athletes in the United States: one is the campaign conducted by the American Olympics Committee, the other is the campaign led by the National Counter Olympic Committee. The honorary chairman of the American Olympics Committee is **Herbert Hoover**, starvation president of the United States; the honorary chairman of the National Counter Olympic Committee is the imprisoned worker, **Tom Mooney**. This alone should be sufficient to show to all class conscious workers what the character of the two campaigns are.

The Olympic Games in this year of crisis can be seen as a boss class Olympics by even the most sceptical. The Olympics Committee in makeup is composed of out-and-out reactionary elements: **General Douglas McArthur**, head of the War Policies Commission and Chief of Staff of the United States Army, is one of the leaders of the American Olympics Committee. (General McArthur, it may be said in passing, only recently completed a tour of inspection of the fortifications and the military forces of the Baltic states bordering the Soviet Union.) Colonels **Ely** and **Roosevelt** are among the army officers in the leadership of the Olympics Committee. **Avery Brundage**, rich Chicago building contractor and president of the Amateur Athletic Union, is another guiding spirit, as is the wealthy New York lawyer, **Gustavus T. Kirby**. In short, the organisers of the Olympics are drawn from the top ranks of the capitalist class.

The work of the Olympics Committee reflects faithfully the policies of the American capitalist class. First and foremost—and most significant—the Olympics Committee is carrying out a **boycott of the Soviet Union**. The Olympics Committee does not "recognize" the existence of one-sixth of the world's surface which is in the hands of the working class. The tremendous growth of physical culture in the Soviet Union, one of the fruits of the revolution, remains "unnoticed" by the Olympics Committee.

The implacable hostility of the Olympics Committee towards the Soviet Union, which they "failed" to invite to the Olympic Games, can only be approached by their hatred of the Negro masses. Negro athletes are not given a chance to compete in the South with white sportsmen. **A special meet is being held for Negro athletes in the South, held with the groveling aid of the Negro middle class reformists.** In the North Negro athletes are discriminated against in somewhat more subtle fashion. Negro and white swimmers are not allowed to compete against each other in most pools. Even where Negro athletes excel so obviously that the general

sport-loving public acclaims the Negro athlete as winner, the officialdom of the Olympics Committee and the Amateur Athletic Union try by every foul trick to cheat the Negro sportsman of his well-deserved victory. Even the capitalist press is forced to admit this.

Besides carrying out faithfully the general class task of attempting to distract the attention of the sport-loving workers from their own immediate task of struggle against imperialist war, the fight against wage cuts and for unemployment insurance—besides all this yeomans service for the capitalist class, the Olympics Committee has its own special little interests that it knows how to take care of very well. Consider for a minute the money spent at the Winter Olympic Games, a figure that scandalized even the American capitalist sport press, accustomed as it is to graft, corruption and swindling. The Winter Games were held at the ultra-fashionable Lake Placid, a millionaire resort. Admission prices were steeper than the hills in the vicinity. **For the two weeks that the games lasted the officials managed to spend \$1,137,654.13!** In order to provide thrills for some jaded millionaires and their mistresses they spent for the bobsled run and the clubhouse **\$248,009.77**, enough to feed about 270 families for a year at \$25 a week. Even Dan Parker, the cynical "Daily Mirror" columnist was forced to say:

"The games lasted two weeks. That's spending \$1,137,654.13 much faster than all the bread lines in New York could accomplish the same feat, which is an Olympic record I haven't heard mentioned at all."

Finally, as a sort of climax, the major portion of the Olympic Games are being held in Los Angeles, California, in the state in which **Tom Mooney**, labour's martyr, has been imprisoned on one of the foulest frameups known to the history of the American labour movement. The State of California, which finds it impossible to give unemployment relief or to release Tom Mooney, finds it entirely possible to give a cool million dollars for the holding of the Olympic Games in California and the elaborate welcoming of the Olympic athletes there. While guards stand grimly on the walls of San Quentin penitentiary, watching Tom Mooney within, the Los Angeles Olympic stadium will be gaily bedecked with the national colours of the various imperialist powers. . . .

Against all this the American worker sportsmen have organised a **Counter Olympic campaign**. The entire campaign was initiated by the **Labour Sports Union**, the American section of the Red Sports International, and is in line with the decisions adopted by the 6th Plenum of the R. S. I. In October of last year Tom Mooney issued his famous call for a boycott of the Los Angeles Olympic Games as a protest against his continued imprisonment. The Labor Sports Union immediately wired him, endorsing his appeal for a boycott and, going further, suggested that he accept the honorary chairmanship of the National Counter Olympic Committee that was then being built. Mooney wired his acceptance of this and the entire movement was spurred on by his endorsement. A number of **Tom Mooney Street Runs** were organised. Runs were held in **New York, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, Youngstown, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Paterson**, and a number of smaller cities in the country. In all these runs the athletes ran through the major streets of the city with slogans on their backs "Free Tom Mooney", "Free the Scottsboro Boys", "Boycott the Olympics", etc. In a number of cities **united front conferences** were held where the athletes from various bourgeois and independent organisations were brought into the movement. Competition has been organised in basketball, soccer, swimming and track and field. The entire campaign is to wind up in the **International Workers Athletic Meet, at Loyola Field, Chicago, July 29, 30, 31 and August 1.**

Athletes from the **Soviet Union** have been invited to attend this meet. The High Council of Physical Culture of the Soviet Union accepted the invitation and has promised to send 5 athletes. German and Canadian worker athletes are expected. If economic circumstances permit, athletes from some of the colonial countries may attend. All in all, the International Workers Athletic Meet will be a real meet of worker and farmer athletes. Negro and white, foreign-born and American-born. It will rally under the slogans of struggle against the Olympics and a fight for the freedom of Tom Mooney, the Scottsboro boys and all class war prisoners. It will be

a step forward in the building of a real tradition of workers sports in the United States and of crystallizing the resentment against the boss-controlled sports movement that exists in the very ranks of those workers who are still in the boss-controlled sport organisations. Concluding on August 1st it will culminate in a splendid **demonstration against imperialist war** and for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Workers all over the world should lend their utmost support to the Counter Olympic campaign; to the struggle against the anti-labour, anti-Soviet, Jim Crow, jingo Olympics and to the struggle for the freedom of Tom Mooney, the Scottsboro Boys and all class war prisoners. The slogans "Boycott the Olympics!" "Forward to the International Workers Athletic Meet!", "Free Tom Mooney!", "Free the Scottsboro Boys!"—these slogans should find an echo everywhere among workers and poor farmers.

The Labor Sports Union, which initiated the entire campaign in the United States, will have its National Convention in Chicago on August 2, 3 and 4. This National Convention with the base of the movement broadened out as a result of the Counter Olympic Campaign, will officially open the drive for the **World Spartakiade in Moscow, August 1933**, at the conclusion of the Five Year Plan. Worker athletes who are now busily engaged in working for the success of the Counter Olympic Campaign are already looking forward to the World Spartakiade campaign and the sending of a mass delegation of Negro and white athletes to the World Spartakiade.

* * *

(Workers interested in the Counter Olympic Campaign may write to the National Counter Olympic Committee, 799 Broadway, New York City.)

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Plenary Session of C. C. of the C. P. of Germany.

The Berlin "**Rote Fahne**" of 27th May publishes the following report:

The main speech at the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany was delivered by **Comrade Thaelmann** who briefly analysed the class situation after the three recent elections in Germany and showed its significance for the policy of the Communist Party. A chauvinist-nationalist wave was sweeping over Germany. The defensive struggle against it must be intensified. A still more energetic counter-offensive must be organised. The nationalist incitement and demagoguery of the fascists must be fought with the programme of emancipation drawn up by the Communist Party and its declaration on the reparations problem.

The Communist Party had offered strong resistance to nationalism, but it had not succeeded in exhausting the revolutionary possibilities existing in the given situation. Considerable weaknesses were still present on important fields of mass work and they would have to be liquidated. There was no question of any change of policy, on the contrary, the existing policy would be carried out even more sharply. The decisions of the February plenary session were of great importance and in exact accordance with the needs of the situation.

Comrade Thaelmann then criticised the lack of energy with which these decisions had been put into practice by the whole Party. In the struggle against war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, those considerations must be stressed which appealed directly to the German workers. In this connection, the campaign for August 1, the international fighting day against war, must be conducted with the greatest energy.

The February plenary session had pointed out that the revolutionary united front policy was the decisive link in the chain. During the last few weeks the Party and the revolutionary trade union opposition movement had taken important steps to adopt new methods and win new successes on this field.

Comrade Thaelmann then dealt with the necessity of organising a mass campaign and a revolutionary united front against fascism. Increased activity was necessary because at the moment the social democratic leaders with their policy of

letting the fascists into the government were overtrumping their own criminal policy and again proving that the Social Democratic Party and the German Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) were the chief supports of the bourgeoisie.

The antifascist united front must develop all forms of the struggle up to the political mass strike in order to bar Hitler's way to power. This struggle could not be separated from the struggle against the capitalist offensive and the struggle for the demands of the workers in the factories and the labour exchanges. The Party must increase its activities to organise and lead mass strikes and mass actions on all fields. It was necessary to improve the work of the revolutionary trade union opposition and the revolutionary unions, to concentrate on the factories, to improve the work amongst the unemployed and the work amongst the poor peasants and landworkers.

All these problems were closely connected with the problems of the inner-life of the Party. As a result of the great number of new members won recently an ideological offensive was necessary to consolidate the Party and overcome membership fluctuation.

Comrade Thaelmann's speech was followed by a discussion which revealed the absolute unity and determination of the Central Committee in all questions. Firm unity existed not only with regard to policy and tactics, but also with regard to all the questions of revolutionary mass work, and with regard to all organisational measures taken by the Central Committee to consolidate the bolshevist discipline of the Party.

The plenary session of the Central Committee was a preliminary to the mobilisation of all the forces of the Party in the present acute situation in order to develop the revolutionary mass struggle and launch a counter-offensive against the class enemy.

Party-Education Work with New Members of the Communist Party.

The question of Party education for all new members is a very urgent question in the C.I. sections at the present juncture, when the growth of the revolutionary upsurge finds vivid expression in the rapid growth of a series of C.I. sections. At the XI Plenum of the E.C.C.I. this question was also raised by **Comrade Thaelmann** on the basis of the experience of the C.P.G. Its experience is dealt with lower down.

The first steps taken by the local C.P.G. organisations in 1929-30, in order to get hold of the new members and draw them into the general elementary classes, without taking into consideration their needs and requirements and the necessity of special methods, produced unsatisfactory results. In the beginning of 1930-31, the C.P.G. took note of these results when it organised elementary Party education classes for new members. Special short term study circles (4 to 6 lessons) were organised for them. 40% of new members profited by these special arrangements in Autumn 1930, which was already a big stride with regard to numbers, though it nevertheless shows that underestimation of the political and organisational significance of this branch of Party work has not yet been overcome by far in the locals. That this is so, is shown by the fact that local Party workers repeatedly raised the question of going back to classes of the old type (without special arrangements for new Party members). In North Bavaria where the elementary classes were held as classes for new members, there were 43 such classes in November and December 1931, and only one of them in a factory. The August propaganda conferences (1931), in summing up the year's work, point out: in 1930-31 only 20% of the elementary classes were held in factories; at the district propaganda conferences, with the exception of Berlin, hardly any representatives from the factories were present; on the Lower Rhine, there is hardly any propaganda work in the factories; in Magdeburg nothing was done in important works such as Krupp, Junkers etc., even the Ruhr which in the first six months of 1931 led the way with regard to this work, did not come up to the mark in the pits ("Propagandist", 10, 31).

Thus, the Party education work with new members is not linked up with the work in the factories; even with a 100% result of the recruitment campaign, this work is dissociated from the most important task of the Party—conquest of positions in the decisive factories.

The work with newly made members being so inadequately organised, its character and results are naturally unsatisfactory. The school syllabus is to a great extent of an abstract character. It is dissociated from the vital issues of the present period that draw workers into the ranks of the Party. Neither the structure of the syllabus, nor the school reports show that the classes for novices are linked up with practical work in the Party organisation, there is nothing to show the difference between the position of a worker who has joined the Communist Party and his position when he was either non-Party or a member of some other party. This is bound to interfere with our efforts to keep new members in the Party.

Apart from these grave defects in the organisation of Party education for new members, there is also lack of steady effort to draw the attention of the Party organisations to this matter. Suffice it to say that the "Propagandist" publishes only 4 short notes a year. The old leadership of the "Propagandist", among its other mistakes, has completely underestimated the importance of Party education for new members. As a result of this, the success in the recruitment of new members between November and December 1930 was not followed up, and in the beginning of 1931 the percentage was only 7 against 40%, and in the second half of 1931 only 15%. The agit prop department of the C.P.G. makes the following declaration with regard to the results of Party education work in 1930-31: "Uneven tempo with regard to keeping newly made members in the ranks of the Party (satisfactory in October to December 1930, slack in January to March 1931)". This is all the self criticism with regard to this field of work.

In spite of all these weak points and defects in the Party-education work of the C.P.G. which call for serious consideration and speedy rectification, it has considerable positive results. As a form of mass Party education, special work with new members is an incentive for sympathisers to join the Party. The serial form of work (in Berlin—Brandenburg a fortnight's course with two evening classes a week, in North Bavaria 5 evenings or 3 Saturdays and 2 Sundays) facilitates the utilisation and distribution of propagandist forces, makes it possible to cater for large numbers with the existing propagandist staff, and enables the propagandists to gain the necessary experience for this special branch of Party education. But these possibilities are not duly considered and utilised by all the local Party organisations. Control over this branch of work is inadequate, and its registration is superficial.

To study the experience of the C.P.G., to let other sections have the benefit of it, and to give methodical help with the correct organisation of the work with new members, such is one of the most urgent tasks of the E.C.C.I.A.P.D.

Anhwei Practically in Red Army Hands.

Shanghai, 28th May 1932.

"The China Press" reports that the Red Army is practically in control of the province of Anhwei. All the military operations of the Nanking government in this province had suffered defeat. The government troops were either compelled to retire or they permitted themselves to be disarmed and went over to the enemy. The last defeat was inflicted on the 7th Nanking Division which recently left Anhwei quicker than it went in, whilst the 146th Nanking division was disarmed by the Red Army whose equipment had been inadvertently supplied by the Nanking government. Reuters declares that Chiang Kai-shek intends to take command of the troops concentrated against the Reds, the suggestion being that then the fur will fly. Unfortunately for Nanking, this report has been published on numerous occasions already and the Reds have not been impressed.