

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 14 No. 17

PRESS

16th March 1934

CORRESPONDENCE

CONTENTS

Politics	D. Zaslavski: Heroes of the Working Class	439
Louis: The Negotiations in Rome	431	
J. B.: In the Morass of Scandals	431	
Aodh MacManus: "Parties of Order" Fly Unity Kites— Workers Declare for General Strike in Ireland	432	
Austria		
Support the Austrian and German Workers in the Fight Against Fascism	434	
Gustav: The Heroic Struggle of the Workers in Upper Styria	435	
Willy Trostel: Practical Proletarian Solidarity for the Heroes of the Austrian Insurrection	436	
Germany		
P. M.: The Struggle in the German Protestant Church ..	437	
"Provision of Work" and the Misery of the Small Peasants in East Prussia	437	
Open Letter of the C.C. of the Y.C.L. of Germany to Com- rade Thaelmann	438	
Great Britain		
W. G. Shepherd: The London County Council Elections ..	440	
Wilhelm Koenen: Solidarity of English and German Workers Against the Anti-Soviet Alliance of McDonald and Hitler	441	
India		
Whither Nehru?	442	
Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union		
L. F. Boross: The 17th Party Congress and the International Proletariat.—II.	445	
The White Terror		
V. Gradinaru: The Campaign for the Release of the Rumanian Railway Workers	447	
Proletarian Commemoration Days		
O. Piatnitsky: Fifteen Years	448	
F. Heckert: Fifteen Years of the Communist International	451	

New Friendships—New Enmities

The Zig-Zag Course of Nazi Foreign Policy

The erratic character of the foreign policy pursued by the Hitler government, the sudden changes of front, the enmities with the friends of yesterday, and the sudden friendships with "the natural enemies" of yesterday, demonstrate not only the adventurous character of aggressive fascist imperialism, but also the instability and insecurity of political conditions in Europe which have been shaken to the very core by the greatest crisis in history.

The final aim of the pan-German chauvinism whipped up by the national socialists brings Germany into opposition to all other powers without exception, for not one of the European powers is prepared to agree to the building up of a new world power in Central Europe, embracing all the German-speaking areas, dominating the continent, armed to the teeth and controlling new colonial possessions. But, despite this, no definite bloc against fascist Germany is being formed in Europe, which is torn with imperialist contradictions. The other imperialist powers which fear an open outbreak of the conflict under present circumstances, but which at the same time are doing everything possible to prepare for the inevitable struggle for the redivision of the world not only with military measures, but also with political measures, are attempting to turn the aggression of German imperialism into channels which they think would be less dangerous for them and to exploit it to weaken their opponents.

For the moment, therefore, fascist Italy which approved for internal political reasons of the seizure of power by German fascism, which came at a very convenient time, has made itself into the advocate of the German armament demands with a view to undermining France's military hegemony on the continent, to exercise pressure on French imperialism, and, if a favourable opportunity affords, to sell Germany's friendship in return for con-

cessions from Germany's more powerful opponents. In pursuing a policy which is developing more and more in the same direction, Great Britain has been actuated less by opposition to France than by hostility to the Soviet Union. It would not be the first time that British imperialism had attempted to use German cannon fodder for the interests of British imperialist policy.

Thus it came about that Germany's armament demands, which were energetically opposed by French imperialism, found direct support in the memoranda issued by the British and Italian governments. With a clear dig at France Mussolini declared that no real disarmament was to be expected from the heavily armed States and that therefore Germany must be permitted to rearm within certain limits. The memorandum of the conservative MacDonald government contained more or less the same thing and contained details of the proposed rearmament of Germany, including an army of 300,000 men, light tanks up to six tons, mobile artillery up to 15.5cm., etc. After two years Germany would also be granted a military air fleet, unless in the meantime, a possibility not taken seriously by anyone, the other powers should have decided to scrap their own air fleets.

Whilst Italian and British imperialisms are thus showing themselves favourably disposed to Germany's rearmament claims and the British Lord Privy Seal, Eden, is being sent on a tour of the various capitals in order to inquire into the possibilities of agreement upon the basis of the British proposals, resistance in France to Germany's rearmament is steadily intensifying in connection with the growing fascist tendencies there, with the formation of the Doumergue government of national concentration, etc. The French government has declared openly and energetically that the proposed concessions are not acceptable. It expresses

frankly its distrust of the peace speeches made by Hitler and appealed to as bona fide by the British and Italian governments, points out once again the military character of the fascist storm and special detachments and of the German police, and refuses decidedly to agree to recognise Germany's right to rearm in any form whatever.

Whilst the imperialist contradictions in the question of German rearmament have given the German fascists ample opportunities to manoeuvre—the German militarists are content if they are permitted to get on with their secret armaments without interference during the diplomatic negotiations—German foreign policy in the struggle for Austria has suffered a signal reverse. It has become known only now that last January the leader of the Heimwehr, Fey, Mussolini's confidant in the Austrian government, prevented negotiations between Dollfuss and the German national socialists with a view to coming to an agreement. The activity of the Heimwehr which culminated in the bloody struggle against the Austrian workers was proceeding under the direct pressure of Mussolini. The temporary strengthening of the position of the Austrian Heimwehr means that Italian imperialism has brought Austria under its control.

The Austrian national socialists have let the decisive moment for action slip past unutilised. A mass party which remains neutral in a civil war and afterwards comes forward to play the role of the battlefield hyena can only lose thereby. After heavy artillery and machine-guns had spoken, the threat of Herr Habicht to renew his paper offensive after a week's armistices was nothing more than a farce. Thus at the moment the balance of the Hitler struggle for Austria is decidedly negative. The Austrian myrmidons of Hitler have not succeeded in advancing a step, but the antagonism between German and Italian fascism in the Austrian question has tremendously intensified. Hitler's vanity must have been wounded when the press organs of Mussolini and the Italian radio declared the ultimatum of Herr Habicht to be "an intolerable threat, insolence, dishonesty, and a criminal challenge," and openly demanded that Hitler should proceed against the man who is still his representative and agent. It was certainly unusual language to come from the lips of a friendly power.

The severity of the conflict about Austria is expressed in the acridness of the discussion. A German Reich stretching from the North Sea to the Brenner and thus having a common frontier with the Germans oppressed by Mussolini in the Tyrol would be just as intolerable for Italy as for France, despite the devoted attachment consistently shown by the German national socialists to their Italian model and despite the repeated declaration of Hitler that in order to retain Mussolini's friendship he would gladly sacrifice all the oppressed Germans in South Tyrol. And thus it came about that the two imperialist powers, Italy and France, which are the sharpest opponents in the question of armaments, issued a joint declaration together with Great Britain against Germany's annexationist tendencies in the question of the so-called independence of Austria.

It is true, however, that Franco-Italian unity in the Austrian question is no more than a negative unity. Neither of them wants to see Austria annexed by Germany, but, on the other hand, Italy's aim of creating an Austro-Hungarian bloc under Italian patronage, although it may be the "lesser evil" for France as opposed to a thoroughgoing annexation by Germany, is hardly to be tolerated by France.

The toleration of such a combination by France would completely destroy the latter's position of influence in Eastern Europe. The States allied in the Little Entente are bitterly opposed to the restoration of Austria-Hungary, for which the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy would be the given form. The succession States which sprang up after the destruction of the Austro-Hungarian empire would tremble not only for the territories which they have annexed (Hungarian areas of Slovakia and Yugoslavia), but for their very existence in the event of a restoration. In fact, their fear is so great that immediately the restoration plans of Italy became known there were even rumours of a Czechoslovakian rapprochement with Germany. The Czechoslovakian government, which only a few weeks ago rejected a German proposal for a pact along the lines of the German-Polish pact, is now said to have agreed after all to the conclusion of such a pact with Germany. The continuation of such a development would destroy the whole French system of alliances.

Whilst German fascism has come into the sharpest contradic-

tion with its Italian colleague in fascism in the question of the struggle for Austria, it has succeeded in developing its newly found friendship for Poland, which not so long ago was so hated and despised. The customs warfare which has lasted for years between the two States has now been stopped and a new agreement has been come to for co-operation "in all questions relating to the formation of public opinion." This "moral disarmament" will mean that the press and radio of both sides will now stop the usual mutual attacks which have been going on for years and for which the persecution of the national minorities on both sides of the frontier offered continuous opportunity. This, of course, does not mean the protection of the national minorities, but the abandonment of both sides. The Germans have promised no rights for the Polish minorities and the Poles have promised no rights for the German minorities. On the other hand, the thoroughly "national" fascists on both sides of the frontier have undertaken to hold back their friends on the other side of the frontier from the struggle against national oppression. The new situation was expressed in the attitude of the leader of the minority German fraction in the Polish Sejm, who declared for the first time that his fraction would vote for the Polish budget.

The German-Polish "friendship," whereby naturally each of the noble friends hopes to outwit the other, is a very serious matter as a sign of the direction in which German imperialism intends to direct its aggressive tendencies. Towards France Hitler fascism was on the defensive from the beginning, and the repeated declarations of Hitler's sudden and new-found friendship for France are simply explained by the fact that German imperialism needs years of peaceful armament before it can hope to measure forces with French imperialism. The German imperialists will have to be content if they can prevent imperialist France from making any intervention against Germany's rearmament. In the struggle for Austria the German "emancipators" are also beating a retreat. After the expiry of Habicht's ridiculous ultimatum nothing whatever happened and no new attack was made. The support of fascist Italy in the question of German rearmament is obviously so valuable for the German fascists that the latter are prepared to leave their "Austrian brothers" in the lurch if necessary to retain it and to abandon the "emancipation" of Austria. And the meaning of the rapprochement with Poland is that for the moment at least there is to be no German expansion towards the East at the expense of Polish imperialism.

The adventurers who are at present in power in Germany have apparently realised the truth of the old proverb that the man who tries to hunt everything at once catches nothing at all. Therefore at the moment the efforts of German foreign policy are concentrated on two points: the carrying through of Germany's demands for rearmament and the creation of an alliance for an intervention against the Soviet Union.

The German-Polish friendship can be understood only within the framework of the old Rosenberg proposal for co-operation with a view to dividing up the Soviet Ukraine. Naturally, the schemers know perfectly well that for the moment their arm cannot reach so far, and for this reason Hitler and Neurath were unwilling to provoke a conflict with the Soviet Union in the question of the release of the Soviet citizens, Dimitrov, Popov, and Tanev, despite Goering's open raving frenzy. And therefore in the interview he gave to the correspondent of the "Daily Mail," which provoked Goering's furious opposition, Hitler announced the release of Dimitrov and his comrades and at the same time repeated his declaration that he harboured no hostile intentions against the Soviet Union.

The working class will not let itself be deceived by the mock peaceful speeches of Hitler. It knows that national socialist promises on the foreign political field are worth just as much as the numerous promises are worth which the national socialists made in the political struggle in Germany, in order to break them cynically afterwards.

Despite the wild and erratic zig-zag of national socialist policy, the rapid changes of wild provocations and far-reaching armament manoeuvres, reckless threats and lying declarations in favour of peace, the general tendency of feverish armaments to a counter-revolutionary imperialist war remains perfectly clear. It is a warning to the international proletariat to strengthen its own armaments for its class war with the same determination and energy, the only war which can save humanity from a fearful world slaughter.

Politics

The Negotiations in Rome

By Louis

On March 14 a meeting will take place in Rome between *Mussolini*, *Dollfuss* and *Goemboes*. Naturally, the Italian, Austrian and Hungarian newspapers are very anxious to convince the world that nothing but purely economic questions are to be discussed when the three meet in Rome, and that there can be no question of any imperialist block formation, or of discussions directed against any other imperialist powers, but purely and simply discussions directed towards consolidating and preserving the peace in Central Europe.

It is not necessary to spend any time refuting these banal newspaper phrases. Economic questions may be discussed when the three meet in Rome, but they will play a subordinate role. There is no possibility of a *customs union* between Italy and Austria, and the post-war development of Hungarian industry and Austrian agriculture effectively exclude the possibility of any customs union in that direction. Italy is not in a position to grant either Austria or Hungary any half-way important economic advantages. The development of Italian agriculture and industry effectively prevent this possibility. It is, of course, quite on the cards that *Mussolini* would like to divert Austrian and Hungarian foreign trade to *Trieste* and *Fiume* in competition with the German seaports Hamburg and Bremen, but the economic relations between Austria and Germany and the economic relations between Hungary and Germany are still more important both in value and in volume than the economic relations between Austria and Hungary on the one hand and Italy on the other. Italy is not in a position to offer Austria and Hungary any compensation for their trade with Germany. Italy is further not in a position to grant either Austria or Hungary any considerable loans. Any economic rapprochement between the three countries can therefore take place within very narrow limits only and in view of the severe economic crisis prevailing in all three countries there is not much to be done in this direction. The trading agreement between Germany and Hungary has resulted in greater advantage to the latter country than its trading agreement with Italy. The Hungarian agrarians are not prepared to abandon these advantages and could not if they wanted to.

Is it possible that the three intend to discuss economic measures against the Little Entente and against the Balkan countries? That is of course possible, but the fact remains that little further in this direction is possible; almost all possibilities of mutual annoyance have already been exhausted.

The negotiations in Rome will in fact be directed against the possibility of Austro-German union, or, what is the same thing in a different form, the integration of Austria in the German fascist system without formal annexation. In this respect the discussions will be directed against Hitler Germany. French imperialism smiles wryly at an unpleasant situation and pursues the policy of the "lesser evil." From the standpoint of French imperialist interests the hegemony of Italy in Budapest and Vienna is nevertheless to be preferred to a national socialist government in Vienna and German hegemony in Budapest.

The Czechoslovakian Republic follows obediently in the footsteps of French imperialism. For Yugoslavia on the other hand a close co-operation on the part of Italy, Austria and Hungary is the greater evil. In the diplomatic game in Europe it is quite favourable for France if Italy and Germany are violently antagonistic, but on the other hand a strengthening of Italian influence in the Danube States weakens French influence, and the antagonisms of French and Italian imperialisms in the Mediterranean, in North Africa, in the Near East, in the Balkans and in the Danube States are absolutely irreconcilable. The possibility of an Italo-German agreement against France exists. Italian imperialism has never made any secret of the fact that the weakening and, if possible, the destruction of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia and the consequent weakening of France would be completely in line with its policy. However, the negotiations in Rome are directed against Germany. The bone of contention is the fight for hegemony in the Danube States between Germany and Italy.

But the negotiations in Rome are also directed against the

Little Entente, and above all against Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Considered from the purely military point of view an Italian-Austrian block represents a tremendous deterioration of the strategical situation of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Italy and Hungary are working for a revision of the peace treaties and revision means war. The discussions in Rome will deal with armaments, supplies of weapons and military strategic plans rather than with economic questions. Not only Germany is arming, but also Austria and Hungary. There are deep disagreements in the camp of the Austrian and Hungarian fascists concerning whether the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy should precede a war or be the result of a war, but in both cases the programme is one of war. Germany is attempting the same manoeuvre in Czechoslovakia as it carried out in Poland. Germany is attempting to counteract Italian influence in Budapest whilst at the same time it is organising opposition to French influence in Rumania. The French system of alliances in Central Europe is thus being attacked from two sides. Whilst fighting against each other Germany and Italy are at the same time both striving to break down the French system of military and political alliances.

The discussions in Rome will therefore also be directed against France. Italy is now engaged in building up its own system of alliances. Up to the present one of the characteristic features of European confusion has been the absence of any firmly-rooted imperialist groupings opposed to each other, but the negotiations in Rome represent the beginning of this new development. Italy is aiming at destroying the French system of alliances and building up one of its own. The struggle between Italy and Germany is also a struggle for hegemony between German and Italian imperialism in this anti-French block. But just for this reason the re-grouping of the imperialist powers is meeting with great difficulties.

However, the general tendency is clear and unambiguous. The negotiations in Rome mean an important step towards the formation of a new system of alliances with Italy at the head. Germany is to be faced with the alternative of meekly playing second fiddle to Italy in this block or going its own way without Italian support. Germany is attempting to exploit other powers, but in fact Germany is itself being exploited by other powers, chiefly by Great Britain and Italy.

A new European war block is being built up in Rome.

In the Morass of Scandals

By J. B.

The parliamentary commissions of inquiry, appointed in France to investigate the recent finance scandals, are continuing their inquiries without making any attempt really to get at the bottom of the matter. Contradictory evidence is given before these commissions, but the result is not any greater clarity. No more than fragmentary and unreliable information is permitted to trickle through to the general public concerning those who benefited by the *Stavisky* cheques. New arrests are being made from time to time, but it is the little thieves, the subordinate accomplices of the great swindler who are hanged, whilst the highly-placed personages involved are being left very much alone, including those who encouraged *Stavisky* in his criminal activities to their own advantage. The investigation into the mysterious murder of the French magistrate, *Prince*, have made no progress whatever. A judge who had been deposed because he had dined with *Stavisky* has attempted to commit suicide as also has a lawyer who was employed by *Stavisky* and who apparently has a bad conscience. The affair is becoming so complicated that the average Frenchman can no longer grasp the ramifications of the affair. But that is exactly what the French bourgeoisie wants. Under the pretext of letting light into the affair it is taking care that the matter will never be cleared up at all.

The most important events of the past few weeks can be summed up as follows:—

(1) The former Chief of Police in Paris, *Chiappe*, has been exposed on various occasions. He did everything in his power whilst in office to encourage the demonstrations of the fascists and was firmly determined never to use his police against the *Camelots du Roi* or the *Croix de Feu*. As the result of a report submitted by one of *Chiappe's* agents, the police inspector, *Bony*, of the *Sûreté*

Générale, was removed from office the day after he had examined Madame Stavisky and extracted from her an admission that her husband had maintained excellent and friendly relations with the Chief of Police, Chiappe. Whilst Stavisky was under suspicion Chiappe renewed his passport on no less than five occasions. The former leader of the Sûreté Générale, Thomé, gave evidence to the effect that the Police Presidium in Paris concealed Stavisky's activities by deliberately withholding reports about his character and activities from 1931 to 1933. Chiappe, his immediate chief and his most important collaborator in the police maintained confidential relations with a rotten circle of highly suspicious bankers and owners of gambling hells.

(2) French Cabinet Ministers, both of the Right and Left-wing of the bourgeois parties, are greatly compromised. According to the evidence of the deputy for Bayonne, Garat, the Cabinet Ministers, Dalimier and Julien Durand, both directly intervened in order to assist in disposing of securities managed by the swindler Stavisky. Stavisky was arrested and then released whilst Tardieu was Prime Minister. At the orders of Chautemps the Sûreté Générale did nothing in January last to find the Stavisky cheques or the books of stubs. Neither Frot nor Sarraut gave the necessary instructions later for the tracing of these highly compromising documents. Chautemps agreed with Chiappe to depose Bony. Daladier took no action against Chiappe although he was well aware of Chiappe's activities.

(3) Since a check counterfoil has been found with the name of Tardieu on it, and a second counterfoil showing that Louis Proust, the liaison officer between the radical party and the finance oligarchs, received no less than two million francs from Stavisky, the talk about publishing the list of those who received cheques from Stavisky has died down suspiciously. It would seem that an agreement has been reached between the Right-wing and Left-wing of the bourgeois parties to ignore the whole affair as far as possible on the pretext that certain cliques at work in the ranks of the Sûreté Générale have deliberately defaced, creased and smeared the counterfoils of the cheques in the hands of the police so that they are now indecipherable. By the way, this may very well be true.

It is becoming clearer and clearer that the whole of the State apparatus, police, courts and the government itself, were in the service of swindling financiers and that French public life was, and is, rotten through and through. The fascist and semi-fascist press is exploiting these facts for all they are worth in order to whip up the reactionary agitation which received such a damper when the magnificent anti-fascist counter-blow of the workers fell. Chiappe, Daladier and Chautemps have done their best to minimise and whitewash the fascist danger by declaring publicly that the events of the 6th February were the result of the indignation of "good republicans," and by denying that the organised action of the fascist Storm Troops on that day was in fact a systematic and prepared thing, etc. It is, however, clear that throughout the whole country there are bands of armed and disciplined fascists and that the Croix de Feu organisation, which has 130,000 members, has its cells in the big military training colleges and in the various garrisons and that active officers of the French army are amongst its members. Generals Lyautey and Weygand, who are known to be fascists, are using all their influence on the officers of the Paris garrison in order, without doubt, to prepare a military coup d'Etat with the assistance of the Paris police (17,000 men), the Garde Mobile (40,000 men) and the colonial regiments.

There is much frank talk arising to the effect that the government of national union is not a government strong enough to deal with the crisis. In order to prepare the way for the establishment of a fascist dictatorship the prevailing confusion is being deliberately fomented and the various commissions of inquiry are doing their part in this to the utmost. Interested circles desire that the fascists should exploit the situation with greater success than they achieved on the 6th February.

On the other hand, however, the indignation of the working masses is also rising. In a score of places all over France the workers have put the fascists to flight and there is great enthusiasm at the preparation of a great anti-fascist national demonstration on the 20th and 21st May, etc. The biggest difficulty in the way of fascism in France is that it possesses no serious social basis amongst the workers and peasants, and that the socialist workers are flocking in increasing numbers into the united front action on the basis of the slogans issued by the Communist Party.

"Parties of Order" Fly Unity Kites—Workers Declare for General Strike in Ireland

By Aodh MacManus (Dublin)

Two events in one week have sharpened the whole political situation in Ireland. In introducing a measure for the surface purpose of stamping out the uniformed wing of the imperial fascists in Ireland, de Valera, as head of the Fianna Fail government, issued an invitation to the fascists to co-operate with him in preserving "order" and the constitution. Six days later the Dublin Trades Council, the leading trade union body in the capital, hurled a bombshell into both the O'Duffy and de Valera camps by declaring for a one-day general strike on May 1 against the fascist menace.

On March 1, the de Valera government introduced the Wearing of Uniforms (Restriction) Bill, aimed (ostensibly) at the blue shirts of the "Youth Section" of O'Duffy's imperialist-fascist United Ireland party. This measure carries still further the fascistisation of the State apparatus already advanced by the de Valera government in its "conflict" with the Blueshirts: uniforms, badges of any kind, military titles (an eye to the Irish Republican Army here) and banners are all banned, and Civic Guards, raiding a building, can arrest without warrant any person found therein who refuses to give his name and address.

De Valera commenced his speech with the warning that the country was moving towards civil war.

"I lived through 1922, and I know how, step by step, the very same thing that made civil war inevitable in that period is going on to-day. . . . Yes, we are up against it." (*Irish Press*, 1-3-34.)

De Valera thus admits what has long been clear: British imperialism, through the military wing of its economic-political representatives in Ireland, is organising for an imperialist civil war on the Irish nation in general and a fascist throttling of the Irish working class in particular. But with mounting unemployment, growing discontent and disillusion with the Fianna Fail government, and tremendous outbursts of mass anger against the Blueshirts; with all these, the contradiction between the working masses and the bourgeoisie as a whole comes strongly to the front, and de Valera, the national reformist, looks not towards the masses as the force to destroy fascism—he is actually holding the masses in leash: his State forces are protecting the Blueshirts and batoning and jailing workers—but flies a kite for a counter-revolutionary unity between himself and O'Duffy. De Valera continued:—

"I make the offer to those on the benches opposite that if they will quit this tomfoolery of blueshirting, which is provocative here as it was in Belgium, Holland and other countries, and if we cannot get by the ordinary forces of the law (these "ordinary forces" already include tear gas and bayonets!—A. MacM.) fair play and freedom of speech at political meetings, we will have a joint, composite force, a national force, and we will preserve order. . . . If the ordinary forces of the State are not sufficient, I say that our two forces together can secure order, but they must be directed and controlled by the proper responsible authority. . . ."

The C.I.D. were keeping a constant watch on the activities of the Communist Party, he said; the Fianna Fail government was not neglectful of that sphere. "I loathe Communism as destructive of the freedom of the individuality of the soul. I defy anyone (how unnecessary this defiance of windmills!) to show that I ever supported Communism or trafficked with it in any way." The C.P.I. had not been suppressed because the government wanted to avoid "anything that could be regarded as an attack on the freedom of the workers."

Not only from de Valera are these appeals to "save the country from civil war and anarchy" coming. Operating through a "well-meaning citizen," the imperialists tried to get the United Ireland, Fianna Fail and Labour leaders to a round-table conference, under the "impartial" chairmanship of Cardinal McRory, to discuss the best way to end the economic war with Britain; but although the reverend gentleman had graciously agreed to preside, de Valera dared not fall into such an obvious trap. At the same time, the *Catholic Mind* (1-3-34), a clerical organ, whose stock-in-trade consists of scurrility and Black Hundred incitements against Communism and the I.R.A., calls for a coalition "National government" consisting of de Valera,

O'Duffy and Mr. Norton of the Labour party (which it "believes" would join such a fatherland front) to suppress the revolutionary forces.

Much more significant than this position is the workers' reply to it. Since the inception of the fascist Blueshirts, with their adoption of the "Corporate State" and open threat to destroy the working-class movement, the labour and trade union leaders have remained silent on the whole question of fascism, except to urge the workers to rely on the de Valera government. Suddenly they have realised that the workers have not adopted the same ostrich-pose, and on March 6, the District Council of the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union placed a resolution on fascism before the Dublin Trades Council.

The resolution urged the trade unions to protect themselves from "the contamination of fascist propaganda and the confiscation of their funds," and instructed the Executive to send a deputation to the National Executive of the Irish Trades Union Congress and the Administrative Council of the Irish Labour party with a view to "organising a national demonstration against fascism." The officials had thought to make speeches on these measures, to have the resolution mechanically accepted, and to pass on. Instead, a militant delegate set the council alight with enthusiasm by proposing immediately an addendum: that in addition to the demonstration the Trades Council call for a one-day general strike on May 1 against fascism, and that it co-operates with all anti-fascist organisations in a national campaign against the Blueshirts. So surprised were the Executive by the immediate response of the delegates, that they dared not openly oppose the addendum, but could only insert the proviso that the union Executives' endorsement be got first. The addendum was then passed unanimously.

Since then, the Executive of the Trades Council has even been forced to issue an official statement against fascism in reply to O'Duffy. The statement says:—

"The council's desire to protect the workers of Ireland from the fate which has befallen the workers of Italy, Germany, Austria and elsewhere—death, imprisonment, the loss of freedom, their rights and their funds—is not based upon any document which may or may not have been circulated among adherents of the political Labour party here. It is based upon the dear-bought experience of the workers elsewhere, coupled with the public utterances of General O'Duffy and upon ten bitter years of experience of the outlook and legislation of an anti-working-class government in the Irish Free State."

At the same time, the Executive deny that there is anything "political" in this decision of the branch delegates for a political general strike, and repeat their "*trust de Valera*" propaganda:—

"The council believes that it is the duty of the government of this country to maintain free speech and the right of public meeting for every section of the community" (including the fascists, obviously!).

Already trade union branches in *Dublin* and *Cork* have unanimously adopted the proposal for a general strike all over the country. That the Dublin Trades Council—the decisive organ in the country—has taken this tremendously important step is in large measure due to the consistent exposure of fascism by the *Irish Communist Party* and the *Labour League Against Fascism*, and the campaign waged in the press, workplaces and T.U. branches.

It is essential now that every Irish Communist and militant worker realises the great class advance that this decision marks, and that all active forces be mobilised around the general strike. Every branch on both sides of the border must be won to support of the strike; from *Cork* to *Antrim* not a factory or workplace—organised or unorganised—must be allowed to break the front of struggle. Resolutions in favour of the strike and the anti-fascist united front must pour into the Executives, so that there may be no mistaking the determination of the workers. The sharpest eye must be kept to the manoeuvres of the reformist officialdom, who have no stomach for such a step, and who clearly hope to find a way of escape through the refusal of certain Executives to endorse the decision. Above all, the Communist Party of Ireland, and every individual Irish Communist, must now come boldly forward as the political leaders of the mass struggle against fascism, directing and preparing the struggle and showing the way forward out of capitalist-imperialist misery and fascist terror to Soviet Ireland, the Workers' and Farmers' Republic.

The Philippine Masses in Counter-Attack

By Pedro G.

That the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. was absolutely correct in its forecast of rising struggles is proven by the recent actions and political temper of the Philippine masses. In the course of two months, namely, from the November 5 Congress of the "K.A.P." or Proletarian Labour Congress, to January there were 21 mass struggles in the city of Manila alone, some—as in the case of 1,900 cigar makers of the La Helena factories—embracing real numbers in this colonial city of 300,000 population. Of these 21 strikes, only two were led by reformists, while the K.A.P. led all others directly—and won most of them.

The Fifth K.A.P. Congress, which was held on November 5, marked a great improvement in trade union work, and early in January a real effort was made to organise the Communist Party fraction work in the red trade unions. The red unions improved their work greatly during 1933, due mainly to the clarification received in mass work through the work of the Second C.P. Plenum. The Fifth Congress of the K.A.P. gathered 500 delegates, coming in from the most bitter struggles the movement has experienced, who confirmed the analysis of a rising revolutionary wave and took steps to improve the organisation. At this congress there were some women delegates, a big progress, considering the feudal backwardness of the country.

A larger percentage of women delegates attended the Ninth Congress of the National Confederation of Peasants, which met about the same time as the K.A.P., and the trade union congress and the peasants' congress held a joint session, with 800 delegates from both showing the deepest determination to carry their struggles to victory.

The joint session fiercely attacked the native bourgeoisie for its subservience to American imperialism, and opposed the widely circulated fiction that the Filipinos have "an American standard of living." "We are worse off even than the 17,000,000 unemployed workers of America," they declared, "for we work twelve and even more hours a day for wages of *one cent* in American money, two centavos in Philippine money." Further, Filipino workers have not even the fundamental rights of human beings under American colonial oppression.

Nevertheless, despite threats of mass arrests, no less than 7,000 people gathered in the working-class district at the Plaza Moriones on November 7, to celebrate the Sixteenth Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, to denounce the infamous "Hawes Cutting" Act of fake "independence" and the native bourgeois-landlord exploiters. This was held under the auspices of the K.A.P.

Nor was this high spirit wanting when, on December 21, the oldest and best leaders of the Communist Party, headed by *Crisanto Evangelista*, were finally subjected to the sentences of the imperialist-native bourgeois courts. Eight were sent into *Bilibid* Penitentiary for long terms, after which they are to be banished to remote provinces, and eight were immediately banished. On December 31, the militant peasant leader, *Feleo*, entered prison to serve eight years. On January 11, another worker leader, *Tolentino*, was imprisoned. But on December 21, when the sentences against the Communist Party leaders were carried out, a mass of 4,000 workers surged around the court, then marched to the offices of the Secretary of Interior and Labour, from thence to the "new deal" Governor-General's office, then across the city to the working-class district where giant mass meetings of protest were held. Written demands and mass petitions for release of the imprisoned class fighters were presented to the authorities.

In all these actions and congresses the masses show distinct enthusiasm. A peasant delegate from *Tayug*, *Pangasinan* Province, where in 1930 an armed rising occurred, expressed at the joint K.A.P. and N.C.P. session deep resentment at the traditional slander of peasant risings, calling them "risings of religious fanatics." "We are not religious fanatics," he declared, "but we are ready to lay down our lives for our revolutionary movement."

The efforts of imperialism and the native bourgeoisie, with its spies and renegades such as *Jacinto G. Manahan*, have utterly failed to check the tide of revolutionary discontent and rising struggles. The Philippines are in the centre of the Far Eastern imperialist cock-pit, and the world movement, especially the American revolutionary movement, would do well to give the Philippine masses every encouragement and aid. The Filipino proletarian and revolutionary peasant will not be found wanting in the big battles ahead.

Austria

Support the Austrian and German Workers in the Fight Against Fascism!

Proletarians of all countries!

Following upon the victory of fascism in Germany, the bourgeoisie has attempted to carry out on a large scale the mobilisation of fascist forces in France and has undertaken a decisive offensive in Austria. The proletariat of France replied by mass demonstrations and a general strike, in Austria the workers replied not only by a general strike but by armed uprising.

The Austrian workers, suffering from misery, hunger and unemployment, having lost faith in democracy, resorted to war, the only just war—war against their oppressors.

For five days they courageously fought against Austrian fascism. They revealed to the world miracles of heroism, the equal of which can be found only in the history of the Paris Communards and the Civil War in the U.S.S.R. Thousands of the bravest and most loyal fighters of the working class fell in battle, among them were many women and children. Thousands were taken prisoners by the fascist hangmen, and many have already been hanged, while others are awaiting court-martial.

But neither the difficulties of the struggle nor the colossal sacrifices were able to break the fighting spirit of the Austrian proletarians. The temporary victory of fascism and its brutality will serve only to consolidate the working class, foster its hatred against the bourgeoisie, strengthen its will to fight for the overthrow of the rule of capital, and will make them more relentless in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Dollfuss, Fey and the Austrian bourgeoisie are responsible for the workers' blood shed in Austria, but together with them the German fascists, who after the provocative fire of the Reichstag introduced a bloody terror against the German proletariat, are equally to blame for this. In the course of the first year of the existence of fascist rule in Germany, they murdered as many workers as the government of Dollfuss and Fey. Dollfuss and Fey are simply following the hangmen road of German and Italian fascism. This gang of murderers are kindling the fires of war around Austria. They bring death and destruction to the toilers of Europe, while all the bourgeois governments look on. German fascism, the soul of European reaction, the most brutal hangmen of the European working class, is the source of savage sadism now raging in the capitalist world.

Proletarians of Austria!

The proletariat of the world and the Communist International are full of enthusiasm about your heroism and dip their banners before your dead. Betrayed by the social democracy, you fought like lions for the cause of socialism, for that cause which has already been victorious on one-sixth of the world. You fought as proletarian revolutionaries not only for the cause of the Austrian proletariat but for the cause of the world proletariat. You have given the first example of armed uprising against fascism in Europe. By your uprising you strengthened the confidence of the working class in its own power, you showed the world proletariat how to fight, not in words, but in deeds, against fascism. You have shown the bourgeoisie what awaits them in the event of an imperialist war. By your uprising you gave the signal to the world proletariat to take the offensive against fascist reaction.

You did not succeed in smashing fascism, but you have destroyed its conceited self-confidence. Your uprising has given a tremendous impetus to tens and hundreds of thousands of workers in the other capitalist countries. Your uprising was an important step in effecting the turn of the social-democratic workers towards Communism.

The blood shed by Dollfuss and Fey will raise new armies of proletarian fighters, armies that will not allow themselves to be betrayed by social democracy as was the case in the past. And, therefore, your struggle and your great sacrifices were not in vain, Austrian workers!

Workers! Consider the lessons of the Austrian uprising.

In the autumn of 1918, the Austrian proletariat was the master

of the situation. The toilers were armed. The proletariat organised Soviets of workers and soldiers. The bourgeoisie trembled before the workers. The Communists called upon the masses to crush the bourgeoisie, to destroy the system of capitalist exploitation.

But the social democracy at the head of the movement in Austria smashed the proletarian revolution as was done in Germany. The social democrats led the workers not to the destruction of capitalist exploitation, but to subordination to it in the name of bourgeois "democracy." It led the proletariat not to victory over the Dollfusses, Feys and Starhembergs, but to conciliation with the merciless and brutal class enemies. It called upon the workers to be mild and humanitarian in relation to those who are erecting gallows for the workers, who are destroying the working class suburbs with the fire of howitzers, giving no mercy to women and children. The social democracy always tried to frighten the workers by speaking about the victims of proletarian revolution, while the fascists are now covering the entire soil of Austria with working class blood. The entire post-war policy of "class collaboration" of social democracy has made it possible for the bourgeoisie to consolidate its forces and launch an offensive against the working class. It was with the support of the social democracy that the Soviets were liquidated, that the working class was disarmed, that step by step the major achievements of the working class were surrendered. The Austrian social democracy called upon the workers to remain within the bounds of bourgeois legality while the Austrian bourgeoisie and its Heimwehr were grossly violating this legality day after day. Like the German social democracy it continuously and systematically gave way to the violence of the bourgeoisie, clearing the place d'armes for the civil war of the Starhembergs and the Dollfusses against the proletariat. It muddled the heads of the workers with "municipal socialism" in Vienna and left the whole State apparatus in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

In the face of brutal reaction the working class of Austria on more than one occasion was on the verge of entering the struggle. On July 15, 1927, the working class engaged in an uprising against the bourgeoisie against the will of the social democratic leaders. More than once the storm of disgust revealed itself among the social democratic workers against the treacherous policy of their leadership. At last the patience of the proletariat was exhausted. In reply to the Linz provocation of the Dollfuss government which had gone over to liquidation of the last remnants of political rights, the Austrian proletariat resorted to a general strike and took up arms. The social democracy adapted themselves to the general strike which had already begun. But it did not want struggle, it wanted merely to scare the Dollfuss government. The uprising took place against its will, because the Austrian proletariat, after the bitter experience of the betrayal of German workers by the social democracy, was not prepared to bow its head before the fascists.

But were the Austrian workers prepared for this armed struggle, prepared in accordance with the situation? No, comrades. The leaders of the social democracy did not allow the workers engaged in the uprising to take the initiative into their own hands. The members of the Schutzbund did not capture beforehand the bourgeois central districts in order to make them the arenas of the struggle; nor did they take beforehand the stations and the important military strategic points. The rebels limited themselves to defence action in the workers' houses of Floridsdorf, Simmering, and other places, and did not take the offensive against the armed enemy. Yet "the defensive is the death of every armed uprising." (F. Engels.) The defensive tactic of the Schutzbundists could not prevent the shooting and defeat of the working class population by the artillery of Dollfuss.

The fighting Schutzbund detachments had no central leadership. Some of the leaders of social democracy, as was the case in Carinthia and Vorarlberg, went openly over to fascism, others shamefully fled at the height of the battle or capitulated even

before the struggle, surrendering to the police in order to remove from themselves any responsibility for the further development of events. From the very first day the trade union fakers betrayed the fighting workers by not calling upon the railroad workers to strike and by disorganising strikes that had already begun. The social democracy did not issue any slogans for the uprising, it hindered the consolidation of the front of struggle and the organisation of the toiling masses around the struggle.

Social democracy had declared beforehand that the workers would be defeated in the struggle, but nevertheless in February, 1934, the proletariat, although they were not masters of the situation as in 1918, could have been victorious if the uprising had proceeded under Bolshevik slogans for the seizure of power and the establishment of Soviets.

Only the Communists who fought shoulder to shoulder with the social democratic workers issued clear slogans of struggle during these days. The Communist Party of Austria, already two days before the events in Linz, called for a general strike and for the arming of the Austrian workers. The misfortune of the Austrian proletariat was that the Austrian C.P. was too weak to lead the uprising independently.

Let not the Second International vulgarise this uprising by their statements that the workers arose in defence of the parliamentary democratic system, in defence of the Vienna municipality. If the Austrian workers were victorious they would have done away with the rule of Dollfuss and Fey, with the bourgeoisie as a class. They would have established Soviets, they would have introduced a regime of proletarian dictatorship, following the example of the workers of the U.S.S.R.

The Austrian workers took up arms because the road to socialism through "democracy" in Austria had gone bankrupt, the same as in Germany. It is bankrupt everywhere, because it is impossible to establish socialism based upon class collaboration. The heroic Austrian workers answer the Second International, which declared that the Austrian uprising was theirs, by saying "Hands off." The social democratic workers who took up arms in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, simultaneously broke with the ideology, policy and tactics of social democracy. He who takes the road to armed insurrection puts himself shoulder to shoulder with the World Communist Party and turns his back on the Second International.

Workers! Consider the road of the Soviet proletariat to socialism. How different is this road from the road which the Bauers pictured to the workers of Austria throughout the whole post-war period. Compare these two roads. The proletariat of the U.S.S.R. continues the glorious task of the Paris Commune. Through the medium of the October Revolution they established the Dictatorship of the proletariat. The Seitzes crushed the militant revolutionary activity of the proletariat by a pitiful reformist illusion about the building of socialism without overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie. And what cynicism one must possess to be able, like the Second International, to compare the Vienna municipality with the Paris Commune, and Seitz with the heroic Communards.

The road of Bolshevism is the road of victory, the road of reformism is the road of defeat. On the one hand, the U.S.S.R.—a granite rock of socialism; on the other, a toy house crushed by the boot of the Heimwehr. On the one hand, armed workers and peasants who have taken power into their own hands; on the other, the armed Heimwehr glorifying over the murdered and tortured workers betrayed by social democracy. Those are the results achieved by the Bolshevik leadership of the working class and the leadership of the social democrats. Workers! judge for yourselves, according to their deeds, and take your choice!

Proletarians of the World! The Austrian and French workers came out into the streets against the growing fascist reaction, they fought and continue to fight for your common cause of liberation from the capitalist yoke. By their uprisings they are discarding everything that has been taught to them by international social democracy in the years after the war of 1914-18. Thus, they are creating the real conditions for a united front of struggle from below. This front can be established only in relentless struggle for the destruction of the treacherous Second International which has led the workers of the capitalist countries to their present situation—the open onslaught of capital and the terror of fascist reaction. To-day, when millions of proletarians of the whole world are prepared to support the struggle of the Austrian and German workers against fascism, the agents of Hitler and Star-

hemberg in Spain, the Spanish socialists and anarchists are disorganising the general strike of solidarity of the Spanish proletariat.

The French socialists and the Czechoslovakian social democrats, by their voting for war loans to Austria, armed the fascist bands of Dollfuss.

In all capitalist countries the social fascists are disorganising the struggle against fascism, the struggle in which the revolutionary workers of Austria sacrificed their lives. Down with the agents of Hitler and Dollfuss in the ranks of the working class! Without this, workers, your victory will not be achieved, your struggle against capitalism and fascism will not be successful. Develop the struggle everywhere, in the form of strikes and demonstrations against your own bourgeoisie, as the best method of supporting the Austrian and German workers in their struggle against fascism and to stop new imperialist wars and counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R.! Popularise everywhere the slogan of Soviets as the form of proletarian dictatorship which has been verified by the experience of the great country of socialist construction. Prepare everywhere for the First of May by creating a broad united front of struggle of the working class, **under the leadership of the Communist Party.** Transform May First of this year into a day of struggle against fascist reaction in all capitalist countries, but first of all against the vicious and vile German and Austrian fascism!

Long live the fighting unity of the working class!

Down with fascism and its agent, the Second International!

Long Live the World Proletarian Revolution!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

The Heroic Struggle of the Workers in Upper Styria

By Gustav (Vienna)

As in other districts in Austria, also in Upper Styria the fight broke out without any orders from the social-democratic leaders. The workers first heard of the outbreak of the fighting in Vienna over the wireless. In *Bruck-on-the-Mur*, the unemployed Schutzbundler (members of the social-democratic republic defence corps) thereupon came together, fetched the weapons from where they were hidden and occupied dwelling houses and also the Schlossberg, a height overlooking the town, from whence they opened fire on the gendarmerie station and the Heimwehr barracks. Half an hour later the workers in two big undertakings went on strike. The greater part of the staff joined the Schutzbundlers. The railwaymen, however, remained at work as no one called upon them to strike. A number of their functionaries took part in the fighting without troubling to issue the strike slogan. The social-democratic party leader Wallisch did not arrive until three hours after the outbreak of the fighting.

The Communists immediately placed themselves at the disposal of the Schutzbund and took part in all the fighting.

In *Niklasdorf* the Communists started the strike in the paper mill and, together with the Left social-democratic functionaries, organised armed groups which came to the aid of the fighting workers in *Bruck-on-the-Mur*.

In *Knittelfeld* the local social-democratic leaders left the workers completely in the lurch. Thereupon the Communists organised an evening meeting which was attended by about 400 persons. Here the social-democratic bureaucrats suddenly appeared and did their utmost to hold back the workers. They even succeeded, by promising the workers that "something would be done to-morrow," in preventing the election of a Committee of Action. On the following day an armed group of workers, including Communists, arrived from Zeltweg and a second meeting was held. Before the commencement of the meeting the Communist Party arranged a consultation with the railwaymen's functionaries with a view to bringing the railwaymen out on strike. In the meantime the social-democratic leaders appeared at the meeting hall and declared that the fight had already collapsed in the whole of Austria, and urged that the workers should disperse in a disciplined manner. They refused to give out weapons. The Communist Party immediately issued a leaflet calling for the continuation of the fight. During the night shots were exchanged with the Heimwehr. On the following day the government forces were

reinforced by 250 men, and captured the workers' quarters by storm. The S.P. leaders maintained their treacherously passive attitude to the end and allowed themselves to be arrested.

In *Judenburg* the factories were still working on Monday; the social-democratic shop stewards were without any instructions. It was only after the intervention of the Communists that the gas works ceased working. The *Schutzbund* leaders kept themselves, and also the weapons, hidden. During the night, however, the workers, led by the Communists, erected barricades of tree trunks and waggons in order to bar the passage of military motor vehicles to *Knittelfeld*. The barricades had to be abandoned in the morning, however, as the workers had not sufficient weapons in order to defend them. The social-democratic mayor and three other functionaries had themselves placed under preventive arrest. Early in the morning about 600 workers assembled outside the gas works. A Committee of Action, consisting of Communists and social democrats, was elected which organised a big demonstration through the town.

A deputation of striking metal workers from *Judenburg* went to *Fohnsdorf*, where they called out the miners.

There was serious fighting in *Zeltweg*, where already on Monday morning about one hundred workers, *Schutzbundlers* and Communists, armed themselves and took up a position on a hill outside the village. An attack by gendarmes and auxiliary police was repelled, one gendarme being killed and another, and also two auxiliary police being wounded. There were no losses on the side of the workers. After the gendarmerie had been put to flight, the railway station was occupied, the railwaymen went on strike and two passenger trains were held up. In the meantime, the local S.P. leaders were arrested without their offering any resistance. When the workers attempted to storm the gendarmerie station, these bureaucrats placed themselves in front of the gendarmes and called upon the workers to abandon the fight. When the military arrived in motor lorries the troop of armed workers retreated into the forests, repelled an attack, and then proceeded to *Knittelfeld*.

In *St. Michael* the workers attacked the gendarmerie station on Tuesday evening. In the course of the fighting three gendarmes were killed and four auxiliary police wounded. After the arrival of government reinforcements the workers were forced to disperse, but managed to save some of their weapons. In this action, as well as in all the fights described above, the Communists took an active part.

In *Leoben* the fighting commenced on Tuesday morning. The Communists from *Leoben* and *Donawitz* fought along with the *Schutzbundlers*. They did not succeed, however, in getting the leadership of the fight into their hands, and as the social-democratic leaders had either lost their heads or sabotaged, the action was without leadership. It came to a fight with the gendarmerie in the course of which one gendarme, two auxiliary police and two workers were killed.

Sympathy with the Communists has increased very much in the whole district because the active and independent role of the C.P. was clearly expressed. The workers see the difference between the social-democratic leaders, who sabotaged and betrayed the fight, and the Communists, who fought along with the workers or led the fights.

Practical Proletarian Solidarity for the Heroes of the Austrian Insurrection

By Willy Trostel (Zürich)

Already in the days when the Austrian workers were still waging their heroic fight, the International Labour Defence issued instructions to all its sections to launch a broad movement of solidarity for the Austrian proletariat. This campaign has met with a lively response in the whole world and has shown that the courageous Austrian workers have captured the hearts of all toilers, that the working class and the oppressed masses have the greatest sympathy for the victims. And just as social-democratic, Communist and non-party workers have fought and fallen together, are pining in prisons together, so the united solidarity front of non-party, Communist and social-democratic workers is growing under the leadership of the I.L.D.

The I.L.D. was the first to come to the aid of the Austrian workers by donating 15,000 francs: 10,000 francs for the widows

and orphans, and 5,000 francs in order to provide legal defence for the arrested workers brought before the class courts.

The trade unions of the Soviet Union placed a million shillings at the disposal of the I.L.D., the whole of which will be applied in relieving the victims.

A number of Italian emigrants in France immediately declared themselves ready to take ten children of fallen fighters.

Even the German I.L.D., which has enormous tasks to fulfil towards the thousands of victims of the bloody Hitler terror, immediately granted 3,000 marks for the Austrian workers.

From one town alone in Italy 500 lira were remitted in the first days after the revolt.

The Swiss I.L.D., which immediately issued collecting cards and contribution forms to the workers, sent 500 francs as a first donation to the Austrian workers.

In France the I.L.D. organised a collection, half the proceeds of which were devoted to the victims of the February fighting in Paris and the other half to the victims of the insurrection in Austria. In addition, the French I.L.D. is prepared to take fifteen children of the murdered or executed fighters into its children's home.

In England, Spain, Greece, Holland, in the U.S.A., and even in the Balkan countries where fascist terror is raging, where the I.L.D. can only work illegally, collections have been successfully carried out.

The International Jurists' Association has sent a delegation to Austria which will take over the defence of the prisoners and will seek to secure the release of the arrested lawyers.

The I.L.D. is also represented in the great delegation of the World Committee against War and Fascism. Its representatives are specially informed on the situation of the families of the fallen, murdered and imprisoned fighters, and will organise direct aid.

The M.O.P.R., in the Soviet Union, has mobilised its members, numbering ten millions, in support of the solidarity campaign for the victims of the bloody terror of Dollfuss and Fey.

The Austrian I.L.D. itself, which since the 20th May last year has been forced to work illegally, immediately fulfilled its duty. Already on the second day of the insurrection it issued a leaflet calling upon the working population to organise help for the victims, to fight for the release of the prisoners, to give hospitality to the widows and orphans. During the insurrection and the days following 4,500 shillings were collected by the I.L.D. in Vienna alone and handed over to the victims. One hundred and twenty *Schutzbundlers* have joined the I.L.D. and are assisting in the work of collecting further money and distributing it among the families.

The solidarity campaign for the heroic workers of Austria has been launched and wonderful proofs of practical solidarity have been furnished, but the campaign must be increased and extended. The united solidarity front for the victims must be set up in every factory, on every building job, in every workers' residential quarter.

The courageous fighters in Vienna, Linz, Steyr, and St. Poelten not only defended their own lives, their own homes, the premises of their organisations; they stood in the fight against the fascist system, and have thereby given to the working class of the whole world a magnificent example of how, with the courage and contempt characteristic of their class, they must oppose the fascist provocateurs and murderers of the workers in their own countries. For this reason the Austrian fighters deserve the support of the working people of the whole world. Show by practical proletarian solidarity the fighting unity of the proletarians of all countries. Under the banner of the I.L.D. create a mass movement of united proletarian solidarity!

Groups of *Schutzbundlers* and Social Democratic Workers Join the C.P. of Austria

Vienna, March 7.

Social democratic workers and *Schutzbundlers* (members of the Republican Defence Force) continue to come over to the C.P. of Austria. Groups of *Schutzbundlers* in *Döbling* and *Alsergrund* in Vienna, numbering several hundred men, have joined in a body. Large groups of the disbanded social democratic youth organisations and cultural associations, the "nature lovers," etc., are also joining the C.P. with their functionaries, bringing with them their funds and equipment.

Germany

The Struggle in the German Protestant Church

By P. M. (Berlin)

At the turn of the year it looked as if the Nazi movement of the German Christians, which up to then had advanced from victory to victory on the way to the incorporation of the Protestant church, had suffered a first defeat. After the much-discussed demonstration in the Berlin Sports Palace, at which an appeal was made for the final storm against the "Jewish crucifix," the propagandists of the now openly unveiled Swastika religion suffered some remarkable reverses. A number of their confidential agents among the higher ecclesiastical functionaries, Bishop Hossenfelder for instance, were forced to resign. The oppositional Pastors' Emergency League was even able to venture to appeal in great public mass demonstrations, outside of the church, for a campaign of extermination against the German Christians. Rebellion against the emergency orders issued by Primate Mueller was openly preached from thousands of pulpits. Refusal of obedience was followed by an imperative demand for the abdication of this Hitlerite governor of the Protestant church. Hitler himself tried to act as intermediary, and gave an audience to Mueller's deadliest enemy, Pastor Bodelschwingh, who had first been elected primate, but was subsequently supplanted by Mueller. The incorporated press, which with its customary cowardice had served only the ends of the German Christians, now ventured to report that Hitler was in favour of neutrality, and was against the application of the apparatus of State force in a religious dispute. Rumours were already in circulation that Mueller would soon have to resign his office, and to retire to a sanatorium on account of a nervous affection.

Then came an abrupt change. Characteristically, this proceeded from none other than Goering, Hitler's secret competitor. At the end of January Goering issued sharp orders against the ecclesiastical circles supporting the Pastors' Emergency League. All the meetings of the opposition were prohibited. Clergymen who refused to abandon their opposition were threatened with internment in a concentration camp. The State Secret Police received orders to have notes taken of all sermons preached. The primate, suddenly recovering from his need of sanatorium treatment, and hurriedly retracing the few cautious steps he had already taken away from the German Christians, now adopted the pose of a dictator. Dismissals were rained down on the oppositional clergy. The Pastors' Emergency League was "voluntarily" disbanded. The last of those provincial bishops and other high ecclesiastical functionaries who were not Mueller's myrmidons were driven from their places, and replaced by German Christians.

After this general spring-cleaning, which lasted all February, the key-stone of the new structure was set in place. All that the Protestant church ever possessed in the way of parliamentary rights, enabling the various provincial churches or communities to vote on ecclesiastical affairs, has been drastically removed by the latest decrees of the primate. Where provincial churches have hitherto possessed a certain autonomy, this has now been shattered. The National Synod, in which the churches of all the provinces were represented and which was re-elected as late as last year under Hitler, has been dissolved by a stroke of the pen. Mueller has rid himself of this controlling body. This classic figure of a Nazi primate has now followed the example of his leader in appointing what may be termed an ecclesiastical Roehm. Bishop Oberheit has been appointed—chief of staff to the primate! This is his actual title. All this coincides with the completion of the absorption of the whole protestant youth movement in the Hitler Youth. This puts the finishing touch to the autocracy of the Hitler church on absolutely military lines.

The grotesque picture presented to-day by German protestantism in the church struggle would be incomplete without a reference to the Nordic faith movement under Count Reventlow, which is making remarkable progress at the present juncture. Reventlow does not want any firmly organised Hitler church, but rather a general Nordic swastika cult, which is to break down all old ecclesiastical barriers, and hence to penetrate circles hitherto possessing no contact with the church. In his opinion this is the best method of combating what the Nazis call "materialism."

These latest events from the seat of the ecclesiastical war show that the national socialists, even under the influence of this so-

called conflict of faiths, are breaking up into factions and disintegrating. The increasing acuteness of the conflict caused by Goering's deliberate stand against Hitler, who for his part is ready to enter into compromises with the ecclesiastical section of the Nazis; the German Christians, who lean for support on Goering's forceful decision; the Reventlow set, who are opposed to both Hitler and Goering—these in themselves represent three tendencies among the fascists. It may very easily happen that the struggle in the church, after a certain stage has been reached, will cause these three groups to play an important role among themselves in a political struggle for power.

The moment appears to be approaching when those anti-fascist trends existing among the proletarian and petty-bourgeois masses still attached to the church, and whose struggle for their faith is in reality, though perhaps still unconsciously, a cloak for their material wishes and disappointments, will find the religious outer husk broken, and the political core appearing. For this reason the reports coming from the scene of protestant ecclesiastical war, and showing developments in the anti-fascist struggle which must be guided into the channel leading to the overthrow of fascism, are not unimportant. At least they signalise the extent to which the general fermentation has advanced in the "Third Reich."

"Provision of Work" and the Misery of the Small Peasants in East Prussia

During the winter months the Nazi propagandists have had very little to say about the situation in East Prussia, the "model province" in which, allegedly, the "battle for work" was being so successfully waged. This silence is quite understandable. As the "provision of work" consisted almost entirely in forcibly sending town workers into the rural districts to work on the land, the reaction here has been stronger than in other districts. The following facts are taken from a report up to the end of the year, which reached us only after considerable delay.

Already in the autumn the discontent and resentment of the workers and small peasants, who are suffering under the compulsory measures introduced in connection with the "work provision" scheme, had assumed such proportions that it found expression in sharp oppositional feeling among the Storm Troops and in fierce conflicts among the bureaucrats. Thus it came to very serious differences between Herr Koch, the provincial governor of East Prussia, on the one hand, and Goering, Darré and Ley on the other. The whole of the Storm Troops were opposed to Koch, who only ventured to go about accompanied by a strong bodyguard of S.S. groups. In the meantime the conflict, which found expression in polemics by the Nazi press against the former (now incorporated) German nationalist press, has been settled. It appears that the ambitious Koch had large-scale plans for settling the unemployed on the land, but was expressly told by his Nazi colleagues that in no circumstances must he come into conflict with the big landowners.

As a matter of fact, the land settlement policy has yielded particularly miserable results this year. The "Koenigsberger Allgemeine" recently published a table, according to which the "East Prussian Land Company" has bought twelve estates, with a total area of 4,192 hectares, out of which 200 settlements are to be created. In the previous year, however, the number of settlements created annually was between seven and eight hundred!

The Schichau shipyard in Elbing plays a big role in connection with the work provision plans in East Prussia. It is announced that a whole number of orders have been placed with the Schichau undertaking as part of the work provision plan. As a matter of fact, however, these orders were placed already in December, 1932, since when hardly any orders have come in.

We had the opportunity of speaking to a former official employed by the shipyard, who is now working in a labour camp. Work camps, or "Kameradschafts lager," as they are called here, are somewhat different from the labour service camps. All the older, mostly married, unemployed who do not receive work otherwise through the work provision scheme, are sent to such "Kameradschaft lager." They are employed on lumber work, road building, land improvement, etc. The camps are scattered over the whole province. The person with whom I spoke was working in a camp situated in the forest in the Lyk district. The head forester derives personal advantage from the camp. First, he has some of the inmates of the camp to work on his farm.

Secondly, he supplies the camp with food grown on his own farm, and thereby makes very handsome profits by charging very high prices. For instance, he charges two marks a cental for potatoes, whereas the highest price he obtains elsewhere is one and a half marks per cental. The pay in this "Kameradschaft lager" is as follows: Single men receive 36 pfennigs an hour, which works out at 15 marks a week. From this amount is deducted 8.20 marks for food, taxes, and health insurance. Married men are paid 40 pfennigs an hour, and also receive an extra allowance of 3 marks a week. The wives of the camp inmates who remain at home with the children receive from the labour office an allowance of one and a half marks per person. That is to say, a woman with three children receives six marks. On the other hand, in most cases the women receive nothing from their husbands, whose earnings are expended on extra food, fares home (once a fortnight), tobacco, beer, etc. In addition, the married women are forbidden to earn anything themselves in order to augment the meagre family budget.

There is great discontent in the labour camps, especially among the married men. My acquaintance informed me that in two camps in the Lyk district, which he knows, all the men are secretly inclined to Communism, and this in spite of the fact that a great number of them are Storm Troopers. A short time ago the men in a camp who are employed by a firm of contractors on excavation work struck for two hours because the firm wanted to introduce piecework instead of paying by the hour. In another camp the staff were ordered during work time to attend a meeting at which an S.A. leader was to speak. They refused to do so, until the camp overseer had them all lined up and marched in fours to the meeting. The speaker endeavoured to fight against the hostile mood of the audience. He tried to explain that it was impossible to give better pay at the present time as the Nazi government could not build up in a short time that which had been destroyed in the course of fourteen years.

Great bitterness prevails among the small peasants on account of the winter relief. In the village of Skeskillen, in Moosbruch, the small peasants came together spontaneously and decided not to contribute anything to the winter relief. The same thing happened at a settlement on the outskirts of the town of Neuendorf, near Koenigsberg.

It is reported that in a peasant settlement near Koenigsberg several settlers abandoned their holdings and disappeared one night under cover of fog and darkness. I heard also from other places that the peasants say there is nothing left for them but to abandon their holdings, otherwise they must starve. They no longer receive any credits in order to purchase stock or implements. The moratoriums for agricultural debts, which were "to rescue the peasantry," have completely destroyed peasant credit.

Many people here fear that there will soon be a war. The ordinary simple folk will have nothing to do with war, and I have heard from various places that for this reason they voted "No" at the plebiscite on November 12. These are people who otherwise have never taken any interest in politics. A fairly prosperous merchant told me that all the retail traders here are compelled to engage five fresh assistants for every 100 already employed by them. The newly employed assistants, most of whom are somewhat old and therefore should be entitled to a higher rate of pay, are placed under the lowest-paid category. The employees are not satisfied with a salary of 100 marks a month, while the small shopkeepers, on the other hand, curse because they have to employ more hands while trade is declining.

Thus among all sections of the working population of East Prussia there is growing dissatisfaction with the national socialist dictatorship.

Open Letter of the C.C. of the Y.C.L. of Germany to Comrade Thaelmann

Dear Comrade Thaelmann,

To you, behind the prison bars of the blood-stained fascist dictatorship, the Young Communist League of Germany sends its message, a revolutionary **Red Front**.

When Hitler's Brown bands seized power in February and March, 1933, thanks to the base treachery of social democracy, the fascist myrmidons threw themselves with savage terrorism on the revolutionary workers and their vanguard, the Communist Party and its closest aid, the Y.C.L.G.

During those days, when the fascist mercenaries raided the

workers' quarters, shot down thousands of Communists and Young Communists, and flung tens of thousands into the concentration camps . . . during these days the social democratic leaders, Grzesinski and Braun, fled abroad, Wels and Leipart voted enthusiastically for Hitler, Stampfer and his kind became Hitler's propagandists, but you, Comrade Thaelmann, did not leave your responsible position for a moment. Under your Bolshevist leadership the Communist Party and the Y.C.L., forced into illegality, succeeded in standing up against the blows of blood-stained fascist terror.

Your steadfastness, your consistency, your Bolshevist determination, your courage, shown in their full greatness in these difficult hours have set us an example in our revolutionary struggle.

Hitler, Goering, Röhm, and other lackeys of the band of exploiters, headed by Krupp, Thyssen, Siemens, etc., have endeavoured, and continue to endeavour, to shatter and destroy the Communist Movement by terror and provocation. They have not succeeded in this, nor will they succeed. The Communist Party and the Young Communist League are there, they are fighting, they are broadening day by day the anti-fascist front of the toilers.

You more than anyone else, Comrade Thaelmann, have helped us in our work in the Young Communist League and in our struggle for the masses of toiling youth. Thanks to your Bolshevist ruthlessness and energy in the struggle for the line of the Comintern and the C.P.G., you led the German League in the struggle against opportunism, against the petty bourgeois anti-Party group of Remmele-Neumann. **You taught us how to form a correct Bolshevist estimate of the forces of the classes, and to apply as weapons in the revolutionary struggle the teachings of the great strategists of the revolution, Marx Engels, Lenin, Stalin.** You taught us that the Y.C.L. must not permit its weapon of self-criticism to rust, that it is in duty bound to employ this weapon for the improvement of its work, and for overcoming all weaknesses and shortcomings. Thanks to your Bolshevist training, to your daily help, the Y.C.L. has strengthened and consolidated its organisation, and thanks to unanimity in the struggle for the line of the Party, the Y.C.L. has proved capable, under the conditions imposed by illegality, of taking one of the foremost fighting positions in the struggle against Hitler fascism.

A few days ago the secretary of the C.C. of the C.P.G., one of your best and closest collaborators, **Comrade John Scheer**, and with him three active functionaries of the illegal Berlin organisation, were treacherously murdered by the fascist executioners. In profoundest sorrow we lower our flags before these murdered comrades, and pledge ourselves to intensify our struggle against the fascist dictatorship, against militarisation, against the new imperialist war being prepared by the fascists.

Comrade Thaelmann! We are faithful to your words: **"The Young Communists are to be trained for revolutionary soldiers' service, for the emancipation of toiling humanity."** These words show your great internationalist Bolshevist spirit. The great inheritance bequeathed by **Karl Liebknecht** is safe in your hands, and we promise you to educate thousands of young revolutionists in the spirit of revolutionary internationalism, against war and fascism, for the defence of the Soviet Union by means of the overthrow of the fascist regime. These young revolutionists will replace those comrades who fall into the hands of the fascist hangmen. We pledge ourselves to fight unwearingly for your liberation, and for the liberation of all political prisoners.

The 3rd of March was the anniversary of the day on which the fascists succeeded in capturing you and throwing you into prison. We were to be deprived of your help. But severe as the loss has been, still it has not meant the destruction of the spirit which you instilled into us, of your teachings of your Party and the Y.C.L. We assure you that we shall carry forward the struggle for winning over the majority of working youth with the utmost tenacity, and shall help to assemble our class on the basis of the revolutionary united front, in order that the struggle for power may be organised on the lines laid down by you.

We call upon the whole of the toiling youth of Germany to rally more closely than ever around the Communist Party and the Young Communist League. Everywhere in the works and factories, in the labour service camps, in the schools, we call upon youth to take up the active struggle against blood-stained fascism and all its measures. We call upon the Socialist Working Youth, the reformist youth, the youth of the Catholic organisations, the youth of the sports organisations, the young people forced to join the Hitler

youth, to oppose in an organised manner all fascist measures by strikes, by fighting demonstrations, by mass protest meetings.

We call upon working youth to develop a struggle on a broad scale for the release of the leader of the toilers of Germany, for the release of all the prisoners of fascism.

The heroic revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the Communist Parties of the Austrian and French proletariats against fascism give us, the working youth of Germany, fresh powers in combining our struggle for work, for bread, against military drill, against the compulsory incarceration of youth in the labour camps, against the compulsory exploitation of youth by the large land-owners, with the struggle for power, with the struggle for the armed overthrow of the fascist Hitler dictatorship and for the establishment of the Soviet Power.

We pledge ourselves to you, the steadfast leader and best teacher of the cause of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, that we shall fight on these lines!

Long live our leader, Comrade Thaelmann!

Down with blood-stained fascism!

Long live Soviet Germany!

Heroes of the Working Class

By D. Zaslavski

"Where did you live last and what was your occupation?" This is what the president of the court, an old official in uniform with gold braid and tsarist orders on his breast asked in a studied, dry and indifferent voice.

The person to whom this official question was addressed answered loudly and solemnly:—

"In general, I lived wherever the interests of the cause demanded and where I was instructed to live by the Executive Committee. I served the cause of the emancipation of the people. This is my sole occupation, which I will serve for many years with all my being."

These were the first words pronounced fifty-three years ago by the revolutionary **Andre Zelyabov** at the trial of the case of the "First-of-Marchites"—"Narodni Volzev" (the members of the **Narodni Volya Party** involved in the case), who executed Tsar Alexander II. Zelyabov was the hero of this famous trial. Before this trial he was known only in the limited circle of revolutionaries. The trial made his name famous far beyond the confines of Russia.

Not only Zelyabov's life in the underground work was heroic, but his fight at the trial was also heroic. Many revolutionaries before Zelyabov conducted themselves in a worthy manner at their trials and at the scaffold. But Zelyabov was the first to utilise the prisoners' dock as a tribune, raising the cause of the struggle for the revolution and for the liberation of the toilers to great heights of principle.

Zelyabov refused to have a lawyer at the trial. A liberal-bourgeois jurist in defending his person would have lowered his struggle. The presiding judge vainly interrupted Zelyabov, demanding that he defend himself, only himself, and not say anything about the Party or about the revolution. Zelyabov was unable to separate himself from the Party, or the Party from himself.

Zelyabov waged a struggle at the trial and did not hide his contempt of the court. Prosecutor **Muraviev**, the future tsarist minister, interrupted his own speech with the words: "... I was stopped for a moment here by Zelyabov's laughter, this gay or ironical laughter which did not leave him during the trial."

The sentence was decided in advance. Zelyabov knew that he would be hung. But up to the last moment he fearlessly laughed at his enemies.

Zelyabov was a bourgeois-democratic revolutionary. But the first generation of proletarian revolutionaries was brought up and trained according to the example of Zelyabov, Sophie Perovsky and Kibalchich. The theoretical side of the **Narodni Volya** very quickly became outworn and crumbled away under the blows of Marxism. But the heroic examples of the intrepid revolutionaries did not become tarnished for half a century. The party of proletarian revolutionaries, the future Bolshevik Party, was organised. Lenin dreamed of the Zelyabovites which "would come forward from among our revolutionaries."¹

Comrade **Dimitrov** is the Zelyabov of our day and of our time,

the Zelyabov of the revolutionary proletariat, the Zelyabov of the mass Communist Party.

To the presiding judge's question about his personal life and activity, Comrade **Dimitrov** answered:—

"I am a proletarian revolutionary. I am a member of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. I therefore belong to the leading Communists, and as such am prepared to bear full responsibility for all the decisions, all the documents and actions of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Communist International. But precisely for this reason, I must state that I am not a terroristic adventurist and not a putschist. I am an impassioned adherent of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The presiding judge interrupted Comrade **Dimitrov** at every step and demanded that he defend himself, only himself, and not the Communist Party and the Comintern. Comrade **Dimitrov** answered:—

"I already said before that I shall defend myself as a Communist and defend myself politically. In my opinion, Communism and the Communist International are not in need of my defence. However, it is important to explain that the Communist Party hasn't anything whatever to do with the fire."

Comrade **Dimitrov** refused to have a lawyer. The court palmed the most meddlesome fascist jurist on to him. Comrade **Dimitrov** smashed this attempt of the court to falsify the irconcilable principled position of the struggle for Communism. **Comrade Dimitrov acted in a Leninist manner.** In 1905, when the political trials in Russia assumed a mass character, Lenin proposed to make use of the court as a tribune and warned against liberal lawyers.

"Lawyers have to be firmly seized hold of—wrote Lenin—and besieged, because these intellectual swine often make a filthy mess. They have to be told in advance: 'If you, rascal, permit yourself even the slightest indecency or **political opportunism** (to speak about the lack of development, about the incorrectness of socialism, about exaggeration, about the **social democrats denying violence**, about the peaceful character of their doctrines and the movement, etc., or anything like that), then I, the accused, will turn around and publicly call you a rogue, stating that I reject such defence, etc.'"²

With Leninist determination, without being concerned about himself, Comrade **Dimitrov** destroyed the possibility for the fascist lawyer swine to "make a filthy mess" of his case.

And, finally, still another moment in the trial of 1933 recalls the trial of 1881. During the speech of Prosecutor **Werner**, Presiding Judge **Buenger** called Comrade **Dimitrov** to order, saying that he should not "smile ironically," as this showed "disrespect for the court."

But Comrade **Dimitrov** was not going to respect the court of the fascist officials. He got up and said:—

"Very much seems to be really funny to me."

But with these features the similarity between the historical Zelyabov, the hero of the democratic revolution, and Comrade **Dimitrov**, the hero of the socialist revolution of the proletariat, ends.

Zelyabov was a tragic figure in the history of the revolutionary movement. He was an isolated revolutionary. His example and his moral splendour inspired the generation which followed him. But he and his comrades waged a struggle as though in the wilderness. He felt his impotence. Terrorist acts were a means of concealing this powerlessness. He fought with poor weapons, precisely those weapons which the fascist reaction now uses against the working class.

Heroes of the working class, heroes of the proletarian revolution fight under different conditions, and the bourgeoisie gets neither solace nor peace even when it still succeeds for a time in pouring the blood of the workers upon the revolutionary flame. **The heroes of the working class are not isolated individuals.** They are surrounded by millions, and heroism itself has become a mass affair. Every one of Comrade **Dimitrov's** brave actions, every one of his fearless and proud words were caught up by the masses of

¹ Lenin: "What Is To Be Done."

² Letter to E. D. Stassova.

the workers all over the world. They awakened revolutionary enthusiasm, and hundreds of thousands of young proletarians say to themselves: "I want to be a revolutionary like Comrade Dimitrov!"

On the report of the trial of the revolutionaries, the "First of Marchites," the first of the proletarian fighters in Russia, learnt the revolutionary ethics. Zelyabov's example inspired Alexander Ulianov. The memory of his brother sharpened and forged the revolutionary passion of Vladimir Ulianov—Lenin.

The report of the trial of **Dimitrov, Popov, Tanev and Torgler** becomes a source of militant revolutionary inspiration for the new generations of proletarian revolutionaries. All those millions in the land of the Soviets who so passionately want to see Comrade Dimitrov, to hear him and be with him—all these are readers who from day to day experienced his indignation, his bitter hatred towards fascism and his love for the German Communists, his contempt for the court and the hangmen, and his irreconcilable struggle. And in the flames of the revolutionary fire which seized Austria, were there not sparks from Comrade Dimitrov's flaming speech at the trial?

The heroism of the working class in the struggle for socialism is inexhaustible. It takes on various forms. The heroes of the civil war are transformed into heroes of socialist construction. Seemingly everyday people doing routine Party work grow into figures who amaze the world with their revolutionary splendour, their proletarian courage. The enemies of the working class compelled Comrade Dimitrov to fight for Communism on the battlefield of the trial. Comrade Dimitrov fought on this field in the same way, with the same irreconcilability, with the same faithfulness to the Party, with the same high spirit with which everyone on his own sector, at his own post, conducts a similar struggle—thousands and hundreds of thousands of Communists who are often nameless and unseen.

And the enemies of the working class could not hide this from others nor from themselves. There are many Dimitrovs. The Dimitrovs are growing and millions want to be such revolutionaries as Dimitrov. The enemies of the working class know that Dimitrov is not an accident. He was educated in the Bolshevik-Leninist-Stalin school.

The movement which produces the Dimitrovs is invincible.

Great Britain

The London County Council Elections

By W. G. Shepherd (London)

The recent elections for the London County Council deserve the close attention and study of every revolutionary worker. The labour party has secured a crushing majority, and for the first time in history are confronted with the task of facing up to their election promises.

At the election meetings **Mr. Herbert Morrison**, leader of the labour party, was declaring "socialist Vienna has gone. Let us replace it by a socialist London." According to the rules of bourgeois democracy, Mr. Morrison's party is in power.

The crushing defeat of the **municipal reformers** is a reflection of the deep hatred that is felt by the mass of the workers against the national government in Britain. It was to be expected that they would be defeated. For twenty-seven years these Tories, open unashamed supporters and servants of capitalism, have ruled the County Council, making London a paradise and a gold mine for the rich, but a city of the Means Test, bad housing, overcrowding and slums. Their record since the last election in 1931 is a particularly damning one.

They cut the wages of the L.C.C.'s 86,000 employees by 10 per cent. They have administered the Means Test so ruthlessly that no fewer than 205,092 unemployed workers were cut off transitional benefit, and reduced the meagre grants from the Public Assistance Committees of no less than 227,745.

Under Tory rule 33 per cent. of new applicants under the infamous Means Test get nothing at all, and in revision cases 13 per cent. are struck off, 22 per cent. get their allowance reduced, making a total of 68 per cent. of those applying for relief and benefit being cut off or getting their benefits reduced. To complete the picture of their record with regard to the unemployed it is only necessary to add that since 1930 the maximum allowances for adults have been reduced from 6s. 10½d. to 6s. a week.

On housing, the record of the Tories is no less damning. There are, after 27 years of Tory rule, 100,000 persons living in 30,000 basement dwellings, and it is estimated that at the present time there is a deficiency of over half a million dwellings in London. Education, health and other social services have suffered to the same extent at the hands of the municipal reformers. Right and left they have robbed the working class in the interests of capitalism.

The savage attacks on the unemployed, the failure to tackle the housing problem, the cuts in social services, served to rouse the working class to such hatred against the Tories, the like of which has not been expressed so sharply in any previous L.C.C. elections. The highest stage of this opposition during the election campaign was reached at the municipal reformers' meetings at **Camberwell**. Here the Tory speakers went to the extraordinary length of placing **barbed wire** on the front of the platform. This only served to rouse the workers' hatred to a higher pitch. At packed meetings the Tory speakers were shouted down and the meetings broken up by the workers present.

Throughout London the Tory candidates and speakers were subjected to constant interruptions at their meetings. In such a situation the **labour party** did not fail to make great play with the record of the municipal reformers and presented themselves as the "saviours" of the working class. Concentrating its main attention on unemployment and housing, the labour party carried through one of the most intensive campaigns in its history.

In all the constituencies it pumped out leaflets, damning the record of the Tories, but carefully avoiding to state labour's programme in concrete terms. "For Humanity in Public Assistance," "Up with the Houses, Down with the Slums," were the two main slogans used by the reformists.

A close analysis of the election appeals of both the Tories and the labour party revealed that on essentials the two parties of capitalism showed very little difference. An example of this can be seen from the election addresses of the municipal reform and labour candidates in **North St. Pancras**.

On the question of Public Assistance the municipal reformers declared:—

"We believe in humane and efficient administration of Public Assistance; each case being determined with sympathy and humanity and according to its needs."

In their election leaflet, dealing with the same question, the labour candidates stated:—

"Labour would administer Public Assistance with sympathy and public spirit, without waste, but with humanity."

Here the reformists are shown in their true colours. Their line on Public Assistance follows through the support for the Means Test—support which has never been repudiated by **Lansbury**, leader of the labour party, who in November, 1931, declared:—

"I am not prepared to give any able-bodied people money year after year without knowing what their position is. If a person has gone out of ordinary benefit and has means to maintain himself, I am not prepared to pay them State money."

It was only the **Communist** candidates in the elections, with eighteen candidates in nine areas, who exposed both the municipal reformers and the labour party as parties of capitalism. The Communist Party stood solidly behind the development of the mass struggle, as exemplified in the great Hunger March against capitalism and the national government. In its propaganda and appeals to London workers it exposed the reformists' policy of refusing to help develop the struggle of the workers against the Hunger and War policy of the national government. The Communist candidates advanced the following programme of immediate demands:—

The abolition of the Means Test; the restoration of the economy cuts; the smashing of the new Unemployment Bill; the reduction of rents in Council houses by 25 per cent.; the building of 250,000 working-class dwellings at rents which workers can pay; and a big increase in expenditure in health and education.

In presenting these demands the Communists showed that they could only be won by the development and strengthening of the mass struggle as a step forward in the struggle for Soviet Power.

The propaganda and agitation of the Communist candidates reached a large number of workers, and the experience gained from all areas confirmed the fact that there was greater interest

and sympathy for the Communist programme than had ever been expressed before. **But this was not shown in the number of votes cast for the revolutionary candidates.**

In the nine areas contested 8,769 votes were cast for the eighteen C.P. candidates, and, whilst this registered an advance on the results of the 1931 election, the voting shows the utmost importance of an intensification of revolutionary mass work.

The election of the labour majority emphasises the fact that the workers, although moving to the "Left," are still under the influence of parliamentary illusions. That the labour party is able to canalise the growing hatred of the workers against the national government behind it is due to the fact that the C.P. has not yet been able to sufficiently stand out in the eyes of the workers as the only revolutionary working-class leadership which is waging the fight on behalf of the working class. The election of a labour majority provides a golden opportunity for this. The reformists can only follow the path of administering in the interests of capitalism, as Mr. Morrison made clear in an after-the-election speech. He declared:—

"The labour majority will exercise its power cleanly, free from improper influences, with determination, and with a sense of public responsibility."

Commenting on this "**The Times**," in a leading article on March 10, significantly remarks:—

"That declaration can only mean that any recrudescence of 'Poplarism' on a wider scale is ruled out."

It is already clear that the whole line of the labour party will now be to explain that the workers "mustn't expect too much," that "the muddle left by the other side will have to be cleared up." There will be the same excuses as presented to the Glasgow workers by the labour City Council there.

The London workers must reply to such arguments as the Glasgow workers did, by organising mass agitation and demonstrations to struggle for their demands. The struggle for the abolition of the Means Test, more houses and lower rents will have to be relentlessly waged against the labour majority on the L.C.C.

Solidarity of the English and German Workers Against the Anti-Soviet Alliance of MacDonal and Hitler

By Wilhelm Koenen

Hitler's frantic efforts to achieve some small foreign-political successes with the various adjoining countries are plain to everybody. In view of the extraordinarily acute and strained situation at home he needs certain foreign-political successes, for which he therefore even makes concessions such as none of his predecessors would have ventured to make. These foreign-political concessions to Italy, France, Belgium and especially Poland, are compromising the Hitler regime in the eyes of the masses in Germany to an ever increasing extent.

This foreign-political activity of Hitler is only a preparation for the great blow, the fight against the Bolsheviks, the war against the Soviet Union, for which he is hoping and longing. There is not the least doubt that Hitler's chief activity in the sphere of foreign politics since the commencement of the present year has been the negotiations which have been carried on without interruption with the imperialist government of Ramsay MacDonald. For Hitler the most important thing is to get permission to continue and increase the insane armaments so as to set up and equip the armies, numbering millions, which are needed in order to be able, on behalf of English imperialism, to march against the hated Soviet Union. After the recognition of equality in armaments for Hitler Germany by the British Foreign Minister, Sir John Simon, at the beginning of January, the arming of Hitler's Germany has now been further sanctioned as a result of Mr. Eden's conversations in Berlin. Hitler is prepared to grant any concession in return for the backing of England.

The first steps to a serious international fraternisation of the workers in the largest London enterprises with the workers of the largest undertakings in Hitler Germany must be regarded in the light of this fraternisation of English imperialism with blood-stained Hitler fascism and the large-scale anti-Soviet incitement.

Thanks to the initiative of the *World Committee for Combatting War and Fascism*, and with the aid of oppositional trade union functionaries in England, some results have been achieved

in this sphere which, in view of the present world situation, must be extended and supported with the greatest energy.

As a result of the initiative of a group of anti-fascist printers, the World Committee received from London the proposal to establish connection between the Ullstein Publishing Company of Berlin and the staff of Odham's Press, Ltd. Odham's is one of the largest printing works in the world, where the "Daily Herald" and many other English newspapers are printed. It has now been possible to bring about such a connection through the mediation of the Opposition in the Ullstein works in Berlin. A first brief description of the conditions of work in the Ullstein Publishing House under the present regime concludes with the following extremely interesting paragraph:—

"This Ullstein concern, which though it is not a direct supplier of war material nevertheless plays an exceedingly important role in the ideological preparation of war, is of greatest importance for our tasks. We welcome your plan to take over the patronage of it and propose that you send material to certain addresses which we shall be glad to give to you, which material will certainly be forwarded on. This report of conditions here may well be a first step towards closer contact."

The Odhams workers received the report from the Ullstein staff with the greatest enthusiasm. They have had the report duplicated and distributed in the works. Their reply to their Ullstein colleagues will be sent shortly.

The World Committee, in its patronage correspondence, has received among other communications a letter from the metal workers of the A.E.G. London with instructions to forward it on to the A.E.G. staff in Berlin. This letter witnesses to the desire of the English workers for the united front, and is remarkable on account of the various questions it asks. The following is an extract from this letter:—

"We metal workers in Great Britain, members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union . . . are stirred by the behaviour of Dimitrov, this sincere champion of the international working class, and his three comrades.

"We hope very much that you will receive our letter without incurring inconvenience and that it will be possible for you to correspond with us regularly in order that we shall be able to help you as far as possible in your hard fight.

"The chief points which we wish to know in order that we can show to the other workers in our works how great is the devastation caused by fascism, and to draw them into the broad anti-fascist fight are:—

"(1) How are the families of the men in concentration camps or in preventive arrest provided for? Do they receive relief, are they maintained by their relatives, or must they starve?

"(2) Have a considerable number of men been released from the concentration camps? If so, under what conditions?

"(3) How many concentration camps are there and how many persons are interned in them?

"(4) What are the working conditions in the works and factories? Are they worse than before the fascist "revolution"?

"(5) Have conditions generally become better or worse?

"(6) How strong is the resistance to fascism in your country?

"(7) Are the trade unions completely dead or do they still exist, hidden?

"(8) What political section is conducting the fight against fascism to-day? . . .

"Yours fraternally"

(Signatures follow: a member of the Labour Party, the Labour Party League of Youth, a non-party worker and a member of the Young Communist League respectively.)

Various other letters which have been received, for instance from the Ford workers in Dagenham, the London busmen, as well as miners and railway workers and the staff of the Siemens Works in Greenwich, are a further proof of this serious solidarity campaign.

The questions asked in the letter from the A.E.G. workers are a plain proof of how greatly the English workers are desirous of engaging in a common fight. These workers stand for international solidarity. To realise this solidarity in actual practice—that is the

most important thing at the present time in view of the threatening outbreak of war. To keep a watch over the production of war material and also to prevent its transportation, is another task confronting the masses as part of the solidarity campaign. All the staffs which we bring into contact with the staffs in Hitler Germany for the purpose of active solidarity and which take up the fight against the English bourgeoisie and against the production of war material, are shock troops in the fight against chauvinism and war.

India

Whither Nehru?

Mr. Nehru has recently published a long article "Whither India." Here, and in a number of other articles, he developed his ideas about the present situation in the country and the tasks confronting the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru developed an energetic tirade in favour of socialism and even Communism (?), and so on and so forth. One might even get a suspicion that there is a turn, a change in the policy of Mr. Nehru, a turn towards revolutionary ideas and revolutionary methods of struggle. However, Mr. Nehru repudiates such thoughts or suspicions and hastily declares: "Personally I am not conscious of any glaring inconsistencies in my ideas or activities during the last thirteen years." (*Bombay Chronicle*, 21/11/33.) Mr. Nehru is correct. He has not changed his policy. **But what kind of policy and activities? What kind of a political line has Mr. Nehru carried out?**

Mr. Nehru now says everywhere that he stands for socialism and independence. That is his credo he says, but as a matter of fact Mr. Nehru fights neither for independence, nor for socialism. The truth of the matter is that **Mr. Nehru disorganises both the struggle for independence and the efforts to build a Communist Party which would be able to organise and prepare a revolutionary camp to fight for independence, land and power and clear the way to carry out the further battle for socialism.**

Mr. Nehru's policy, as a matter of fact, is directed against the independence of the country and against socialism. This is not accidental. This is an expression of the nature of bourgeois-national-reformist camp, of which Mr. Nehru is one of the main "Left" leaders. This opinion is based on facts and we will briefly touch on some of them. Mr. Nehru says he is for independence and socialism; let us see the correct facts.

Does Mr. Nehru Fight for Independence?

One of the main principles of Gandhist treacherous policy is propagation of non-violence. The propaganda of non-violence carried out by the Congress leaders and liberals and supported by British imperialism represents the beastly fear possessing the exploiting classes before the people's revolution. It is aimed at disarming the toiling masses and preserving the slavish, submissive mentality among those sections of the down-trodden masses who were brought up and live under the terror of feudal landlords, caste regulations, police terror, etc., who were brought up in the spirit of subjugation, poverty, submissiveness, passive acceptance of their fate (which religion teaches them, too), lack of understanding of their own class interests, etc., etc., who suffer from imperialist and feudal-moneylending exploitation. The bourgeoisie, headed by Gandhism is doing its best to exploit such slavish mentality and covering it up with phrases about ideals of humanity, etc., demands of the toiling masses that they give up the idea of revolutionary struggle for independence, give up the idea and preparations for agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

This is the strategy of the bourgeoisie, and it was not an accident that the "*Bombay Chronicle*" published everyday on its front page (beginning from 1930) in big letters: "Non-violence is our sheet anchor."

The bourgeoisie made frantic efforts to instil into the minds of the toiling masses this spirit of defeat and submissiveness, especially because, as a result of growing revolutionary movement, the experiences gained during the last decades and the examples of Soviet Union and China, the slave psychology and submissiveness were fast disappearing and the influence of Congress bourgeoisie weakening. It is sufficient to cast a glance at all the peasant risings of the last few years (Kashmir, Burma, Alwar, etc.).

Propaganda of non-violence, coupled with an appeal to preserve the united national front and submit to the leadership of the Congress bourgeoisie, remained as the chief anti-revolutionary weapon

of Indian reformism and served the interests of British imperialism as well.

Mr. Nehru strongly recommends support of non-violence and passive resistance as the main dynamic forms of struggle. "Personally," says he, "I accepted the non-violent method because not only did it appeal to me in theory but it seemed to be peculiarly suited to present conditions in India. . . . I believe that for a long time to come our most effective methods must be non-violent." (*"Bombay Chronicle,"* 21/11/33.)

Mr. Nehru accepts non-violence in theory and in practice. **This is sufficient for us to state that Mr. Nehru is a reformist and does not stand for independence.** It will be of no use for Mr. Nehru to shift the blame onto the toiling masses and justify himself by referring to peculiar conditions. Peculiar conditions in India demand exactly the opposite, they demand sharpest struggle against the theory of non-violence so that everybody in the country should know that it represents the interests of exploiting classes and is directed against the independence of the country.

There is another theory of Mr. Nehru which shows that he is against the independence of the country. And it is the following: Mr. Nehru continues to claim that Gandhism represents a revolutionary force. In spite of the fact that many Congressmen, and even such as Mr. Bose, have been compelled to admit the bankruptcy of Gandhism and the treacherous role it played, **Mr. Nehru defends Gandhi and Gandhism.** This is one of the fundamental questions that divides a revolutionary camp from a reformist one. In a letter published in the "*Manchester Guardian*" (11/12/33), Mr. Nehru declares: "But the awakening that Gandhi brought about was definitely a political awakening of the masses . . . **the programme of open and defiant action that Gandhi put forward worked an amazing change in the masses.**"

According to Mr. Nehru, Gandhi is a revolutionary leader who has awakened the masses from their slumber to a political life by putting forward a programme of direct actions. This statement of Mr. Nehru does not correspond to the facts. The true position was totally different. The toiling masses, because of their sufferings from feudalists, moneylenders, imperialists, and under the influence of Russian October Revolution and the experiences gained during the war and shattering of the capitalist system—under the influence of all that, the toiling masses woke from their slumber and a revolutionary mass movement developed. The masses became active and demanded relief, demanded struggle against oppressors. At the same time, the Indian bourgeoisie, which demanded from British imperialism some reforms and economic concessions, came forward in the role of opposition, took the leadership over the toiling masses and did its best to press the imperialists for a compromise and to stop and disorganise the mass movement for independence, which, as the Mopla rebellion and the Bombay disturbances show, assumed a revolutionary character and has been developing new, higher forms of struggle.

This was the essence of the situation in 1919-22. **The Congress leadership, headed by Gandhi, did its best to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses.** This fact Mr. Gandhi admits himself. Let us take the letter addressed by Gandhi to the Viceroy regarding the inauguration of non-co-operation:—

"I venture to claim that I have succeeded by patient reasoning in winning the party of violence from its ways. . . . I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent eruption if the people had not had presented to them a **form of direct action**, involving considerable sacrifice. . . . Non-co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. . . . At the same time I admit that non-co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. . . . Not to run some risks now will be to court much greater risks if **not virtual destruction of law and order.** . . . I hope that your Excellency will give those who have accepted my advice and myself the credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty." (Speeches and writing of Gandhi, "*Young India*," 1919-1922, page 200.)

This statement of Gandhi very clearly shows that he tried to find a form of direct action to prevent a revolution directed against imperialist law and order. Mr. Gandhi begs the Viceroy to recognise his service to British imperialism. This is the essence of Gandhism, which represents the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. This treacherous statement of Gandhi must be widely circulated. It must be explained to the toiling masses that from the beginning till now, including participation in the Round

Table Conference, assistance to collect taxes in U.P., etc., etc.—Gandhism carried on a struggle against the independence and agrarian movement and did his best to keep the present system of imperialist and feudalist exploitation intact.

Mr. Nehru supports and defends Gandhism, his past and present. He does it because he is not a socialist, not a Communist; he was and remains a "Left" Gandhist; he does not fight for independence. On the contrary, Nehru and his ideas represent one of the most harmful obstacles on the road to independence.

To expose his ideas, to annihilate the influence of "Left" Gandhi-ites will help very much to strengthen the revolutionary camp, to put an end to the existing confusion among the toiling masses and revolutionary elements of the petty bourgeoisie, will make it possible to attract them to the side of the revolutionary camp.

The anti-revolutionary character of the policy of "Left" Gandhi-ites, who falsely describe themselves as socialists and Communists, can be seen from their activities as well. Mr. Nehru supported Gandhism during 1921-1922. He participated in the preparation of the Nehru Constitution, although he did not sign it. There was a division of labour between son and father. Motilal Nehru prepared and signed the draft of the slave constitution, which accepted limited dominion status as its goal and preserved all titles, property, i.e., preservation of landlordism, etc. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru participated in the preparation of the constitution and agreed to preserve all titles of property, agreed to vote for the communal electoral system. He disagreed with dominion status and together with Bose, who signed the constitution, formed the League of Independence. He declared himself a socialist, etc. However, the League has done nothing, and in 1929-30 was quietly buried and Mr. Nehru was elected to a high position in the leadership of the National Congress. He started, together with Gandhi, with the Lahore Independence resolution and soon after supported Gandhi's eleven points of surrender, eleven points which represented the interests of capitalists and landlords. When the British imperialists refused to accept them, Mr. Nehru supported Gandhi's salt march, the purpose of which was again to provide an outlet for mass energy and disorganise the mass revolutionary struggle (Gandhi stated himself: If we don't start, the forces of violence will get the upper hand and it will be too late), Mr. Nehru refused the offer of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party to give support to the G.I.P. railway strike and help to convert it into a general strike, which would have immensely developed the revolutionary offensive of the toiling masses. Instead of that, he endorsed Gandhi's trip to London, to the Round Table Conference, etc., and he now covers up the bankruptcy of Gandhism with phrases about socialism and does his best to preserve bourgeois Congress leadership over the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru becomes indignant when Communists begin to criticise the Congress policy and the Congress leadership. "The Congress," declares Nehru, "has been far the most militant organisation in India during recent years. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous for people who do nothing effective themselves to accuse the Congress of lack of militancy." (The "Indian Labour Journal," 12/11/1933.)

Mr. Nehru confuses the bourgeois Congress leadership and the wide masses who followed it. The toiling masses are militant. The National Congress, headed by Gandhi, Nehru, etc., did their best to disorganise the struggle of the toiling masses. Even Bose admitted this in his recent address to the Indian political conference in London. Will Mr. Nehru, who claims to be a socialist, kindly explain how the masses could influence the National Congress with its system of appointed Congress dictators, with no functioning rank and file membership, etc.?

Mr. Nehru continually calls for the cessation of criticism of the Congress. But this is in vain, because the very interests of the struggle for independence depend upon the clear exposure of the treacherous essence of the Congress policy. The victory of the struggle for independence demands the formation of the Communist Party, clear-cut demarcation between the forces of revolution (i.e., working class and peasantry and town poor) and reformism (bourgeoisie, liberal landlordism, upper strata of petty bourgeoisie), annihilation of the Congress reformist influence among the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru is afraid of this. He is afraid because he represents the interests of the reformist camp and does not fight for independence.

That is Mr. Nehru's actual position regarding independence. Let us now consider his views on socialism.

Does Mr. Nehru Stand for Socialism?

Mr. Nehru does not stand for socialism, and it is easy to prove this. In addition to his reformist, bourgeois policy on the question of independence, non-violence, etc., Mr. Nehru himself states that his Communism has nothing in common with proletarian Marxian Communism. "I do not approve," says Nehru, "of many things that have taken place in Russia, nor am I a Communist in the accepted sense of the word. . . . I have a weakness for Oxford and what it stands, if something like it, only with a broader base, could be retained, well and good." ("Manchester Guardian," December 11, 1933). It is clear that **Nehru's Communism is nothing else but Oxford liberalism.**

Nobody needs to take Mr. Nehru's declarations about socialism seriously and no one demands it from Nehru. However, it would be interesting to know what exactly Nehru disapproves of in Russia and China. Mr. Nehru declares he disapproves of the Communist methods applied in Russia and China. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Nehru wants socialism and independence **without** a revolution. He is ready to swear for workers and peasants, etc., etc. But no revolution. One of the defenders of capitalism wrote in the "People" (Lahore, October 23, 1933) about the Communist creed of Nehru: "This reflects a peculiar mass-psychology, demonstrating that the method more than the creed is often the cause of strife. If the creed is a good creed and the method adopted innocent, even those who have to suffer not only sympathise with it but often work hand in hand to achieve the object. . . . Gandhi, therefore, rightly stressed in his letter to Panditji the importance of methods."

The landlords and capitalists tell Nehru: please speak as much as you want (but please vaguely) about socialism, **but** do recommend innocent methods, i.e., be against anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, stand for non-violence and prevent the formation of the Communist Party. And Mr. Nehru carried these instructions out faithfully.

To prove that Nehru is not a socialist is not a difficult job, it is sufficient to know some elementary things about socialism. Revolutionary socialism, based on the class struggle, represents the theory of the working class and includes as one of its main points the acceptance of the hegemony of the working class, not only in the struggle for socialism but for independence and destruction of landlordism as well. According to it the leadership of the working class, expressed through the Communist Party, is able to organise the scattered masses of the peasantry and destroy the imperialist-feudalist yoke. The working class, according to the socialist theory, will then carry the fight further to destroy the capitalist system and replace it by a socialist system. For that purpose the Communists must fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary prerequisite for establishing the socialist society. Now this theory and the methods advanced have been tried in the Soviet Union and in China, and proved successful. In China the Kuomintang carried out the policy propagated by Nehru, with what results are known; the counter-revolutionary betrayal of the people and the dismemberment of China.

The only force which proved capable of defending the country was the Chinese Red Army and the Soviets. Now Mr. Nehru is against socialism as preached by the working class throughout the world, he is against the Communist methods, he is in favour of **innocent** methods preached by Gandhi. What has Mr. Nehru's pseudo-socialism in common with the proletarian socialism of the Communists? Nothing at all. That is why we are justified in saying that Mr. Nehru's socialism is reformist Gandhism, covered up with some "socialist" phrases to fool and demoralise the toiling masses. The Communists do not demand of Nehru that he be a socialist. Mr. Nehru admits that the imperialist yoke is the basic reason of poverty of the people, he admits that landlordism, feudals (princes, etc.) are parasites, who blocked the development of the productive forces. Mr. Nehru speaks against Communalism, emphasising that it is abused and represents the interests of the reactionary feudal groups, etc., etc. If he admits all that, let him fight to destroy it, this is what one would expect from a representative of a true nationalism, but instead of this Mr. Nehru betrays the struggle for these tasks. He has proved unable to carry out the revolutionary struggle for bourgeois tasks, the tasks which are essential even for capitalist development. **Mr. Nehru stands by Gandhism and betrays the struggle for independence.** It is not accidental, it is the result of the whole position and role of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is incapable of carrying on a revolutionary

struggle against the imperialists, it is a reformist force, it strives for compromise with imperialism, because it is afraid of the people's revolution. The dangerous and harmful role played by the "Left" congressites is that they cover up this treachery of bourgeois nationalism by "revolutionary" phrases and they still succeed to fool considerable sections of the toiling masses.

In the present epoch, when socialist ideas are winning everywhere, when the bankrupt bourgeoisie is trying to find salvation in fascism, every national reformist group in India tries to cover itself with a socialist garb.

Everybody—Mehta, Gandhi, Giri, Ruikar, Kandalkar, etc.—every reformist, uses socialist phrases. It is the garb which they are putting on to fool the masses.

Mr. Nehru has explained himself clear enough. "Nationalism," says he, "to an ever-increasing extent, and everywhere, is appearing in a socialist garb. . . ." Explaining further the growing class conflicts in the country, Mr. Nehru continues: "We cannot escape having to answer the question, **now or later**, for the freedom of which class or classes in India are we specially striving?"

For a time, he says, we tried to avoid giving an answer "on the ground that the national issue must be settled first," but now we, "as men of action," must "fashion our idea of freedom accordingly." ("Whither India," "**Bombay Chronicle**.") The reasoning is clear. At first we came forward with an appeal for a united national front and kept socialism, i.e., class struggle out; we appealed to capitalists and workers, landlords and peasants, princes and subjects, etc., to stand together and live peacefully. We did for a time. But now a change is taking place. People have followed our instructions for many years and now they see there is no such a thing as this united national front, that in practice the landlords and princes and also capitalists do not fight for independence. Workers and peasants began now to revolt. They said you fight neither for independence nor for the workers' and peasants' interests. They also said: We must destroy landlordism because it not only exploits us but even supports the imperialists.

The people began to see the game of the exploiters and congress leaders who represent them and **the illusions of the united national front** began to evaporate. Mr. Nehru sees that, and that is why he says, as a practical politician, he must "fashion the idea accordingly"—and hence his strenuous efforts to don a socialist garb. Mr. Nehru is ready to give concessions to the peasantry, even part of the land of the landlords, and so on. But he is against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Although he sees the changes in the relationship of the class forces, he hopes to preserve the leadership of the bourgeoisie, he does his best to preserve the influence of the bourgeois national congress. That is the origin of his socialist garb. But now it is too late. The workers have learnt a lot. Nobody will fool them with a "socialist garb" only, the workers will form the Communist Party to fight for independence and for true socialism, as it is built in the Soviet Union, as well.

Mr. Nehru represents the interests of the most far-sighted sections of the industrial bourgeoisie, who understand that the home market cannot be developed unless the feudal system is abolished. They also understand that petty concessions will not help much, but at the same time they see that the only force capable of changing the present conditions is the toiling masses, and that the revolution is the only way. But they are still more afraid of the people's revolution. They do their best to avert the revolution and preserve the leadership over the toiling masses. That is why they try their best to prevent formation of the Communist Party. Without it they believe it will be possible to avoid a revolution and sometime later achieve some more tangible results.

Mr. Nehru represents the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie and those upper strata of the petty bourgeois and bourgeois intelligentsia which are connected with the bourgeoisie. It is here that the understanding between Nehru and the Roy-Karnik group comes to the front. The peculiar task of the Karnik-Roy-Kandalkar group is to preserve the influence of the bourgeoisie among the workers and prevent the formation of the Communist Party which would be able to fight for the leadership of the toiling masses, and prepare and lead them for anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

How, According to Mr. Nehru, the Working Class Should Behave Itself

According to Mr. Nehru's idea, the struggle for independence is separate from the struggle against landlordism and the unbearable exploitation of the workers. Mr. Nehru further divides the func-

tions, the bourgeoisie (or, as he says, nationalism) will carry on political struggles, while the working class should limit itself to economic struggles, "should organise itself in the trade unions and the like quite separately," and should follow the leadership of the Congress bourgeoisie or, as he puts it, "have co-operation in militant activity."

These ideas of Nehru have as their aim to disarm the revolutionary movement and keep the leadership of the reformist bourgeoisie over the masses.

First of all, is it correct to say that the struggle for independence is represented by the bourgeoisie and that bourgeois nationalism represents a revolutionary force? Is it correct to say that "the National Congress is, as its name implies, a national organisation, whose purpose is national freedom for India," that "it includes many classes and groups which have really conflicting social interests, but that the common national platform keeps them together" (Nehru)? No, it is not correct to say that.

There are two kinds of nationalisms. There is bourgeois nationalism, represented by the Congress leadership, which expresses the reformism, the cowardness, the reactionary character of the bourgeoisie and liberal landlords. But there is a revolutionary nationalism of the peasantry and considerable sections of the petty bourgeoisie which is ready to carry on revolutionary struggle for independence. The working class is ready to support the revolutionary nationalism and lead the forces of it towards the anti-imperialist revolution. The revolutionary peasantry is ready to carry on the struggle not only for independence, but for destruction of feudal-money-lending exploitation as well.

Mr. Nehru confuses bourgeois nationalism with revolutionary nationalism. He mixes various conflicting classes and conflicting programmes. Mr. Nehru is sadly mistaken if he believes that it will be possible to unite reformists and revolutionaries on a "common national platform." It is true the Congress bourgeoisie succeeded for many years in fooling the people and disorganising the revolutionary struggle under the banner of a common, united national front and common platform of all classes. It meant that it succeeded in subordinating the working class and peasantry to its control. **But now the situation is changing.** The working class understands that this common platform meant reformism and subjugation to bourgeois leadership. The illusions of the united front with bourgeois nationalism are fast disappearing. The working class evolves as a separate class force, as an independent class force. Conditions have been created for rapid formation of the Communist Party and successful fight of the working class for the hegemony in the mass movement.

Mr. Nehru will not be able to prevent this process of class differentiation by his agitation for a common united front with the bourgeoisie. It was tried for many years and it proved its anti-revolutionary character, it proved its bankruptcy.

But that is not all. The history of the revolutionary movement in India has proved that the working class is the most consistent anti-imperialist force. The brunt of the street battles in the cities of India was borne by the working class. The British imperialists directed its heaviest blows against the proletariat. The Meerut trial is a classic example of this. The history of the revolutionary movement in India clearly shows that the independence of India will be attained only when the working class, headed by a Communist Party, takes the lead, organises the scattered masses of the peasantry, exposes the national-reformists and thus delivers a mighty blow to imperialist oppression. This is what happened in former Russia, it is taking place in China. In China the "Left" Kuomintang talked about socialism, democracy, etc., it agitated for a common national front with the bourgeoisie when it became anti-revolutionary, etc., etc., and it betrayed the struggle for independence. Wang Chin-Wei, the former leader of the "Left" Kuomintang, is the chief helper of the bloody watch-dog of imperialism, Chiang-Kai-shek.

The working class of India will never accept the counter-revolutionary theory of Nehru that the working class should subordinate itself to the National Congress and limit its work and organisations to trade unions only, nor will it accept the counter-revolutionary theory of Roy-Karnik-Kandalkar group that the working class cannot grasp big political issues such as independence, and therefore should limit itself to partial struggles only and follow the National Congress or a new party of radicals which the Karnik group proposes to build.

Both of these theories of Nehru and Karnik are practically the

same, and aim at keeping the proletariat as a submissive appendage of bourgeois nationalism, an appendage which should be a Left-wing of the bourgeois camp and exert pressure through "Left" congressites. It is very clear why Mr. Nehru, in the same article (published in "The Indian Labour Journal," November 12, 1933), declares:—

"I am not in theory against a Labour Political Party apart from the Congress, but I fear that any attempt to make such a party to-day will be utilised against the workers," i.e., Mr. Nehru is not in favour of the formation of a political party of the working class. He goes still further and gives advice to the Congress to take the initiative in forming trade unions, etc., to develop a militant programme "even in advance of Congress programme," etc., i.e., to promise everything but keep control of the labour movement in the hands of the Congress bourgeoisie.

That is how the Communism of Mr. Nehru looks in practice. He is ready to vote for a limited Communism (!), but he is dead against the Communist Party.

The bourgeois class nature of the "Left" congressites is made clear. The bourgeoisie and the imperialists understand very well that nothing comes by itself.

The Bolshevik Marxian theory makes it clear that Communists do not believe in sheer spontaneity. Marx in his time said the former philosophers tried to explain the world, but it is time to change the world. The essential point of Bolshevism is that there cannot be a true Communist policy if it does not include organisational measures to put this policy into effect. The working class has only one weapon, and this weapon is the organisation. The working class can take the leadership of the masses and mobilise them for the revolution if its vanguard is organised, if a Communist Party is built. The Communists when they see and decide on strike action, or non-payment campaign, a general strike, etc., must immediately take steps to organise it. **This is an essential part of Bolshevism.** And the most important part of this organisation, the most important prerequisite to materialise the Communist policy, to carry out everyday struggle, to prepare and lead the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution is the formation of the Communist Party.

Without it any talk about socialism, independence, etc., becomes sheer deception of the toiling masses. And therefore it is not an accident that all the anti-revolutionary forces, from the imperialists up to the "Left" congressites and Karnik and Co., direct their fight against the formation of a strong mass Communist Party.

Karnik-Kandalkar, who are better connected with the workers and see their dissatisfaction, are carrying out their work more skilfully. They stand for a leadership of a "Left" (!) nationalist party which, according to them, should lead the masses, but at the same time they formed a workers' party to give outlet to the workers' desire to have their own political party. The workers' party created by Karnik-Kandalkar will play a subordinate role and put pressure on the "Left" congressites. That is to say, the purpose of creating such a party is to deceive the workers and keep them as a submissive appendage of bourgeois nationalism.

Karnik-Shastri, etc., declare that the Congress is fighting for independence, and what is necessary is that I.N.C. should adopt a different programme of demands, because, they say, if the I.N.C. gets freedom, it may be used against the toiling masses. The Karnik-Shastri group are deceiving the workers on the main question. Because the essential point is that the Congress leadership and its "Left" variety, Nehru, etc., are **not capable of fighting for and achieving the independence of the country.** They are against the revolutionary struggle for independence. That is the essence of the criticism of the Communists. The Communists are ready to make temporary agreements with any revolutionary group which is prepared **in deeds** to fight, be it only for independence.

But experience has proved clear enough that the Congress bourgeoisie is an anti-revolutionary force and does not fight for independence. Therefore the ideas of Shastri-Karnik to put pressure on it through Nehru and other "Left" congressites only help the bourgeoisie to disorganise the revolutionary mass movement.

The central task of the Indian revolution still remains the formation of the Communist Party, which will consolidate the working class, organise the scattered millions of the peasantry, and build a broad anti-imperialist front to carry on the battle for independence, land, bread and workers' and peasants' power.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

The 17th Party Congress and the International Proletariat

By L. F. BOROSS

The following article is the second of a series of three by our Moscow Correspondent on the Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., the first of which appeared in our issue No. 14 of March 2.—Ed.

II. Unity and "Unity"

In all the reports on the Seventeenth Party Congress—in the press as well as in innumerable meetings—the fact that the Party Congress revealed the unity of the entire Party, unity which is even unparalleled in the Bolshevik Party itself, was underscored with particular enthusiasm.

In what was this unity expressed at the Party Congress itself? Even externally, so to speak, according to the order of business, this unity was expressed in the fact that almost all the reporters were able to forego detailed concluding remarks, that the discussion at the Party Congress lasting fifteen days did not disclose any opinion which in any way deviated from the standpoint of the reporters. It was the first Party Congress at which there was no opposition at all. Not only was there no opposition, but the representatives of all the currents of opposition which had manifested themselves during the past decade had themselves to acknowledge the complete bankruptcy of their standpoint at the Party Congress.

Leading representatives of the former Trotskyist opposition (Radek, Preobrazhinski) came forward and said:—

"The declarations which various comrades (from former oppositions—L. F. B.) made here are not simply the result of their political bankruptcy, not only the result of the bankruptcy of the opposition, but the result of a much more important process—the result of the great positive victory of our Party. **Every one who unintentionally expressed the influence of other classes, who fought against the Party in the belief that he serves the working class, now has to ask himself the question: You either stand on this side or on that side of the barricades; there can be no middle course.**" (Radek.)

Leaders of the former united Zinoviev-Trotskyist opposition (Zinoviev, Kamenev) spoke and made the following declarations:—

"I had the presumption to force my particular conception of Leninism, my particular conception on the 'philosophy of the epoch' upon the Party. However, as I to-day recognise (of course late enough), that conception was a chain of mistakes. And if the Party had not repulsed these mistakes, **then we would now discuss everything possible at the Party Congress here, but not the Second Five-Year Plan of socialist construction.**" (Zinoviev.)

The leaders of the former Right opposition (Bucharin, Tomsky, Rykov) came and confessed:—

"In the light of events it is now clear that any victory of our false line . . . **would have exceedingly weakened the positions of the working class. It would have led to premature intervention . . . and in consequence to the restoration of capitalism.**" (Bucharin.)

The former leaders of the so-called "Right-Left" bloc were also not missing:—

"We did not see the perspectives which Comrade Stalin had outlined, we looked for a way out not in overcoming the difficulties, not in an advance but in a retreat. We did not understand that **retreating before the difficulties meant nothing else but capitulation before the class enemy** who was concealed behind these difficulties." (Lominadse.)

Thus the former opponents of the Bolshevik general line themselves came forward as its crown witnesses.

But the mightiest symbol of complete unity was the storm of enthusiastic acclaim for the organiser of the victory of socialism—Comrade Stalin—the storm of applause which began in the Kremlin Hall, continued in the socialist factories and on the collective farms of the vast country, and found a million echoes in

all the workers' quarters in the cities of the capitalist countries, in all the colonies and everywhere where the toilers live and work.

This unity of the Bolshevik Party is naturally, in this completed form, a result of the victory of socialism. The fact that socialism has triumphed finds its simple expression in this. Every doubt as to whether the path leading to socialism was correct was therefore overcome in the most natural manner in the mind of every toiler who really wanted and still wants socialism. As long as there are still remnants of hostile classes in the country, as long as the Soviet Union is still surrounded by capitalist countries, the pressure of the class enemy is still possible upon individual sections of the proletariat as well as upon individual members of the Party. But the Seventeenth Party Congress very clearly showed the following:—

“The unity of the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Comrade Stalin gave the possibility of overcoming the age-old social modes in the national economy of the Land of the Soviets which unavoidably lead to class divisions. Within the country the great alliance of the workers and the collective farmers is no longer threatened by anything. The unity of the Bolsheviks watches over this alliance and the tried leadership guards the Party unity.” (“Pravda.”)

If one regards this unity from the perspectives of the Seventeenth Party Congress as a result of the victory of Socialism, then that is only the perfected expression of the fact. The unity of the Communist Party, the united front of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party, was and remains the means, the prerequisite for this victory. For us proletarians in the capitalist countries, it is at present precisely this side of the teaching of the Bolshevik struggle for unity which is the most actual.

Since the existence of the Bolshevik Party in the Soviet Union, and still more since the existence of the Communist International, the Communists have always been slandered by the social democracy as the disruptors of the unity of the working class. Every act of treachery which the social-democratic leaders commit, they cover up with the excuse that the Communists, through the split, have weakened the capacity of the working class for struggle and action. Therefore, the social democracy cannot come forward against the capitalists with as much weight as they could if the working class were united.

It is, of course, difficult for the social democracy to persuade even their own members that Noske “had to” massacre many thousands of workers because the Communists had split the social democracy, i.e., that they did not want to take part in the murder of the workers; or that Zeorgiebel had to have the thirty-three workers shot on May 1, 1929, for the same reason. It is also difficult to maintain that it is the “split” by the Communists which is to blame for the fact that social democracy “has to” circulate the vilest and most criminal lies and slanders about the Soviet Union. Was it perhaps necessary for the same reason to ban the Red Front Fighters' League and to grant freedom to the S.A. to murder at will? For this reason was it also necessary to help fascism to come to power? In order to characterise still more strikingly the “unity” of which the social democracy is in favour and the split with which it reproaches the Communists, one could formulate it in the following manner: “We must lick Hitler's boots because the Communists don't want to lick them along with us; we had to betray the labour movement at every step for the past fifteen years because the Communists did not want to betray it along with us, and had thereby split the labour movement.”

Absurd and impossible as these arguments sound, the idea of unity, the desire for unity and for a joint struggle is so strong among the class-conscious proletariat that it could only be held back from the real united struggle for its liberation, for socialism, by the abuse of this will to unity and by a false, fraudulent flag of unity.

The vast international significance of the Seventeenth Party Congress finally consists also in the fact that it has proved that the Communists are the only Party which understands how to set up the unity of all the decisive sections of the working class and, under its leadership, the unity of all the decisive sections of the toiling population. At the same time it has also shown what kind of unity the working class needs in order to throw off the yoke of exploitation and achieve socialism.

The Seventeenth Party Congress showed the proletariat of the entire world that it was precisely the Party which was able, for the first time in the history of the labour movement, to establish the complete unity of action of the proletariat, which was the first to

brand the hypocritical, traitorous Menshevist-opportunist “unity” of the labour movement. Only the separation of the workers' movement from the social democratic leadership, only an irreconcilable struggle against the class enemy and against all the agents of the class enemy in the ranks of the working class, only the irreconcilable struggle against any penetration of anti-working class opinions (also unconscious) into the ranks of the Party of the proletariat can guarantee the unity of the working class which will make it capable of fighting.

What would have happened if the Party had pursued the line of the various oppositions was explained at the Party Congress by the former leaders of these oppositions themselves. But let us now go one step further and ask: What would have happened if Lenin's line had not triumphed in the Russian labour movement, if the entire Russian working class or its decisive majority had remained under Menshevik leadership? If in 1917 there had been only a “united” social democratic party under the leadership of Martov, Dan, Abramovich (the Russian Otto Bauer), Wels and Blum, if there had not been a firm, revolutionary Bolshevik workers' party, who would have beaten back Kornilov's counter-revolutionary attack in the autumn of 1917? It is quite clear that in such a case Kornilov, perhaps in another form, perhaps under another name—would have set up—even before Mussolini, before Horthy, before Hitler—the first fascist dictatorship upon one-sixth of the globe, upon which to-day the first proletarian government is building up the classless society.

The Second International was and is in favour of such unity; the Löebes, the Noskes, the Otto Bauers and the Blums wanted, and still want, such unity. The Communists do not hide the fact that they do not want such unity, that they strive for the unity of the fighting front, the unity of the organisation of the proletarian revolution. They strive for a united front from which everyone who works for unity with the bourgeoisie is excluded. And the Seventeenth Party Congress showed that it was precisely the victory of the Bolshevik line which was the beginning of the genuine class militant unity of the Russian proletariat. From the heights which have been attained in the fighting aims of socialism, it is seen that the founding of the Communist International, the separation of the most advanced masses of the proletariat from the parties of the social traitors, represented the beginning of the revolutionary unification of the proletariat on a world scale.

It is not simply an accident that almost at the same time as the Seventeenth Party Congress revealed the triumph of Bolshevik unity, of revolutionary unity under Communist leadership, that the idea of the social treacherous “unity” was finally carried to the grave with the corpses of the heroic Austrian workers who fell in hundreds. Betrayed, sold, left in the lurch by their leaders, the masses of the Austrian social democracy carried out their separation from the social fascist leadership in practice. By their actions, by their heroic fight, they acknowledged their desire for unity with the Communist Party, with the aims and methods of its struggle.

At the same time as the Communist Party, which rules in the Soviet Union, discussed at its Party Congress the concrete problems by the fulfilment of which it is rapidly approaching a classless socialist society, the Austro-Marxist fraud of “Red Vienna” collapsed. The illusions about the social-political crumbs which the bourgeoisie for the sake of its own peace, for the time being graciously permitted the Austro-Marxists to celebrate as a “socialist victory,” burst. But in the very hour when the social democratic “Red Vienna” collapsed like a house of cards and buried thousands of fighters under its ruins, there was the birth of the real Red Vienna, the Red Vienna of the Bolshevik unity of the Austrian working class which is being formed.

It is the beginning of that unity which the Soviet proletariat and its Party have achieved

“in a determined, irreconcilable struggle on principle both in theory—for the purity of Marxism-Leninism—as well as in practice—in the merciless exposure of all opportunists, of those who had little faith, fault-finders, hypocrites—in unceasing class vigilance, in inexhaustible, ardent love and devotion to the cause of the international revolutionary proletariat.” (“Pravda.”)

The Seventeenth Party Congress not only shows the paths but also the aims, and the result of such unity—unshakeable power of the working class, an impregnable fortress of the world proletariat; uninterrupted advance of the million masses to greater well-being and higher culture, unhindered pushing forward to the already beckoning heights of the classless society.

The Week in the Soviet Union

The New School Year in the Soviet Union

The present school year has been accompanied by a remarkable advance of the Soviet schools. Better training and better discipline in the schools have been achieved. This success is due to the good preparations.

Three million children will attend the elementary schools of the R.S.F.S.R. in the school year of 1934-35. The number of pupils attending the secondary schools will increase from 1,441,000 to 7,789,000.

On February 25, the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union issued directions for the preparation of the new school year. The directions point to the necessity of completing the repairs to the school buildings and the erection of new schools in good time. One hundred and thirty-two million roubles will be expended on new constructions and 28 millions on the repair of the school buildings in the R.S.F.S.R. in the year 1934. A further question is the supplying of the schools with sufficient fuel. In the past school year instruction had often to be suspended owing to lack of fuel. Hence the decree of the C.E.C. provides that the schools shall be fully and adequately supplied with fuel for the whole year up to the end of March.

In order to raise the quality of instruction 40 million copies of textbooks will be issued in Russian, and 1.7 million in the languages of the national minorities. In addition, the autonomous Republics and districts will also issue textbooks in the various languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union. Great care will be taken to provide the schools with the necessary material for polytechnical instruction. There is no doubt that the new school year will witness the raising of the polytechnical school to a still higher level. The whole Soviet public is enthusiastically participating in the improvement of the schools. Collective farms, machine and tractor stations and Soviet estates are the friends and helpers of the schools.

The Supply of Vegetables to the Industrial Centres

The Council of People's Commissars has decided to carry out the provision of vegetables this year according to the State plan on the basis of the system of contracts. The State Plan envisages for the year 1934 the provision of 2,076,000 tons of vegetables as compared with 1,900,000 tons last year. The carrying out of the State vegetable provision plan is under the control in the first place of the main supply organisations, such as the management of the canned food trust, the vegetable department of the co-operatives and others, who must conclude contracts in the Southern districts by April 15 and in the central districts and in the North by May 1 at the latest.

The collective farms and collective farmers, as well as the individual peasants, must deliver the vegetables punctually and to the amounts provided in the contract at the points of collection. The Council of People's Commissars has called upon the various organisations to support the supplying of vegetables by providing labour and means of transport as far as possible. The provision of vegetables is of great importance for the further improvement of the food supplies in the industrial centres.

Successes in the Production of Locomotives and Waggon in February

The locomotive factories, with the exception of the new works in Lugansk, have successfully fulfilled the production plans for the month of February; 193 locomotives have been built, which is 19 more than last year. The Koloma works turned out 20 locomotives, whilst the plan provided for 19. The Kharkov works also exceeded the plan and built 20 locomotives instead of 18.

In the two months of January and February the transport industry of the Soviet Union received 185 new locomotives compared with 128 in the same period last year.

The situation in regard to the production of passenger coaches is not so favourable: only 108 were built as compared with 146 stipulated in the plan.

Improving the Quality of Woollen Cloth

The woollen industry of the Soviet Union is this year ceasing to produce some inferior qualities of cloth. On the other hand, the output of better qualities will be considerably increased. The manufacture of cotton cloth will be reduced and that of pure woollen cloth increased. Various new methods of work are being introduced in order to improve the quality of production. Suitings are put through hydraulic presses. Improvement is also being effected in the dyeing of cloth.

The White Terror

The Campaign for the Release of the Rumanian Railway Workers

By V. Gradinaru (Bucharest)

On February 7 the Court was to have pronounced its decision on the appeal made by the leaders of the railway workers and oil workers against the sentences imposed upon them in connection with the revolt of the Rumanian workers in February, 1933. All the revolutionary organisations, headed by the C.P. of Rumania, organised a broad mass campaign for the release of the railway workers and the improvement of the barbarous prison regime. With this end in view the Red Aid and the revolutionary trade unions proposed to the social-democratic and Ghelert organisations that mass strikes and mass demonstrations against the monstrous terror of fascism be organised on the basis of a broad united front.

The social-democratic and Ghelert leaders cynically rejected the proposal to organise a struggle for the release of the railway workers. The masses of workers and the lower social-democratic organisations, however, disregarding the decision of their leaders, enthusiastically accepted the united front proposal of the revolutionary organisations.

In order to prevent the workers expressing their solidarity with the prisoners, the Tatarescu Ministry intensified its terrorist measures. Special troops were drafted into the workers' quarters, where a state of siege has been proclaimed. The factory managements had placards posted up announcing that those workers who did not come to work on February 7 would be instantly dismissed.

Revolutionary workers were arrested throughout the whole country. The police this time also arrested socialist workers where social-democratic organisations, under the pressure of the workers, had joined in the action for the release of the railway workers. In Bucharest more than 200 revolutionary functionaries were arrested before February 7. The Siguranza organised raids in the workers' quarters after first completely cordoning them off. As a result of these raids a secret printing press of the Youth and the leaflets for February 7 fell into the hands of the police.

In spite of these extreme measures of the government, in spite of the wholesale arrests and the slogan of the social democrats not to participate in the "Communist provocations," the workers responded in masses to the appeal of revolutionary organisations.

In Bucharest the Anti-Fascist Unity organised a big meeting attended by 1,000 workers. A part of the workers and *N. D. Cocea*, an author, were arrested and brought before the military court. Factory gate meetings took place outside "Electrowerk" and "Juta" works. The workers of the "Regina Maria" works proclaimed a 15-minute strike for the day of the appeal. During the strike meetings took place inside the works.

In Galatz the unemployed carried out a street demonstration. The unemployed demanded bread, work and the release of the railway workers. This demonstration, which was attended by 1,000 unemployed, was also taken part in by numerous dock workers.

In Czernovitz the railway workers collected 2,000 lei for the support of the families of the arrested railway workers. Sixty railway workers signed a petition for the quashing of the sentences.

In Jassy and Arad meetings were held and 3,000 lei collected for the imprisoned workers.

The movement for February 7 met with great response among the workers, as a result of which the government was compelled to postpone the hearing of the appeal until March 14 and to issue instructions to the press not to mention the day of the hearing.

The Tatarescu government realises that, in view of the intensification of the economic crisis, it will not succeed, in spite of the bloody terrorist measures, in checking the struggle of the working masses which is now being concentrated on the release of the railway workers.

In spite of the state of siege and the court-martials, which are daily sentencing dozens of revolutionary workers, the class struggle is assuming ever higher revolutionary forms. Therefore the Tatarescu Ministry is making secret preparations for March 14 in order to uphold the sentences imposed on the railway workers.

But the proletariat of Rumania and of the whole world will by its struggle prevent the condemnation of the heroic railway workers who stand in the front ranks of the fight for the emancipation of the proletariat from the capitalist yoke.

Proletarian Commemoration Days

Fifteen Years

By O. Piatnitsky (Moscow)

(1) The Main Achievements of the Communist International

In the period of relative stabilisation Communist Parties arose and became firmly established in most countries of the world (in 65 countries). As a whole they adopted the programmatic, tactical and organisational principles of Bolshevism.

In the period in which the partial stabilisation of capitalism has been shaken, at the time of the end of the stabilisation, and finally at the time of transition to the point when the world is on the eve of a new cycle of revolutions and wars, the Communist International includes Communist Parties which are becoming mass parties in the capitalist countries, are accumulating revolutionary experience and, under the conditions of the intensifying contradictions, are carrying out the policy of class against class.

In the fifteen years of its existence the Communist International, founded on the initiative of our Party under the leadership of Lenin and in the last ten years working under the leadership of Stalin, is able to record a number of achievements.

(1) For the first time in the history of the labour movement there has been established a united, centralised world Party under uniform leadership, with a Marxist-Leninist programme, tactics and organisation, based on national sections which accept the directives, both in regard to principles and tactics, of the Comintern not only in words, but strive also to carry them out in actual practice, adapting them in nearly all countries of the world to the concrete conditions obtaining.

(2) The sections of the Communist International are to-day uniform and more firmly welded together than ever before. In the fight on two fronts, against "Left" phrases and Right opportunism, they have succeeded in liquidating fractions and groupings and have learnt to suppress, expose, and remove from their ranks anti-Party elements as soon as they make their appearance. We had an instructive example in this respect recently in the Czech Communist Party. Guttman, a member of the C.C. of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia, was removed from his position as editor of the central organ "Rudo pravo" on account of the opportunist line of this paper on important questions. Guttman, who fought against this decision of the C.C., attempted to set up a fraction and sent to the Party organisations and Communist fractions a platform-memorandum containing Trotskyist slanders against the C.P. of Czechoslovakia and the Comintern. Guttman's memorandum was discussed in the Party organisations, was unanimously rejected, and Guttman himself was expelled from the ranks of the Party without, however, being followed by a single member of the Party.

Despite the bitter fight which the bourgeoisie and the social democratic parties and trade union bureaucrats are waging against the Communists (40 sections of the Comintern are illegal, eight are semi-legal and only 16, not reckoning the C.P.S.U. and C.P. of China in the Soviet districts, are more or less legal), the influence of the sections of the Communist International over the workers in all countries is growing. Ever broader sections of revolutionary workers are becoming convinced that only the Communist Parties fight for the daily interests of the toiling population, that only the Communist Parties are capable of leading the proletariat to the fulfilment of its historical tasks, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of socialism.

(4) In the sections of the Comintern there exists perfect clarity in regard to imperialist war, and unanimity on the most important and fundamental question, namely, the necessity of conducting the fight in the first place against their own imperialist governments. The question of imperialist war, however, brought about the decay of the Second International in the year 1914, and is furthering this process of decay to-day, as the social democratic parties are already beginning to form themselves into groups in accordance with the interests of their imperialists. In the countries in which war is already being waged (Japan, Bolivia, Paraguay, Colombia and Peru) the Communist Parties have adopted the correct Leninist attitude with regard to the question of the

fight against imperialist war, and the strongest of these Parties, the Chinese and Japanese, are actively and courageously carrying out this policy.

(5) Unlike the social democratic parties of the pre-war period, the sections of the Communist International have begun to work among the peasants, not only in the colonial and semi-colonial countries (China), but also in the big capitalist countries of Europe and America. This work is not sufficiently developed by a long way, but the first steps have been taken (in Bulgaria, Poland, Spain, U.S.A., France, etc.).

(6) Unlike the Second International, the sections of the Comintern are organised not only in the capitalist, not only in the dependent countries, but also in the colonial countries and these sections, in contrast to the Parties of the Second International, are pursuing not a bourgeois but a Marxist-Leninist policy in regard to the national and colonial question.

(7) The Communist Parties are carrying on systematic work in order to popularise the victories of socialism in the Soviet Union, although it must be said that even this work, owing to the insufficiently broad connections of the Communists with the masses, does not embrace all toilers who could be won over to active support of the Soviet Union. Even the Communists do not by a long way always succeed in refuting the lies and repelling the provocations of the social democratic bureaucracy and of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, which, as is known, are the chief purveyors of anti-Soviet calumnies.

(8) The sections of the Communist International are conducting mass campaigns in all countries of the world against the preparation for imperialist war and attacks on the Soviet Union, against Japan's robber war in China and the participation of the imperialists in the Kuomintang offensive against Soviet China, and are conducting campaigns against fascism in Germany and in other countries.

(9) In contrast to the Parties of the Second International, many Communist Parties are carrying on work of political enlightenment in the army and in the navy.

(10) Since their existence the sections of the Comintern have not only independently led strikes and demonstrations, but many of them have organised barricade fights and taken part in them.

(11) Finally, already, even if not in all sections, united and numerous strong cadres have been formed which not only want to but are also able to carry on Communist work in spite of all the difficulties, cruel terror, murder and torture.

(2) Shortcomings and Tasks of the Sections of the Communist International

In his report to the Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin considered it necessary to emphasise that "the victory of revolution never comes of itself. It must be prepared and won. Only a strong proletarian revolutionary party, however, can prepare for and win it." Are there many such strong proletarian parties in the Communist International? No, not many!

Can one say that the growth of the forces of the sections of the Communist International—an indisputable growth—is commensurate with the radicalisation of the masses of workers and peasants? This question also cannot, unfortunately, be answered in the affirmative.

Already the Sixteenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., in the resolution on the report of the delegation of the C.P.S.U. in the Executive Committee of the Communist International, emphasised the necessity of overcoming the organisational lagging of the sections of the Communist International behind their growing ideological-political influence. This task has by no means been fulfilled; it rather acquires even greater importance at the present time.

In the event of war the bourgeoisie will drive into illegality the sections which are now still legal or semi-legal. The question of the work of the Communist Parties under conditions of illegality,

therefore, acquires enormous importance. The bourgeoisie, in driving the Communist Parties into illegality, aims at shattering the advance-guard of the proletariat and isolating it from the working class. We can say without exaggeration that in no country has the bourgeoisie succeeded in shattering the sections of the Communist International; that no terrorist methods of the bourgeoisie have been able to fulfil this task and liquidate the work of the Communists.

A number of weaknesses and shortcomings exist in the actual carrying out of the mass work in most even of the legal sections. This is still more the case in the illegal sections. An extension and consolidation of the connections with the masses must be achieved under all circumstances. Development of Bolshevik mass work, improvement of its content, the employment of more elastic forms, strengthening and deepening of connections between the Party and the masses, and before all with the works and factories, do not yet occupy the centre of attention even of the legal and semi-legal parties.

Whilst terror and persecution render difficult the mass work of the Communist Parties, at the same time, under the conditions of the growing exploitation and impoverishment of the masses, they facilitate the development of this work in that they destroy the "democratic" illusions among the masses and make them more susceptible to revolutionary agitation and propaganda. It is only a question of learning how to reach the masses with this Communist agitation and propaganda and knowing how to consolidate the ideological and political results achieved, both under legal and also illegal conditions.

The main reason why the sections of the Communist International, in spite of the numerous resolutions of the Comintern and of the sections themselves, do not adequately carry on Bolshevik mass work, is to be sought in the existence of social democratic remnants and also sectarian distortions which have not been eradicated from the practice of the overwhelming majority of the sections. If these remnants formerly hampered our work, they can be of profound importance under conditions of war and war preparations. For this reason the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. devoted special attention to the question of improving the mass work.

(1) The Communist Parties are not adequately conducting a systematic, ideological fight against the social democrats and against other opponents in their meetings for workers, employees and peasants. In the fight against the social democracy two kinds of mistakes are committed: firstly, the Communists, instead of carrying on an ideological fight, often simply frighten away the workers by calling the workers who are members of the social democratic organisations or reformist trade unions fascist or little Zoergiebels. There were examples of this in Germany and in other countries. Secondly, not a few Communists see in the social democratic party a real workers' party, and when they carry on an ideological fight they do so only against the social democratic leaders. This is to be observed in Czechoslovakia, in France, and in some party organisations in Switzerland.

At the same time the Communists lose sight of the fact that the social democracy, whilst it is becoming fascistised to an increasing extent, is at the same time increasing its demagoguery by adapting itself to the radicalisation of the masses and hypocritically playing with the slogans of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," "workers' power," etc., in order to retain their hold of the masses.

Thus, for example, in the platform of the C.C. of the social democratic party of Germany, which appeared in the "Neue Vorwärts" of January 28, 1934, we read that "the overthrow of the national socialist enemy by the revolutionary masses implies a strong revolutionary government," that "it will therefore be incumbent on the revolutionary government immediately to take decisive social and economic measures to secure the permanent and complete powerlessness of its defeated opponents. This entails: immediate expropriation, without compensation, of the heavy industries, of the large landed estates as well as the breaking up of the old machinery of government."

The Party Congress of the Polish social democratic party in February, 1934, in the adopted resolution, set up the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government which, "in the transition period will have the character of a dictatorship, which is necessary in order to render impossible all attempts at counter-revolution." In the same resolution it is stated that "this government can arise only as a result of the mass fight of the workers and peasants and

after overcoming the illusions of the masses that there is any power under the capitalist system which can improve their position without the final overthrow and smashing of the State power of the possessing classes." (Emphasis in the original resolution.)

(2) The Communists do not sufficiently expose the fascists before all the working people as the most reactionary, chauvinistic and imperialist groups of finance-capital. The fascist policy every day supplies fresh material by means of which, in the oral and written agitation, it can be plainly proved to the working people of all countries that the fascist dictatorship brings to the workers, peasants and the lower strata of the petty bourgeoisie the worst form of economic and political slavery. The Communists, who call for resistance against the terrorist fascist bands, conduct only inadequately the fight against the fascist ideology, against chauvinism and race hatred, and do not sufficiently oppose to it proletarian internationalism.

(3) The Communist Parties carry on hardly any systematic, intensive work in the reformist and fascist mass trade unions. This applies not only to countries where there are legal and illegal Red trade unions (Czechoslovakia, France, United States, China, Japan), but also to the remaining countries where there are no such Red trade unions. As no adequate systematic work is performed in the mass organisations of the enemy, there are hardly any Communist fractions which would be capable of consolidating the influence of the Party in these organisations and winning the best elements in them for the Party. At the time of great revolutionary fights in the year 1920, when he saw in the attitude of various "Left" West-European Communists dangerous tendencies to neglect the revolutionary work in the mass organisations of the enemy, Lenin devoted a special section of his work "Left-Wing Communism" to this question. This section is entitled: "Should revolutionaries work in the reactionary trade unions?" Lenin wrote:—

"Not to work in the reactionary trade unions means to leave the insufficiently developed or backward masses of workers under the influence of the reactionary leaders, of the agents of the bourgeoisie, of the labour aristocracy or 'bourgeoisified' workers."

It is true, of late, the Communists have begun here and there to work in the reformist trade unions. They no longer call upon the workers to leave the trade unions, to abandon work in these trade unions; they even adopt resolutions on the work to be carried on in the reformist trade unions, but in spite of their own decisions and the decisions of the Comintern they do not carry out this work, giving all sorts of reasons for not doing so.

As a result, things developed as Lenin foresaw in the year 1920. Although the reformist trade unions have collaborated in reducing the standards of living of the workers and in the wholesale dismissals, etc., the trade union bureaucrats have succeeded in many cases in holding back the trade unions from the struggle against the bourgeoisie, on the one hand because they performed the daily routine work, paid out sick benefit, pensions for the incapacitated and unemployed workers, were able to keep their trade union members in the factories, while unorganised and revolutionary workers were dismissed and, on the other hand, because the Communists did not work in these trade unions and did not expose the manoeuvres of the bureaucracy.

What is the explanation of the fact that the Communists up to now have not carried on any correct work in the trade unions, in spite of the instructions and concrete directions and repeated open criticism by the Comintern and of the R.I.L.U.?

I shall indicate some of these reasons:—

(a) In the Communist Parties, which were founded after the war, there gathered the revolutionary elements which had left the social democratic parties and the reformist trade unions on account of their treachery. They therefore adopted from the beginning a reluctant attitude towards Communist work in the reformist organisations.

(b) When the split in the social democratic parties occurred, that portion of the active members who had acquired experience in trade union work remained with the social democracy.

(c) In those countries in which Red trade unions exist, the Communists confine themselves exclusively to work in the Red trade unions. In those countries, however, in which no Red trade unions exist, but where trade union opposition groups have arisen, the latter have set up their parallel apparatus, which was correct in itself, but at the same time the Communists omitted to carry on

work inside the reformist trade unions. This is the reason why the Red Trade Union Opposition, which organised and independently led strikes, proved unable to draw the rank and file of the reformist trade unions into these strike struggles and to consolidate their positions in the reformist trade unions.

(d) Owing to this weak work in the trade unions, the Communists were unable to offer the necessary resistance to the expulsion of Communist and revolutionary workers from the unions, with the result that the positions of the Communists in the trade unions were still further weakened.

One of the chief reasons why the Communists in France, Poland, England and U.S.A., but also in other countries, in spite of their active participation and sometimes even leadership in strike struggles, were unable sufficiently to extend their influence and, what is the chief thing, not sufficiently consolidate this influence, is their reluctance to work in the reformist trade unions and in the other workers' mass organisations.

The Communists will never be able to consolidate their influence in the trade unions if they do not fight for every elective position. "This struggle must be conducted ruthlessly and unconditionally, as we have conducted it, up to the complete exposure and the driving out from the trade unions of all incorrigible leaders of opportunism and social chauvinism." (Lenin: "Left-Wing Communism.")

(4) The Communists, who are not working in the reformist trade unions, do still less work in the fascist or yellow trade unions. Of course this work in the fascist trade unions is more difficult than that in the reformist unions, but the Communists must be not only self-sacrificing but adaptable and must possess the special ability to formulate the demands round which the rank and file can be rallied, etc., in order to fulfil their tasks successfully.

The Communists must fight in every way against the establishment of fascist organisations, but where these organisations have already assumed a mass character they must not abandon work in these organisations. Work in the fascist organisations is possible and necessary. It is particularly necessary now when the bourgeoisie is setting up alongside the reformist unions, mass trade unions, which are under its open, direct and unrestricted leadership, and which is compelling the workers by various means to join these trade unions. Thus in the U.S.A., as a result of Roosevelt's measures, not only the A.F. of L. has increased (by 1½ million members according to its own reports), but also the company unions which were set up by the capitalists for the purpose of undisguised subjection of the workers and which, according to newspaper reports, number five million members. The fascists who have seized State power have not only captured the reformist unions, but, as in Poland, for instance, are setting up their own fascist trade unions alongside those of the P.P.S. and of the nationalist trade unions. Finally, the fascists, after having disbanded the trade unions and all sorts of sport and cultural organisations which are not under their direct control, are endeavouring to gather the adult and the young workers, both men and women, into special organisations under the pretext of satisfying their cultural requirements (Dopo Lavoro in Italy, "Strength through Joy" in Germany, etc.).

What we have said regarding the work in the trade unions applies equally to work in the other mass organisations of the enemy.

To improve our work in the trade unions and other workers' mass organisations of the enemy does not, of course, mean the dissolution of the trade unions and mass organisations which are under the control of the Communist Party. These organisations must be consolidated and converted into real mass organisations in which the Communist leadership is ensured by correctly working Communist fractions.

(5) The improvement of our work in the reformist and fascist trade unions is indissolubly bound up with the improvement and extension of the work of the Communists in the factories. Experience shows that this work is possible, although the bourgeoisie is endeavouring in all countries, particularly in the fascist countries, to purge the factories from undesirable workers.

In connection with a certain growth of industry in a number of capitalist countries and the introduction of a shorter working week, a fresh influx of workers into the factories is taking place in spite of an intensified speeding up of work. This renders it possible for revolutionary workers to be taken on in the factories and work there. At the same time the working conditions in the capitalist factories are becoming more and more unbearable. The workers

perceive that in the armament factories especially the individual capitalists are enriching themselves, whilst the conditions of wage slavery for the workers are getting worse. The Party organisations, on the other hand, are following on the line of least resistance. The few Party members who have remained in the factories after the wholesale dismissals in the time of crisis, prefer to work in the street cells in the districts where they live. The Party organisations have not yet realised the necessity of organising cells in the factories in which Communists have managed to keep their jobs, they have not yet realised the necessity of work in the factories by recruiting factory workers for the Party.

More than ever the factory, the workshop, the pit must become the stronghold of Communism.

(6) The Communist Parties had great influence over the unemployed. In the first years of mass unemployment it was only they who set up unemployed organisations. The sections of the Comintern and the revolutionary trade unions have neglected the work among the unemployed of late. The fascists are therefore trying to gain ground among the poorest sections of the unemployed who do not receive any unemployment benefit.

The bourgeoisie, with the aid of the social democrats and of the trade union bureaucracy, is systematically cutting down all forms of social insurance, in particular unemployment benefit. The bourgeoisie is introducing compulsory labour to an unheard-of extent, mainly for war purposes, the workers being paid the lowest wages and subjected to a military regime. As a result a portion of the unemployed is temporarily drawn into a peculiar process of production under conditions of unrestrained exploitation.

At the same time, Bolshevik mass work in the labour service camps, at public works, etc., is acquiring great importance.

There are many trade union members and members of other mass organisations among the unemployed. The Communists, by improving their work among the unemployed, are able through them to penetrate into the mass organisations and to get a firm footing there.

The mass struggle for social insurance and unemployment benefit must be increased in every respect.

(7) The historic victories of socialism in the Soviet Union and the boundless possibilities of the country of the proletarian dictatorship, which have been proved to the whole world, in regard to the development of the productive forces and the raising of the level of the broadest masses of toilers, are exerting a tremendous influence upon the masses of workers, employees and the main mass of the peasantry in the capitalist world. This influence is growing from year to year and from month to month. The Communist Parties must utilise much more energetically and actively the devotion and sympathy of the toiling masses for the country of the proletarian dictatorship in order to extend and consolidate their influence.

(8) The above-mentioned shortcomings are rendered worse, and can partly be explained by the fact that not all the Party members are informed of the Party decisions, just as not all members of the Red trade unions and of the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition are informed of them. This applies both to the decisions of the leading organs of the Comintern and of the leading organs of the Parties. These decisions are not sufficiently popularised by the Party and in most cases their carrying out is not checked up. There are not a few "honest chatterboxes" among the Party functionaries who confine themselves to adopting the decisions and believe that these will be carried out automatically.

"Good resolutions and declarations in favour of the general line of the Party are only a beginning; they merely express the desire to win, but it is not victory. After the correct line has been given, after a correct solution of the problem has been found, success depends on the manner in which the work is organised, on the organisation of the struggle for the application of the line of the Party, on the proper selection of workers, on supervising the fulfilment of the decisions of the leading organs. Without this the correct line of the Party, and the correct solutions are in danger of being severely damaged. More than that, after the correct political line has been given the organisational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself—its success or failure." (Stalin.)

Comrade Stalin's statements fully apply to the majority of the sections of the Comintern. The Communist Parties must not only inform the broad masses of their decisions but also systematically supervise their carrying out in practice.

The Executive of the Communist International is working to overcome all the above-mentioned shortcomings.

When the Communist Parties liquidate all the shortcomings in their mass work and work Bolshevistically, they will become strong revolutionary parties, of which Comrade Stalin spoke, and then the victory of the proletarian revolution will be achieved!

Fifteen Years of the Communist International

By Fritz Heckert

The victory of the great October revolution introduced a new and higher epoch of proletarian world revolution. It stirred up the toiling masses in the capitalist countries to strikes and actions against imperialist war and against the rule of the bourgeoisie, against the will of the social-democratic parties and the reformist trade union leaders. In the demonstrations and strikes of the workers, in the mutinies in the armies and navies, in the uprisings of the masses of the peasantry, the growing opposition to the wholesale slaughter of the peoples and to the whole capitalist system, found expression. The slogans of the October revolution have become the fighting signals of the insurgent masses of workers in a whole number of capitalist countries. But the tremendous influence still exercised by social democracy over the proletarian masses of the Western countries has prevented the attainment of the great goal of Soviet power outside the country of the October revolution.

The great lessons taught by the year 1917, and by the November revolution in Germany, gave the international proletariat revolutionary experience of enormous importance. The working class of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and wherever revolution raised its head, did not, however, possess such a Party as that which the Russian proletariat had created under the leadership of Lenin. Hence the revolutionary uprisings in these countries lacked that great mobilising and motive force which was represented by the Bolshevik Party, the leader of the victorious October revolution. The revolutionary groupings which had sprung into existence during the war (Spartacus League, etc.) had not fully carried out their separation from traitorous social democracy when the revolution broke out. It was not until a few weeks after the beginning of the November revolution, in the last days of December, 1918, that the German working class created its own Communist Party. As in Germany, Communist Parties were formed in a number of capitalist countries during the revolutionary events of 1918-19. The forming of these Parties, and the great tasks which the revolutionary uprisings set the working class, made it necessary at the same time to form a new international organisation.

It was Lenin who took the initiative towards this. Headed by the C.P.S.U., eight Communist Parties appealed to all proletarian organisations standing for the dictatorship of the working class, calling upon them to take part in an international conference. This conference met in Moscow on March 2, 1919, in order to consult the steps to be taken in the given situation. On March 4 Lenin made the proposal that this conference should be declared the first congress of the Third Communist International. This proposal was adopted.

The great historical importance of the first congress of the new international association of the proletariat lies in the fact that it laid the foundation for the building up of a united world party of the revolutionary working class, and that this congress set the proletariat of all countries the fundamental task of taking up the struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This first congress, in its theses, drawn up and proposed by Lenin, explained to the proletariat of the whole world the essential character of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the class character of bourgeois democracy. Here the role played by the social-democratic parties was clearly exposed, with their betrayal of the struggles of the workers for their emancipation, their treachery against the working class, maintaining that bourgeois democracy is the necessary stage on the way to socialism. "The historical task of the proletariat"—the theses state—"is the struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the Soviet power." This laid down the line on which the international proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist International, commenced its struggle for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie in the whole world.

But at the time of the founding of the Communist Interna-

tional there was still a great lack of clarity in all Communist Parties, with the exception of the C.P.S.U., on many questions of the proletarian class struggle. This made an energetic struggle necessary, from the very beginning of the C.I., against a number of petty-bourgeois conceptions and against the traditions inherited from the social-democratic movement. Hence the C.I. at the time of its founding was by no means an international proletarian organisation in which unanimity and clarity prevailed with regard to all the fundamental questions of the proletarian class struggle. Many members of the new Communist Parties did not yet recognise the tasks which are set a really revolutionary workers' party. They did not yet realise that the Communist Party can be only the vanguard of the proletariat, its most class-conscious, most strictly organised and most disciplined section, the motor, so to speak, which propels the whole mighty working class forward. In many minds complete vagueness still prevailed as to the role played by the State as the instrument of the power of the ruling class, and, in consequence, there was equal vagueness as to the nature and necessity of the proletarian dictatorship. Many still failed to recognise the role played by the social-democratic parties as the social-fascist wing of the bourgeoisie. Many illusions still existed in the ranks of the Communist Parties, many believed that it was still possible to wrest social democracy as a party from the bourgeois front and win it back for the revolutionary class struggle.

The great importance of the peasant small holders and sections of the petty bourgeoisie as allies in the proletarian revolution was also not understood by a large number of Communists. All this insufficient knowledge resulted in a number of wrong conceptions with regard to the toiling masses and the necessity of winning them over under the leadership of the working class. Very deficient, too, was the realisation of the importance of the national and colonial questions for the development of the proletarian revolution. Therefore the Communist International was confronted first of all by considerable tasks in its own ranks. It was of paramount importance to spread enlightenment on all these fundamental questions in the affiliated Parties, and beyond these among the broad masses of the workers.

Besides these fundamental questions, a number of elementary tactical problems had to be cleared up; for instance, the question of the importance of revolutionary work in the reformist trade unions and other proletarian mass organisations, the question of the utilisation of the bourgeois parliaments, the question of the necessity of applying revolutionary united front tactics in order to wrest the masses from the influence of social democracy, to mobilise them in their own interests, and thereby to create the prerequisites for the winning of the majority of the working class for the proletarian revolution.

While the First Congress laid down the general line and established the great world organisation of the proletarian class struggle, the Second World Congress of the C.I. dealt in detail with the above-mentioned fundamental questions.

With the revolutionary development of the labour movement shortly after the war, the influence of the social-democratic International commenced to dwindle and the sympathies of the masses to turn towards the Third International. This development of the sympathies of masses brought with it the danger of the penetration of social-democratic and opportunist tendencies into the C.I. In order to ban this possibility as far as possible, the Second World Congress adopted the "21 conditions for admission into the Communist International." An important document, containing the fundamental obligations of a Communist and of a Communist Party.

These conditions state: "The propagation of our struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat must be concrete. The workers and the toiling masses must be shown the necessity and inevitability of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of their own daily experiences. . . . The daily agitation and propaganda must bear a Communist character. The necessity of a complete break with reformism and with so-called centrism must be recognised and this break carried out. All the decisions of the C.I. and the E.C.C.I. are binding on the affiliated Parties. . . . In order to secure the Bolshevik line of the Communist Parties, periodical cleansings must take place, and petty-bourgeois opportunist elements removed from the Party. Every Party affiliated to the C.I. must call itself the Communist Party."

On the basis of the decisions of the Second World Congress, the Comintern has carried on a successful struggle against opportunism of every kind. A large number of Communist Parties,

aided by the C.I., have cleared their ranks of opponents of a Bolshevik Party, and have been able to overcome their greatest weaknesses with regard to theoretical and tactical questions. In hundreds of struggles, in many countries and in many spheres, the proletariat has had the opportunity of testing the correctness of the fundamental decisions of the C.I.

The fifteen years of the struggle of the C.I. have been at the same time fifteen years of struggle against the Second International, its counter-revolutionary ideology and class betrayal. The powerful influence of reformism in the proletariat has hampered the revolutionary development. Under the banner of "democracy," social democracy has defended the bourgeois dictatorship against the interests of the proletariat. Social-democratic theory and practice have paved the way for fascism. One of the main tasks of social democracy has been to disrupt the proletarian united front. By means of provocation and treachery it has split the working class again and again, and prevented the unification of the proletariat in defence of its own interests. Hence arose the necessity for the Parties of the C.I. to wage a constant and inexorable struggle against social democracy.

The C.I. has shown that the splitting of the working class by social democracy is the main source of the weakness of the proletariat, the cause of its defeats, and the basis for the still existing terrorist rule of capitalism. So long as this split exists, the working class cannot establish its power and build up socialism, and the working class will remain in the slavery of decaying capitalism. Just as the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main strategic goal of the C.I., so its main tactical task is the establishment of the proletarian united front on a Marxist-Leninist basis.

With the formation of the C.I., the class struggle of the proletariat has been raised to a higher and more purposeful stage. The existence of the Soviet Union and the building up socialism in the land of the October revolution, have placed the leadership of the class struggles of the proletariat in the hands of the Communist International in an epoch of two systems: the decaying capitalist world and the rapidly developing socialist era. This fact gives a special content to the struggles of the working class of the capitalist countries. Everywhere the struggle for the Soviet power is pushed into the foreground. The international proletariat, in its struggles for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, can rely for support on the great material and moral forces of the first proletarian State in the world. This is of the greater importance in view of the fact that the crisis of the capitalist system is steadily intensifying the danger of another world war, worse even than the last, which can only be prevented or stopped by a victorious proletarian revolution.

The Comintern has succeeded in the fifteen years of its existence in striking deep roots among the ranks of the toiling masses in all the countries of the earth and in winning over millions of new fighters for the revolutionary class struggle. The development of the capitalist world, the increasingly visible decay, and the consequent enormous increase in the poverty and want of the toiling masses, and on the other hand the rapid progress of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and the determined struggle of the Communist Parties for the exploited and oppressed of the whole world, have enormously strengthened the faith of millions all over the world in Communism.

The example set by the Communist Party of Germany after Hitler's seizure of power, the struggles of the masses of the proletariat in Austria and France, the struggle for the Soviet power in China, show that under the leadership of the Comintern, revolutionary parties actually come into being in the capitalist countries, capable of arousing and leading the struggles of the working masses for their emancipation. In spite of the application of the utmost terror, the fascists have not succeeded in interrupting for even one moment the struggle of the German Party or the Chinese Party.

The events in the Far East, in Germany, in Austria, in France, the revolutionary struggles in many other countries, show that the proletariat has taken up the struggle for power. "The struggle for the Soviet power is the main slogan of the proletariat at the present time"—this was emphasised by the Thirteenth Plenum of the C.I. in December last year. The C.I. declares quite openly to the proletariat that the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be established by force. The force exercised by the bourgeoisie must be broken by the application of determined force by the proletariat. The latest events in Austria bring further proof of this.

In the capitalist countries the proletarians and the oppressed peoples are gathering beneath the banners of the C.I. In view of the imminent danger of a world war, the storm battalions of the working class are forming under Communist leadership, in order to prevent this war by revolution, or to shatter it by revolution. There is only one way of escape for the working class from the present situation, the path of the October revolution. On this path wave the flags of the Communist International, and beneath these flags the proletarian armies are marching forward to the Red World October.

Solidarity With the Spanish Proletariat

Appeal of the International Red Aid

Toilers!

Between April, 1930, and to-day the various governments of the Spanish republic have murdered more than 950 workers and peasants. They have furthermore sentenced hundreds of revolutionary workers to thousands of years of imprisonment. Thousands of toilers, of women and even children have been wounded during this period in the course of strikes, demonstrations, etc., by the bestial Spanish "Guardias Civil" and by the rest of the apparatus of repression of the Spanish governments.

Fifteen thousand workers and peasants are languishing to-day in the dungeons of the Spanish republic. The reactionary government of Lerroux-Gil Robles has proclaimed the "state of alarm"—which in practice does not differ from the state of siege—over the whole country; the trade unions are being closed down, the workers' press is being gagged, a decree is being adopted rendering all strikes illegal, the right of speech, of combination is being more and more restricted.

The Spanish bourgeoisie is answering with the machine-guns and with its whole apparatus of repression to the growing revolution, to the militant strikes that spread over the whole of Spain, to the militant anti-fascist demonstrations of the toilers, and to the broad peasants' movement that is directed against the landowners and against the Spanish bourgeoisie.

Toilers!

The Spanish proletariat does not allow itself to be terrorised by its exploiters. The Spanish workers and peasants are answering heroically to every attack, to every offensive of the bourgeoisie.

The solidarity of the international proletariat with the brave, heroic Spanish workers and peasants must be expressed in an energetic way. The Spanish proletariat is struggling for the overthrow of a regime which has brought it to starvation; it is struggling in order to throw open all the prisons of Spain, so as to liberate 15,000 of its best brother fighters.

Toilers!

Organise the solidarity with the heroic Spanish working class! Demand the immediate release of the 15,000 revolutionary political prisoners in Spain.

Long live the heroic struggle of the Spanish workers and peasants!

International Red Aid.

Published weekly. Single copies, 2d. Subscription rates: Great Britain and Dominions, 12s. per year; U.S.A. and Canada, five dollars per year. Remittance in STERLING per International Money Order, Postal Order or Sight Draft on London.