

THE



ommunist

G. DIMITROFF: UNITED FRONT OF THE INTERNATIONAL
PROLETARIAT AND OF THE PEOPLES AGAINST FASCISM

FORWARD ON THE FRONT OF THEORY!

P. WIEDEN: PACIFISM OR CLASS STRUGGLE?

International

Organ of the Communist International

VOLUME XVI

12

SIXPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published monthly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English

Contents :

No. 12, December 15, 1938

- | | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. G. Dimitroff: United Front of the International Proletariat and of the Peoples Against Fascism | 3 |

EDITORIAL NOTES

- | | |
|--|----|
| 2. The Anti-Jewish Pogroms | 15 |
| 3. Whither is Daladier Leading His Party and France? | 17 |
| 4. Spies of German Fascism in the U.S.A. | 19 |
| 5. Schools in Hitler Germany | 20 |
| 6. Hendrik De Man—His Path and His Aim | 23 |
| 7. The Viceroy and the Grouser | 25 |
| 8. The Munich Conspiracy and the Dutch | 26 |

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

- | | |
|---|----|
| 9. Forward on the Front of Theory! | 29 |
| 10. P. Wieden: Pacifism or Class Struggle? | 33 |
| 11. K. Funk: The Policy of the Labour and Socialist International and the Fascist Offensive | 42 |
| 12. W. Ulbricht: Towards the Unity of the German Working Class | 48 |
| 13. F. Fürnberg: The Revolution in Austria in 1918 | 55 |
| 14. A. Fischer: The Peasants in the Year 1918-1919 | 59 |

DOCUMENTS

- | | |
|--|----|
| 15. On the Form of Party Propaganda in Relation to the Publication of the "Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" | 67 |
|--|----|

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

- | | |
|--|----|
| 16. Twenty-First Anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution | 77 |
|--|----|

UNITED FRONT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT AND OF THE PEOPLES AGAINST FASCISM

By GEORGI DIMITROFF

I

AT the present time, when the Soviet people, freed from capitalist slavery, celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of the Great Socialist revolution which inflicted a crushing blow on the first world imperialist war, millions of people in the capitalist countries are falling victims to sanguinary fascist brigandage. The fascist miscreants are driving mankind towards the abyss of a new imperialist war.

Long before the present events, Comrade Stalin repeatedly uttered the warning that fascist governments were preparing a new imperialist carnage. In January, 1934, from the tribune of the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade *Stalin* declared:

“Again as in 1914, the parties of bellicose imperialism, the parties of war and revenge, are coming into the foreground.”

“Quite clearly things are moving towards a new war.” (See Stalin, report at Seventeenth Party Congress of Communist Party Soviet Union.)

Subsequently, on March 1, 1936, in a talk with *Roy Howard*, Comrade *Stalin* stated:

“In my opinion there are two seats of war danger. The first is in the Far East, in the zone of Japan. I have in mind the numerous statements made by Japanese military men containing threats against other Powers. The second seat is in the zone of Germany. . . . At present the Far Eastern seat of danger reveals the greatest activity. However, the centre of this danger may shift to Europe.”

Guided by Comrade Stalin's Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation, the *Seventh Congress of the Communist International* characterised the plans of plunder of German Fascism in the following way:

“The adventurist plans of the German fascists are very far-reaching and count on a war of revenge against France, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic States, which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union, and the wresting of the Soviet Ukraine from the U.S.S.R. They are demanding colonies and are endeavouring to stir up sentiment in favour of a world war for a new repartition of the world.” (See resolution on the tasks of the Communist International in connection with the preparation of the imperialists for a new world war. Section one.)

The entire course of events has shown how correct the Communists were when they sounded the alarm

regarding the oncoming danger of war and issued the timely call to the working people to resist Fascism on the basis of a united Popular Front.

In 1935, Italy attacked Abyssinia. Fascist Germany, in its turn, arbitrarily tore up the Versailles Treaty, introduced conscription, militarised the Rhineland and transformed it into a military base from which to strike a blow at France. Then it forcibly occupied Austria, seized the Sudetenland, took possession of all the military-strategic positions of Czechoslovakia, achieved its dismemberment in the endeavour to transform Czechoslovakia into its virtual colony.

In the summer of 1936, the ruling circles of Germany and Italy, having first provoked a fascist putsch in Spain, organised armed intervention against the Spanish Republic. They drafted their regular troops and an enormous quantity of military equipment to Spain and dispatched their navies to blockade the Spanish Republic and secure their domination in the Mediterranean. For two years Italian airmen and German artillery have been reducing Spanish towns to ruins, slaughtering Spanish women and children, drenching with blood the soil of the Spanish people, whose only wish is to be masters in their own home.

A no less nefarious war for the conquest of China is being waged by the Japanese fascist militarists in the Far East against the Chinese people fighting for its independence.

“All these facts go to show that the second imperialist war has in fact already begun. It has begun surreptitiously, without war being declared. States and people have somehow imperceptibly crept into the orbit of the second imperialist war. War has been begun in different parts of the globe by three aggressive States—the fascist ruling circles of Germany, Italy and Japan. War is being waged over a tremendous expanse from Gibraltar to Shanghai. War has already succeeded in drawing over five hundred million people into its orbit.

“In the last analysis it is being waged against the capitalist interests of Britain, France, the U.S.A., since its object is to secure the repartition of the world and spheres of influence to the advantage of the aggressive countries and at the expense of these so-called democratic States.

“The distinctive feature of the second imperialist war is, for the time being, that it is being waged and developed by the aggressive Powers, while the other Powers, the ‘democratic’ Powers against whom in fact the war is directed pretend that the war is no concern of theirs, wash their hands of it, back out of it, laud their own peaceableness, rail at the fascist aggressors and . . . step by step

yield their own positions to the aggressors, at the same time asserting that they are preparing to resist" (see the "Short Course of the History of the C.P.S.U." Pages, 318-19, Russian Edition).

Why has this series of sanguinary fascist crimes become possible? It has become possible because the ruling circles of the so-called democratic States have systematically retreated before the fascist aggressors.

Italian fascism was allowed to attack Abyssinia with impunity. It not only enslaved Abyssinia, but also hurled itself against Spain. German Fascism was permitted to militarise the Rhineland without hindrance. It made use of this to fall upon Spain, engulf Austria and crush Czechoslovakia. The Japanese freebooters were enabled to seize Manchuria and the Northern provinces of China. With growing insolence the Japanese militarists embarked upon a war to conquer the whole of China. Step by step the countries of "Great Western Democracy" retreated before the fascist plunderers. Step by step the fascist plunderers strengthened their positions, increased their aggression, resorted to new acts of violence, and at the same time used all this to draw the noose ever tighter around the neck of their own people.

Yet the Governments of the bourgeois-democratic countries possessed adequate means wherewith to bar the road to the fascist offensive and to avert the outbreak of war. They were in a position to curb the fascist aggressors by the joint action of the States, members of the League of Nations interested in maintaining peace. They were in a position to do so by employing Article 16 of the League of Nations Covenant, which provides for collective action against violators of the peace. They were in a position to do so by applying economic sanctions, which would inevitably have compelled the Governments of Germany, Italy, Japan, which do not possess adequate raw materials and financial resources, to retreat in face of the resolution of those who are interested in the maintenance of peace.

Such action to secure the maintenance of peace would have met with the enthusiastic support of all peoples who want neither the bondage of Fascism nor the horrors of war. Undoubtedly, such action would have been greeted by the masses of the people of the fascist countries themselves who are groaning under the yoke of fascist barbarism. A powerful movement of the peoples would have been the most effective means against the instigators of war.

However, the bourgeois Governments did not put the system of collective security into operation. They did not do so because they *did not want to*. They did not do so because their policy is determined by the reactionary imperialist circles, who, out of fear of the growth of the working-class movement in Europe,

of the movement of national liberation in Asia, out of hatred for the land of Socialism sacrificed to Fascism the interests of their own peoples. In the name of their narrow class imperialist interests they yield the small nations to be rent asunder by Fascism, thereby facilitating the further aggression of the fascist Governments. They supported German Fascism because they want in its person to have a *European gendarme* that strangles every democratic anti-fascist movement of the masses of the people.

So as to arrive at agreement with German Fascism the haughty ringleaders of these imperialist circles not only did not spare the prestige of the "Great Powers" they represent, but also underwent such personal humiliation at the hands of the fascist dictators as though they were speaking on behalf of countries already defeated in war.

And vain are all their endeavours now to cover up their terrible responsibility to the peoples by their lying equivocations to the effect that by bending the knee to the fascist dictators, they were saving the cause of peace, were saving Europe and mankind from the horrors of war.

II

At all the stages of fascist aggression, and of the unleashing of imperialist war, *only the great Soviet Union pursued a firm policy of peace*. Had the other States accepted the proposals of the Soviet Government regarding a collective repulse to the aggressor, peace would have been preserved. Millions of people would not have been hurled, as now, into the bloody shambles of destruction by war.

During the onslaught on Abyssinia, the Soviet Union as distinct from other countries, consistently operated the economic sanctions established by the League of Nations in relation to fascist Italy. From the very beginning of the military intervention against the Spanish Republic, the Soviet Union declared for resolute collective action by all the countries belonging to the League of Nations, against the German and Italian violators. On more than one occasion the Soviet country came out against the policy of so-called non-intervention, which in fact, meant the application of a blockade to Republican Spain and has enabled the interventionists to introduce their troops and military supplies for the annihilation of the Spanish people, and get off scot-free.

When the Italian pirates began to sink merchant ships in the Mediterranean the Soviet Government resolutely demanded an end to the piracy and brought about the conclusion of the well-known Nyon Agreement which was directly aimed at the protection of peaceful merchant navigation. At the assembly of the League of Nations and in its commissions, in the so-called non-intervention committee and in all other

bodies, only the Soviet Union has unreservedly defended the just cause of the Spanish people.

At the Brussels Conference, summoned in connection with the onslaught of the Japanese militarists on China, the Soviet Union insisted on the operation of a policy for the collective repulse of the Japanese invaders. The Chinese people knows that it has, in the Soviet peoples its unswerving friend, the advocate of the sovereignty, integrity and independence of China.

When German Fascism moved its troops into Austria, the Soviet Union proposed to the Governments of the other States that they take joint action against the arbitrary conduct of the fascists.

Everybody is aware of the position adopted by the Soviet Union when German Fascism was brandishing the knife over Czechoslovakia, when the Polish and Hungarian vultures fastened their claws into the living body of the Czechoslovak people. In accordance with the agreement concluded with Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union declared before the whole world that it was ready to come to the assistance of Czechoslovakia should the latter be attacked, and would fulfil its obligations as provided for in this treaty. The Soviet Government also warned Poland that an attack by it on Czechoslovakia would entail the automatic cancellation of the non-aggression pact between Poland and the Soviet Union.

The whole world knows how the Soviet Union answered the invasion of Soviet territory at Lake Khasan by the Japanese Samurai. By a crushing lightning blow at the Japanese provocateurs, the army of the land of Socialism showed *how to employ armed force to guard the cause of peace.*

The Soviet Union pursues its policy in the interests of the genuine defence of world peace, in the interests of the working people of all countries. Its peace policy corresponds to the aspirations of all peoples. The Soviet Union is the powerful buttress of the struggle against wars of conquest, the unfailing defender of small nations and weak countries against fascist aggression and imperialist enslavement.

In its struggle for peace, the Soviet Union bases itself on the might of victorious Socialism. Every new Socialist factory is a new fortress in the struggle of the peoples of all countries against Fascism. Every flourishing collective farm is a new blow at the dark forces of reaction. Every success of the Socialist country strengthens the power of the working people throughout the world. The culture and science of the Soviet country are placed at the service of the whole of mankind. The land of Socialism is the staunch bulwark of the liberation struggle of the working people throughout the world, the most important factor in rallying the forces of the international working class and of the anti-fascist People's Front. *The moral and political unity of the Soviet*

people increases the great vital force of international solidarity among the working people.

Amid the general anxiety, confusion and uncertainty as to the morrow that reign in the capitalist world, only the Soviet people looks calmly into the future. Steadfastly and confidently the Soviet Union is completing the construction of Socialist society and advancing to Communism.

Every day brings to the working people of the capitalist world ever new proofs of the *correctness of the path* being followed by the great Soviet people under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. The entire tremendous struggle of the Party of Lenin-Stalin for Socialism, for the Socialist industrialisation of the country, for the collectivisation of peasant farming; the struggle against the host of enemies, the rooting out of the Trotskyist-Bukharinite agents of Fascism in the U.S.S.R.—all this is increasingly assuming its place in the minds of the international working class as their very own cause, the cause they hold most dear.

The whole of working mankind is vitally interested in the all-round consolidation of the Soviet Union, in the resolute strengthening of contacts between the great Soviet people and the working class and peoples of the capitalist countries. Herein lies the most important guarantee of the successful struggle against fascist aggression for world peace.

III

It would be a most *dangerous delusion* at the present time for the labouring masses and the peoples to believe the false pro-fascist legend that it has been peace that has been secured at the price of the predatory dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, that German Fascism has by this act of violence completed the fulfilment of its programme of aggression in Europe and that the peoples may sleep in tranquillity without grievous thoughts about new onslaughts by fascism, which menace their liberty and independence. Only accomplices in the fascist crimes, only deceivers of the peoples or hopeless political blockheads can spread such a legend. No person in his right senses will deny that it is precisely since the Munich conspiracy that the effrontery of the fascist aggressors has immensely increased. And it could not be otherwise, for German Fascism has been presented by the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie with new, exceptionally favourable military-strategic and economic positions for the further development of its aggression.

The fact should be clearly appreciated that the question has already been passed beyond the bounds of the arbitrary revision of the Versailles treaty by the fascist States.

What is at issue is a new repartition of the globe. What is at issue is not only the redistribution of the

existing colonial possessions. Fascism is placing on the order of the day the question of the *repartition of Europe itself*, the colonisation of a number of *European* States and the imperialist enslavement of a number of *European* peoples.

The fascists beasts-of-prey themselves do not consider it necessary to conceal the course of their plunderous endeavours. The map circulated by the fascists after the occupation of the Sudetenland clearly demonstrates the plans of German Fascism. It turns out that according to the schedule outlined in this map the spring of 1938 was to see settled the fate of Austria; the autumn of 1938 of Czechoslovakia; the spring of 1939 is to see a blow struck at Hungary; in the autumn of 1939 the object of plunder is to be Poland; preparations are being made for a blow in the spring of 1940 at Yugoslavia; in the autumn of 1940—at Rumania and Bulgaria. In the spring of 1941—France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland are to be the object of a fascist onslaught; in the autumn of 1941 fascist Germany plans its attack on the U.S.S.R. Further, we learn from this map that German Fascism magnanimously places at the disposal of fascist Italy a big part of Spain, the southern districts of France, Greece, a big part of Turkey, Syria, Palestine and North Africa.

Naturally, there is a great deal in this that is undoubtedly the fruits of unrestrained fascist fantasy. It suffices, however, to observe the disruptive work of German and Italian Fascism in the British and French possessions to become convinced that the fascists are really working to put these or similar plans into operation. German Fascism is inundating Alsace Lorraine with its agents. On France's Pyrenean frontier the German fascists are engaged in intensive activity to establish bases for a blow at France. Fascist agents are inflaming separatist movements among the Slovaks and Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia, are conducting disruptive work in Yugoslavia, Rumania, in the Balkans. They are preparing the next blow against Lithuania and the other Baltic States. The intrigues of German fascism in the Scandinavian and other countries, the provocative putsches in the Latin-American countries, the extensive espionage activity in the U.S.A.—all these are links in the general chain of the fascist offensive. The Polish fascists, who have flung themselves like jackals on the riven body of Czechoslovakia and are baring their teeth at Lithuania, are themselves, by their policy of plunder, subjecting the independence of Poland to the menace of a blow from the insatiable hand of German Fascism.

But the fascist plunderers are reckoning without their host. The peoples have by no means yet said their decisive word.

The fascists may rob and run riot like highway robbers in the Middle Ages, insofar as they have not

yet met their *host* fully armed. This host is the *peoples* and primarily the *working class*. When one day they gather their forces and deal a determined blow to the plunderers, the world will see *all* the emptiness, swagger and conceit of these "bold Aryan warriors," who scare the lives out of cowardly hucksters in the countries of bourgeois democracy.

Never yet, since the end of the world imperialist war, has the hatred felt for the war-mongers been so profound and strong as at the present time. A wave of popular indignation against the vile deeds of Fascism is rising in all countries. The movement to repulse the fascist aggressors found clear expression in the days when the plotters in Munich were tearing to pieces and sacrificing to Fascism the cultured, democratic Czechoslovak Republic. Millions of people rose in its defence in the most important countries of the world. In Great Britain, for many days without a break, big meetings took place which demanded the defence of Czechoslovakia. Numbers of the biggest trade unions, social organisations, representatives of the intelligentsia, outstanding public figures came forward with the demand for a collective repulse to the fascist gangsters. They insisted on Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union uniting their forces to aid Czechoslovakia. Very influential British newspapers published tens and hundreds of letters from their readers protesting against the betrayal of Czechoslovakia by the British bourgeoisie. Thousands of such protests were sent to newspaper editors. The Executive Committee of the Co-operative Party, speaking on behalf of five million members, demanded of the British Government that it call Parliament together and come to the aid of Czechoslovakia.

After the return of the British National Council of Labour delegation from Paris, where a conference took place with the leaders of the French trade unions, several thousands of mass meetings took place throughout Great Britain, directed against the policy of bowing and scraping to German Fascism. The protest movement grew with every day that passed.

In the United States of America, despite the resistance of pro-fascist circles which proclaim the policy of so-called isolationism, the movement in support of Czechoslovakia attained particularly big dimensions. Representatives of organisations of twenty-one nationalities (Czech, Slovaks, Serbs, Rumanians and others) sent messages to the President of the U.S.A., demanding that the Kellogg Pact be fulfilled, and that the system of collective security be put into operation in defence of Czechoslovakia. Similar demands were put forward by representatives of social, trade union and other organisations, and by many outstanding men of science and culture. In a number of towns "Save Czechoslovakia" Committees were established. The meetings, organised to protest

against the new onslaught by fascist Germany, attracted enormous numbers of people. In some of the biggest centres of the country (Chicago) huge demonstrations took place, in each of which hundreds of thousands of people took part.

In France a wave of indoor and outdoor meetings, of demonstrations against the Munich agreement, took place throughout the country. Not only trade union and public organisations, but also authoritative military circles declared the need for supporting Czechoslovakia.

Even in such countries as, for example, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Poland, where an outspoken reactionary regime exists, the masses of the people found ways and means of expressing their sympathies for Czechoslovakia and of coming forward in its defence against the German onslaught. From distant Australia, representatives of the trade unions addressed the Czechoslovak people with a promise of aid in case of war with Germany. The Czechoslovak embassies in the European capitals received an enormous number of letters containing expressions of these sentiments. *Thousands of people expressed their desire to join the Czechoslovak army as volunteers.*

In general there was not a single cultured spot in the world where the just indignation of the progressive sections of the population against the Munich plotters did not find expression.

The popular movement attained particularly big dimensions after the Munich agreement. The masses are increasingly realising the real meaning of the policy of the ruling cliques, which is directed towards retreating before Fascism. The smoke-screen created by the pro-fascist circles and their representatives in the ruling spheres, assisted by a number of reactionary leaders of the Second International and of the International Federation of Trade Unions, and designed to convince people that peace was saved in Munich, is beginning rapidly to disperse.

And it is now easy for everyone to visualise what a tremendous force could have emerged from these movements if the working class of the most important countries, primarily France, Britain and the U.S.A., and the organisations of the international proletariat had taken united and determined action against the robber agreement arrived at in Munich. *This force could have prevented the Munich agreement, could have rendered impossible the crime committed against Czechoslovakia and could have driven the unbridled fascist robbers far back.*

IV

If a deep and careful analysis is made of what has taken place after Munich, it reveals two basic trends in international political development.

(1) The further conduct of the policy expressed in the Munich plot, the *policy of agreement*

between German and Italian Fascism on the one hand, and the imperialist cliques of Great Britain and France on the other; an *agreement* directed against the vital interests of their own peoples, against the poorly protected nations and countries, against the international Labour Movement, against democracy, against the great land of Socialism.

(2) The development of the movement of the working-class united front, of the united front of the peoples against this *bandit agreement*, against fascist aggression, in defence of world peace.

The first trend leads to the division and enslavement of Spain and China, to the enslavement of independent peoples, to the intensification of colonial slavery, to the further unleashing of imperialist war.

The second trend leads to the victory of the Spanish and Chinese peoples over the fascist invaders, to the consolidation of the liberty and independence of the small nations, to the curbing of the fascist aggressors, and to the guaranteeing of world peace.

There can be no doubt that it is precisely *this second trend* that corresponds to the interests of the working class, and of the peoples of all countries. But for it to triumph, it is necessary that reaction at home be curbed in the lands of bourgeois democracy, that the policy of capitulation to the fascist aggressors be stopped; governments are necessary that base themselves on the masses of people, that reckon with their interests and their wishes, governments that are ready to fight against the fascist enemy from without.

But the ruling circles of Britain and France are endeavouring by every possible means to hinder this. They understand only too well that their betrayal of Czechoslovakia, *the further operation of the agreement with Fascism*, on the one hand, and *the intensification of reaction at home* on the other, are *two sides of one and the same medal*.

For the ruling circles of Britain and France to be able to carry through the policy of agreement with Fascism, they need to tie the working class in their countries hand and foot. And they have already begun a drive against democratic liberties, *against the working class and its organisations*.

In France the Radical Party Congress showed quite clearly how the French partners of the fascist aggressors are proposing to carry through the offensive—planned in Munich—against democracy and peace, against the interests of the proletariat and of all working people. The drive against the social gains of the working people won on the basis of the People's Front, the new financial decrees, which place tremendous burdens on the backs of the working people, the attacks on the People's Front, the plans of recognising Franco, and of agreement with fascist Italy aimed at strangling the Spanish Republic, the encouragement of disorders by the fascist bands of

Doriot and De La Rocque, the unleashing of the anti-Communist campaign—all these are links in a single chain. The ruling circles of the French bourgeoisie are, in the most shameless fashion trampling under foot the national interests of the French people against whom their age-old enemy, German imperialism is preparing its blow.

In Britain the partners of German Fascism are seeking for ways whereby to crush the voice of the opposition press and of criticism, so as to prevent the concentration of the democratic forces, to hinder the advance of the labour movement. They are intensifying the exploitation of the working class under the guise of work for "national defence." They have endorsed the seizure of Abyssinia by Italian Fascism. At the time when ever new transports of interventionist troops and equipment are being conveyed to Spain, they prove, with unparalleled cynicism and despite the obvious truth, that Italian Fascism is recalling its "volunteers." They calmly permit the sinking of British ships by the fascist interventionists. They are preparing the enslavement of Spanish people by a new robber agreement with Hitler and Mussolini. They are encouraging the reactionary forces in other countries in every possible way, by deliberately weakening the defensive power of the peoples of these countries against fascist aggression.

The most important lesson of the recent events is precisely that, *unless the reactionary imperialist cliques and capitulators in one's own country are curbed, it is impossible to curb the unbridled fascist brigands, it is impossible to conduct a successful struggle in defence of the liberty and independence of the people and to defend universal peace.*

The defence of world peace, the defence of the peoples against armed fascist aggression, cannot be achieved by wordy pacifist declarations and invocations. *What is needed is active struggle, resolute resistance.* The onslaught of armed Fascism must be countered by the mailed fist of the peoples.

The working class and its communist vanguard is the most resolute and consistent adherent and champion of peace. But this does not at all imply that it stands for peace at any price, that it is willing to hand over its own people and its country to the fascist vultures "in the interest of peace." He who desires the establishment of real and durable peace must employ all possible forces and means to fight against the fascist plunderers and enslavers. He must resolutely oppose the policy of agreement with the fascist aggressors and cast aside capitulators and accomplices of the fascist aggressors, who deceive the people with their false pacifist homilies.

In the light of the international situation that has developed after Munich, the proletariat and the working people of all countries are directly confronted with political tasks of tremendous importance.

These tasks can be put briefly as follows:—

To frustrate the policy of collusion and brigandage between the fascist aggressors and the imperialist cliques of Britain and France:

To offer resolute resistance in countries of bourgeois democracy to reaction which is raising its head and which is aimed at the social achievements of the working people, at democratic liberties and at the labour movement:

To ensure the victory of the Spanish and Chinese peoples over the fascist vultures:

To protect the Czechoslovak people and the peoples of small countries from foreign enslavement:

To render all possible assistance to the working class and the peoples of fascist countries in their struggle against the dictatorship of the fascist gangsters and warmongers.

All these tasks are indissolubly connected. But the Spanish question is of particular and *urgent importance.* Under no circumstances must a *repetition of Munich* be permitted. The application of the villainous Munich method must not be permitted with regard to the Spanish people.

All the necessary forces are at hand for a solution of these tasks. *All that is necessary is that these forces be brought into action.*

It would be difficult in post-war political history to find another moment like the present one, when the interests of the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, when the interests of the small nations, of the dependent and colonial countries, when the interests of culture and science, the interests of peace and democracy so coincided and merged in a common current against Fascism, the worst enemy of mankind. *This is quite a real basis for the establishment of the united front of the working class and of the peoples of all countries against fascist barbarism and the incendiaries of imperialist war.*

V

The decisive role in the establishment of a powerful united front against fascist aggression and brigandage belongs to *the international working class.* The entire course of historical development brings the working class forward as the initiator, organiser, and leader of this front.

The working class is the most advanced class and the paramount force of modern society. Its vanguard unit has won victory on a sixth part of the earth over the dark forces of capitalism, and has built up a new, socialist society. The international working class is supremely interested in finally smashing the chains of capitalist slavery and exploitation throughout the world. It is the most irreconcilable enemy of Fascism and of all reaction, the most resolute and consistent fighter against all oppression and enslavement of peoples, against all kinds of wars of plunder.

The working class is the backbone of the people. Thanks to its decisive role in the productive life of

the country, to its numbers, its concentrated and organised character, it is the staunchest bulwark of the liberty and independence of the country.

The working class is the only class in modern society that is armed with the most advanced science of Marxism-Leninism, with the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that illuminate the path of struggle against the forces of Fascism and war, against fascist barbarism and capitalist slavery.

All this places an *historic responsibility* on the working class. If it is to fulfil its role of initiator, organiser and leader of the common front of all the anti-fascist forces of the world, *it must realise its own strength and be able to make use of this enormous strength to rally together all who work by hand and brain.* Of exceptional significance is the counsel of the great Lenin that the working class needs, first and foremost, to acquire *faith in its own forces*, to smash the accursed prejudice that the peoples are unable to manage without the leadership of the bourgeoisie, without it deciding their fate. *The working class must become profoundly imbued with the consciousness of the need resolutely to take the lead of the popular movement against Fascism.*

The treachery towards Czechoslovakia and the Munich plot once again show most convincingly that the working class cannot place the conduct of *foreign affairs and the defence of the country, uncontrolled* in the hands of a bourgeois government, at the mercy of the imperialist cliques and the financial magnates. Life imperatively dictates the task to the working class that it itself should set about solving these questions. The question of war and peace must be decided by the masses of the people and primarily by the working class. The masses of the people have been regarded in the capitalist countries merely as an instrument in the hands of the ruling classes. They have been hurled into the abyss of war in the name of the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. And it is desired once again to make free with them in the way that pleases the taskmasters of the capitalist countries. But the working class is vitally interested not to place its fate, the fate of its country, in the hands of the ruling classes. *It is time that the wide masses of the proletariat and the people understood that in modern capitalist society there is no force other than the working class that is capable of taking on itself the leading role, the role of true, staunch and thoroughly consistent fighter against foreign fascist invasion.*

The ruling classes, headed by their imperialist upper clique, have in the past made, and now make, their starting point their own mercenary class interests. History knows of dozens of examples when these classes betrayed their peoples, their country to foreign enslavers, so as to maintain their position as exploiters

and their property privileges. The Munich agreement is a new and graphic example in this respect.

The working class has not, and cannot have any interests save those of the people in the struggle against fascist aggression. This follows from the very position of the working class in bourgeois countries. Every blow to the country, to the people dealt by the fascist brigands is primarily a blow to the masses, to the working class. The example of Czechoslovakia is extremely eloquent testimony of this. The capitulatory sections of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, who played no small part in the yielding of their country to be plundered by German fascism, are rapidly finding a common language with this brutal enemy of their country. The blows of fascism are falling with full force on the people, on the working class.

The necessary lessons must be drawn in good time from all this. And the Communists will not tire of explaining to the masses and primarily to the working class, its role and obligations in the defence of their country against fascist aggression.

But for the working class to rally together and consolidate the popular movement against Fascism, it must first and foremost, *establish unity in its own ranks.* The enemies of working-class unity, the enemies of the anti-fascist popular front, whoever they may be, whatever the masks behind which they conceal themselves, *must be ruthlessly exposed and ousted as accomplices of reaction at home and of the fascist aggressors.*

At the present exceptionally responsible moment one must not limit oneself to the mere *propagation* of working-class unity.

To-day already unity must be established in practice, sweeping aside all obstacles in its path. One must not delude oneself that working-class unity can be brought about *without a struggle against its opponents in the ranks of the Labour Movement itself, against the enemies of the land of Socialism, against the bearers of bourgeois influence into the ranks of the proletariat, against the Trotskyites and all sorts of other agents of Fascism.*

There are quite a number of people in the ranks of the Socialist Parties and the trade union organisations who stand for working-class unity, condemn the policy of retreating before the fascist aggressors and are ready to oppose them, as is demanded by the defence of the interests of the working people, by the interests of the peoples whose liberty and independence is menaced by fascism. And the number of such people is growing and will continue to grow. But they only consider it possible to lead their organisations along the path of the united front, along the path of struggle against the fascist aggressors and their accomplices within their own countries, providing it meets with the agreement of the Citrines, the Spaaks and such-like leaders who are stubbornly

opposed to both the cause of unity and the policy of struggle against fascist aggression. They think to persuade these leaders to change their policy by admonitions and exhortations. But this is an illusion, a dangerous and harmful illusion. These reactionary leaders have bound themselves so firmly to the chariot of the imperialist bourgeoisie, that to hold up the establishment of united working-class action against fascism until they deign to give their agreement to it, only means to *lose precious time*, means to sacrifice the interests of the working class, of democracy and peace. *The enemy does not wait.* At every step it makes use of *the absence* of international working-class unity.

The present international situation imperatively demands that the working class, despite still existing differences in its midst, in the ideological sphere and various party political trends, should find *common language as soon as possible* in the struggle against Fascism and operate a *single international policy* that will bar the way to the fascist plunderers and warmongers and guarantee the cause of peace between peoples.

The realisation of the idea that is maturing in the ranks of the Labour Movement with regard to the calling of an *international workers' conference* of representatives of organisations of the working class of all countries would be an exceptionally important, practical step on this road.

Such a conference is necessary for the defence of Spain and China. It is necessary for the protection of the social gains of the working class and of democratic liberties.

It is necessary so as to rally together all forces of the international proletariat against the wrecking course adopted at Munich. An international workers' conference would outline specific measures to *secure* that the declarations regarding aid to the Spanish and Chinese peoples do not remain mere wishes, but would be really carried into life.

Representatives of the vast masses of the proletariat would jointly discuss:—

How in deeds to effect an embargo on goods dispatched to the fascist murderers of women and children in Spain and the *boycott* of the goods of the fascist aggressors:

How in deeds to secure the necessary food for the Spanish people, *how in deeds to secure the return* of the gold belonging to the Spanish Government which is withheld by the Bank of France, and the release of frozen Spanish credits in various countries:

How in deeds to secure for the Spanish Republic the right and possibility to purchase all that it needs for its existence:

How in deeds to prevent belligerent rights being granted to Franco, the hangman of the Spanish people:

How in deeds to secure the stopping of intervention in Spain and the withdrawal of the fascist troops of Italy and Germany which are carrying on their brigandage there.

Such a conference will be able to mobilise all the

forces and resources of the working class and of international public opinion to secure the most speedy victory of the just cause of the Spanish people.

Finally, such a conference would help to establish the much needed united action of the working class itself, to establish a *single and correct international policy for it*. And it would give a powerful impetus to the development of the united front of the international proletariat and of the peoples against fascism, against the unleashing of a second imperialist war.

Let it not be said that the calling of an international workers' conference is an impossible thing.

True, the agents of fascism, the pro-fascist anti-communist elements, the enemies of working class unity will do everything to prevent such a conference. But the millions of organised workers, all working class leaders who are true to their class and their people and understand the need for united working class action, and for rallying all the anti-fascist forces regardless of organisational and party affiliation, will stand for such a conference.

The fascist dictators and the representatives of imperialist cliques are conspiring among themselves *against* the interests of the working class, *against* the interests of the peoples and the cause of world peace.

Why cannot representatives of the workers' parties and organisations come together and settle matters *in the interests* of the working class, *in the interests* of the peoples and of world peace? Why could not the Labour Movement of all countries unite its forces against Fascism, the common enemy of all working people, of all mankind?

Why cannot representatives of the organised workers of Britain, France, Spain, China, the U.S.A., Scandinavia and other countries, jointly with the workers of the Soviet Union come together at an international conference and invest the great cause of international proletarian solidarity with *real, effective strength*?

Now after Munich, all these questions face every working-class organisation, every worker, every leader of the Labour Movement. They compel them to ponder deeply.

And the only correct reply to all these questions is to cast aside the rotten arguments of the saboteurs of united action and to take practical steps to establish a world front of the international proletariat and of the peoples against Fascism.

VI.

Proceeding from this conviction, and basing itself on the will for unity of millions of advanced workers throughout the world, the Communist International has endeavoured to utilise every, even the slightest possibility and has not missed a single appropriate opportunity to achieve united action of the international working class. It would be useful now to

call to mind the most important concrete steps of the Communist International in this direction.

When the fascists came to power in Germany, the Communist International, in February, 1933, addressed a proposal to the Second International regarding joint action against fascism. When the Spanish proletariat, in 1934, rose up with arms in hand against the monarchist-fascist reaction, the Communist International, in October, 1934, proposed to the Second International to carry through a joint campaign in aid of the Spanish proletariat.

In April, 1935, the Communist International proposed that joint May First demonstrations be carried through against fascism and war. It wrote at that time about the danger of the outbreak of a new imperialist war, and about the need to muster the forces of the international proletariat against the German and Japanese warmakers:

"The C.I. has invariably promoted the agreements between the Communist and Socialist Parties for the joint struggle against the common enemies of the working class in all capitalist countries. Events have happened lately which *demand imperatively*, beyond national confines, the *joint international action of the working class*. The re-introduction of general conscription by the fascist Hitler government; its war threats against Lithuania and the other Baltic states, against Austria, and especially against the Soviet Union; the acute intensification of the danger of an imperialist war instigated by Hitler Germany and its allies, military-fascist Japan and fascist Poland."

When the immediate danger of an onslaught by fascist Italy hung over Abyssinia, the Communist International, on September 25, 1935, issued a call for common action against this onslaught. In the appeal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International to the Second International, it stated in this regard:

"The Seventh Congress of the Communist International instructed the Executive Committee of the Communist International to approach the leadership of the Labour and Socialist International with the proposal to establish international unity of action of the proletariat. We know that your Executive Committee decided fundamentally to examine the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International before adopting a position on the question of unity of action. And in order to give you this possibility we wished to wait somewhat before making our concrete proposals for negotiations on this subject. *But the international situation is so strained, the danger of the outbreak of a new imperialist war is so menacing and so close that there is not an hour to lose.*"

When the war against Abyssinia flared up, the Communist International once again proposed to the Second International to organise joint action by the international proletariat against the war.

In connection with the fascist revolt in Spain, the Communist International, in October, 1936, made a proposal regarding the adoption of urgent measures for joint action on behalf of the Spanish people. After the nefarious bombardment of Almeria by a

German naval squadron when the intervention of German and Italian Fascism began to assume wide dimensions, the Executive Committee of the Communist International repeatedly instructed its representatives, the French Comrades Cachin and Thorez to communicate with De Brouckere, chairman of the Second International, with a view to establishing permanent contact and to employing joint efforts for the establishment of a united front of the international working class. On June 3, 1937, the Communist International, at the request of the Socialist Party, trade unions and Communist Party of Spain once again proposed to the Second and Amsterdam Internationals to organise joint action of the organisations of the international proletariat against fascist aggression. On June 26, 1937, after the fall of Bilbao, the Communist International repeated its proposals.

On May 1, 1938 the Communist International once again proposed to the Second International to establish united working class action in the struggle against Fascism.

A few months before Munich and also *directly* preceding the Munich plot, the representatives of the Communist International approached De Brouckere, the chairman of the Second International with the proposal to establish permanent contact between the leadership of the international organisations of the working class and urgently to take joint action to ward off the fascist blow aimed at Czechoslovakia and the cause of world peace.

However, all these proposals were turned down. That is how the leadership of the Second International acted under the pressure of its reactionary, anti-Communist wing, under the pressure of the enemies of the united front.

This policy, of course, was and is cordially welcomed by the fascist aggressors. It renders it easier for them to enslave the working people in their own countries and to attack other peoples and countries. Every day the events of international life adduce ever new proofs of the ruinous character of the policy of splitting the labour movement which many reactionary leaders in the ranks of the Second International and of the International Federation of Trade Unions obstinately continue to pursue.

It would be incorrect to assert that the Second International and I.F.T.U. have not officially occupied themselves with questions of the struggle against fascist aggression, with questions of aid for the Spanish Republic. They have adopted many resolutions, and several of their leaders have made quite good speeches in this regard. But there is a *gaping void between these words and the actual deeds.*

Thus, for example, at a joint conference of the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions, held on June 24, 1937, the following decision was taken:

"To employ *all possible means* to exert pressure on the governments of States belonging to the League of Nations, so that the latter may render assistance to the Spanish Government in restoring its political and territorial independence.

"To demand the restoration of freedom of trade so that the Spanish Government may be able freely to purchase arms:

"To extend the clear obligations of solidarity in relation to Republican Spain to *all members and all the respective organisations belonging to both bodies.* (My italics—G.D.)

In March 1938, at a joint session of the Executive Committees of the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals, a still more determined resolution was adopted. It was stated in it that the Internationals

"demand action of all their sections so as to render immediate and effective aid to Republican Spain and its heroic struggle against fascist aggression. They must be ready to support the French and British Governments in all measures of a *moral, political, financial, economic and military character*, which should prove to be necessary for preparing the end of German and Italian intervention." (My italics—G.D.)

Such are *the words* of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. But *in deeds* the decision taken at this very session regarding the organisation of meetings, demonstrations and other measures to mobilise the masses and public opinion in defence of the Spanish people, was not carried out. The parties of the Second International and the organisations of the International Federation of Trade Unions were not mobilised to put into practice the resolution adopted.

These decisions make it an obligation on all the organisations and all the members of the Socialist Parties to carry them into life, but *in deeds* the governments of a number of countries led by Socialists, by members of the Second International, and Socialist ministers in governments act directly contrary to these decisions. At the time when the Second and Amsterdam Internationals were adopting the resolution regarding the need to apply sanctions of an economic, political and military character, *socialist ministers* were speaking in the name of their governments at the League of Nations in favour of the annulment of Paragraph 16 of the League Covenant which provides for such sanctions. The Socialist Spaak, Prime Minister of Belgium, who used most shameful government orders for the persecution of International Brigade volunteers and for the *expulsion of emigrants* who had fled from the fascist plague in Germany and Austria, stubbornly sabotages all support for the Spanish people, is striving to secure the recognition by Belgium of the fascist government at Burgos and truckles in every way to the fascist pogrom-mongers of Berlin.

The Socialist ministers in the governments of the Scandinavian countries are in duty bound to carry through the decisions of their International. Nothing could prevent the governments of these countries from

selling to the Spanish peoples all that it needs for its defence against Italian and German bombing planes, to save the women and children of Spain from the death-dealing fascist bombs. But *in deeds* the governments headed by the Socialists have not only failed to do this, but they keep frozen the credits of the Spanish Republic with the aid of which it would be possible to save millions of Spanish children and their mothers from starvation.

In Great Britain, a number of leaders of trade unions and the Labour Party who play a decisive role in determining their policy, in contradistinction to the growing sympathy and support of the Spanish people by the British workers, give their Government the possibility of using the hall-mark of non-intervention to stifle Republican Spain. The very same Labour leaders who sang the praises of Chamberlain when he flew to Berchtesgaden and Munich, continue to oppose unity of the international working class and joint action by it in support of the Spanish and Chinese peoples.

The French Socialist Party, one of the leading parties of the Second International, at one time, particularly when its representatives were at the head of the Government of France, possessed wide possibilities of carrying the decisions of the International into life. But the Party leadership did not make use of these possibilities.

One could continue further to describe the crying contradiction between the *words and deeds* of responsible representatives of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. But what has been said is quite sufficient already.

Yet the facts testify that numerous units of the working class want *in deeds* a determined struggle against Fascism, want real aid for Spain and China. They show the leaders of their organisations how the fight should be conducted against Fascism, how the forces ought to be united for this struggle.

A splendid example, one which will go down as a glorious and heroic page in the history of the struggle against Fascism, in the history of the struggle for unity of the ranks of the working class, is provided by the *international brigades in Spain*. The battalions of volunteers made up of German, Frenchmen, Britishers, Canadians, Americans, Italians, Poles, and men of the Balkans and many other peoples, which covered themselves with undying glory in the battles against Fascism, were made up of Communists, Socialists, and a number of other anti-fascists. Adherence to different political parties did not prevent them taking up arms and coming to the defence of the cause of all advanced and progressive mankind. *They really wanted to fight against Fascism.* Herein lies the secret of their unity and the secret of their success. And it is clear to everybody that he who really wants to conduct a struggle against Fascism

will not seek for endless excuses to disrupt united action by the working class.

Millions of workers stand for the policy of active support of Republican Spain. They denounce the policy of "non-intervention" and demand its annulment. They seek to secure for the Spanish Government the right to purchase arms and demand the withdrawal of the interventionists. They share their crusts of bread to aid the women and children of Spain. The big resources that have been and continue to be gathered in various countries in aid of the Spanish people speak more eloquently than any words of the fraternal international solidarity of the working people.

When the seamen of three Swedish steamers refused to transport supplies for the insurgents, when the workers in a number of countries refused to load military supplies and goods for the fascists, they showed an example to the leaders of the trade unions and Social-Democratic Parties of *how to act*. Among these seamen there were undoubtedly people who belonged to various political parties and who had different viewpoints on many questions. But they *really* wanted to fight, and united on the basis of **common** action against the fascist insurgents and interventionists, who are sowing death on Spanish soil.

One can find many such examples. And their number would be *immeasurably greater* if this *action* was led and organised by the corresponding working-class organisations. Every day brings fresh proofs of the growing readiness of the units of the working class to employ increasingly effective measures so as to put an end to the policy of their governments which are helping to strangle the free peoples and are encouraging the fascist aggressors.

Alive in the minds of millions of workers is the *experience of the struggle against the counter-revolutionary intervention, directed against the Soviet Republic in 1918-1920*. The working class at that time compelled the bourgeois governments to retreat, and these were compelled to abandon the dispatch of troops and military supplies, and the open support of the whiteguard counter-revolution. The proletariat of the capitalist countries achieved this by their determined action. The refusal to load and transport troop and supply ships, strikes of workers, meetings and demonstrations, the refusal of soldiers to fight against the Land of the Soviets and revolts on warships and in expeditionary units—all this helped the workers and peasants of the Soviet country finally to crush the interventionists.

This historic experience shows how tremendous are the forces possessed by the working class, and how it can frustrate intervention directed against a **people** fighting for its liberty and independence.

The Communists, basing themselves on the entire

experience of the struggle of the international proletariat, and proceeding from the great tasks which face them, will join with all supporters of the united front in the ranks of the Second International and the Trade Union International in waging a still *more energetic and tenacious* struggle for the fighting unity of the ranks of the proletariat both in separate countries and on an international scale, will wage an unswerving struggle for the anti-fascist people's front. The obstinate resistance of the saboteurs of the cause of unity cannot stop the Communists and all other supporters of the united front from fulfilling this *historic task*, on the solution of which depends the success of the struggle against fascist reaction within the capitalist countries and against fascist onslaught from without.

There can be no insurmountable obstacles to the achievement of the united action—so much needed—by the international working-class movement. Let there but be a sufficiently clear understanding by the working class itself of the need for such unity and the firm, unshakeable will to bring it into being despite all obstacles. *The whole question is to bring this unity about as rapidly as possible and to ensure a firm basis for it.* And then the fascist incendiaries of war and the reactionary cliques in other countries will receive a complete repulse and be doomed to inevitable defeat.

* * *

The fascist aggressors are beating the drums regarding their "Munich victory." They are making furious preparations for new bandit conspiracies and crimes. They are helped in this by the worst enemies of the working class and of Socialism in the bourgeois democratic countries. Men of little faith, capitulators, cowards bow their heads before fascist jack-boots.

But the fascists are celebrating prematurely. Their "victory" is a *Pyrrhic victory*, a victory which is fraught with defeat for them. They have engulfed Austria, but millions of the Austrian people hate them. They have seized the Sudetenland, but have roused the wrath of the peoples of Czechoslovakia to the uttermost limits against themselves. They have crushed Czechoslovakia, but have roused all small nations against themselves. They are shedding the blood of the Spanish people, but twenty million Spaniards pronounce the name of the German interventionists with anathema.

The fascists, by their effrontery, are rousing the whole world against themselves. By their revival of the monstrous obscurantism and inquisition of the Middle Ages, by Jewish pogroms which far outdo the most sanguinary deeds of the "Black Hundreds" of Tsarist Russia they are calling forth the most profound indignation of mankind. By their brigandage

and conquests they are undermining the ground beneath their own feet. And the hour of vengeance will come. A united working class, together with the genuinely democratic forces of the peoples are in a position to curb the fascist violators and warmongers, and together with their own peoples to crush Fascism.

There are not, nor can there be, such forces in the world as can turn the wheel of historical development back. The future belongs not to rotten declining capitalism and its poisonous foul-smelling cesspool—Fascism; but to ascending Socialism, towards which are turned the eyes of all working people, of the whole of advanced mankind.

THE ANTI-JEWISH POGROMS

SOME years before Hitler's coup d'état, the world was shocked by the horrible deeds of two German murderers, Haarmann and Denke. Those were single cases of depravity, but to-day such things are universal in Germany, and a part of the Government's policy.

The methodical extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jews who were unlucky enough to be Germans was officially inspired and carried out with Prussian thoroughness. It has been more terrible than anything in history. Nero's persecution of the Christians, the burning of heretics by the Inquisition, and the pogroms of Tsarist Russia are nothing compared with the German Fascists' murderous campaign against the Jews. In cold blood, not in some crazy outburst, the Nazis have condemned hundreds of thousands of defenceless people to a terrible end. They have revived the philosophy of barbarism in the very centre of Europe. They have put under State management the crime which Haarmann and Denke committed, and made its perpetration the duty of every citizen. Goering, chief huntsman of the Reich, and his pack are hunting human beings. Their ancestors in the forests of primeval Germany considered it dishonourable to kill defenceless people. The German Fascists seem to have gone back to the violence of the barbarians, but not to their code of honour.

In Paris a seventeen-year-old Jew shot a representative of the State where Jews are proscribed. This young man's parents are starving in no-man's-land. Together with 15,000 other Jews and Poles, they were torn from their beds, herded into cattle trucks and driven towards Poland to an accompaniment of kicks and blows. They were met at the Polish frontier with a salute of guns. Bullets drove them from the German frontier. A prey to the cold, to hunger, and to death, they wandered to and fro between the two States. Fifteen thousand people faced a terrible fate in no-man's land, mocked by the German Press, which considers it a joke that men and women, old people and children should meet their deaths between two States for no other reason than that they are Jews. Their frightful cry for help died away at the baize doors, behind which sat refined Englishmen and amiable Frenchmen, representatives of the world of culture. The result was a desperate resort to arms, to shout from the housetops the truth which the world had refused to admit, namely, that German Fascism dooms not only 15,000 human beings, but

every human standard to no-man's land and to extermination.

This desperate boy resorted to arms because he had lost all faith in the power of words, but the leaders of the Nazi terror were really responsible for his deed. The doors of the German Embassy were opened with amazing rapidity to this seventeen-year-old boy. An outlaw was able to rush straight into the closely guarded study of a fascist diplomat. He was given an opportunity to fire his shot unhindered. Three thousand francs were found in his pocket. The results of his shot had been carefully prepared. The German fascists know how to drive people to desperation, and they also know how to use that desperation in their own propaganda. The men who organised the attacks on Barthou, Dollfuss, Lessing and many others doubtless knew how to fit an enemy whom they had almost driven mad into their plans.

The news of the shooting of a German diplomat was quietly received by the German people. Violent deaths have been common in Germany of recent years. Fascism's trail of blood leads from the coup d'état to the assassinations of June 30, 1934, and on to the murders of brave Liesel Herrmann and of other anti-fascists. There is nothing about the violent death of a fascist diplomat to arouse the people particularly. But the fascist Führer demanded "fury of the people." The fascist gangs were let loose.

At their leaders' orders, they broke into and plundered every Jewish shop. They entered Jewish homes, smashed everything to matchwood, and took away the valuables. They set fire to synagogues, and massacred in the streets people who looked Jewish. They made Jewish women and girls lie down on the pavements, and marched over their bodies. Their leaders, in the words of their own Horst Wessell song, "were marching, in spirit, in their ranks." The fascist leaders applauded, and announced that this was only a prelude, only a dress rehearsal, to whet the appetites of their followers. This inhuman and premeditated destruction was followed by the so-called "fury of the people," from which the German people, disgusted and ashamed, stood aside. The corpses were not cold, the trampled women had not risen to their feet, before murder and robbery received official sanction. In Vienna, 10,000 Jews were imprisoned. In Munich, 6,000 Jews were driven out of their homes and given twenty-four hours to quit the Reich. They received neither passports nor visa—their cards,

they were told, were the only papers they would get. In Munich, all bakeries and provision shops were forbidden to sell to Jews. Orders were given throughout Germany that no Jews were to be admitted to theatres, cinemas, cafés, restaurants, swimming baths or parks. The Jews were ordered to repair immediately, at their own cost, the shops which the Nazi had smashed, and to replace doors and windows, so as not to shock foreigners. The insurance companies were forbidden to pay out money to Jewish claimants. Jews were advised to liquidate all independent businesses and resign all leading positions within fourteen days. Employers were ordered to sack their Jewish employees. Finally, a so-called indemnity of one milliard marks was imposed on the Jews.

Calculated vandalism and premeditated madness are too terrible to describe in words, because words are the medium for describing the actions of human beings. The peace which the English gentlemen set their seal to at Munich has already broken out in Germany, and its brutality is inhuman.

Before the rescuer flew to its aid, German Fascism was down and fighting for breath. For that it is now taking its revenge. Before Munich, the German people had, for the first time, seen the executioner's hand tremble, and the German fascists had felt, as never before, the hatred and disgust of the people. They felt the awakening of the people, and they felt the desire of hundreds of thousands for an opportunity to desert to the armies of democracy. German soldiers took tanks to the Czechoslovakian soldiers as a present from the anti-fascists of Germany. German soldiers on the Western Frontier refused to fight the French. Germans forced to work on the completion of fortifications openly announced their intention of joining the French army as volunteers. There was unprecedented excitement and hope amongst the mass of Germans. After Munich, the German fascists carried out reprisals for the trembling of their own hands, and for those first rays of freedom's light which had penetrated to the German nation.

Their revenge falls on the whole nation, not only on the Jews. If the leaders of one of the murder gangs discover that their followers are turning away from them in disgust, they try to close every path which might lead them back to an honourable and decent life. In the same way, the German fascists are trying to associate the whole German nation with their own terrible deeds in the eyes of the world, and to brand the whole people with infamy. They are counting on the world believing that a

massacre carried out on orders by a few thousand bandits is a national movement. They are counting on the world holding the whole German people responsible for the unspeakable vandalism of a well-drilled gang of murderers. They mean to blacken the Germans before the whole world, and thus preserve their power over them. The Nazi leaders have proclaimed triumphantly that the German people is universally hated. They go on to say that Germany does not desire to be loved, but to be feared. Their outcry has revealed their plan to use the world's disgust to isolate the Germans from the civilised nations. The blood of harmless Jews is to be used to bind the German people to the fascist murderers. Moreover, those in power in Germany intend to extend their barbarous persecution of the Jews to other countries, so as to strengthen reactionaries and prepare the way for German imperialism.

In the face of this terrible plan evolved by the German fascists, every decent German must protest against the anti-Jewish pogroms, and defend the German people. The nation of Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Humboldt must not be lost in an orgy of fascist bestiality. The fascists shall not succeed in silencing the German people, and reducing them to their own level.

The persecution of the German and Austrian Jews has aroused great indignation throughout the civilised world. In the United States and in England, the whole nation is protesting against the barbarians who are defying all human standards and dishonouring Germany. The colonial peoples have realised what is in store for them if they are handed over to Germany. They and every other nation whose independence is threatened by the Nazis have seen the misery which awaits them if they do not defend their freedom with vigour.

The terror which followed Munich is now to be extended to the Catholics and to "Aryans" who oppose the fascist massacres. The Nazi leaders have proclaimed their intention of plunging the whole world into chaos if Germany's crazy actions are checked. Actually, the opposite is true. The world will be saved from the barbarism which the Nazis call peace only if the peoples put an end to the fascists' massacres.

The unprecedented persecution of the Jews which has followed Munich demonstrates that Fascism cannot be weakened by concessions, but can only be checked by firm resistance. These pogroms should be a terrible warning to all nations, and make them get together in a world-wide alliance against Fascism.

WHITHER IS DALADIER LEADING HIS PARTY AND FRANCE ?

ON September 29, in Munich, Daladier trod underfoot the Pact of Mutual Assistance between France and Czechoslovakia like a scrap of paper, and signed what has rightly been called the "Abdication of France." A month later at the Marseilles Congress again he treated like a scrap of paper the vow taken on June 14, 1935, with which the Radical Party sealed the alliance of the middle classes with the working class to defend Democratic liberties against Fascism. For Daladier the laws which guaranteed to the workers all that they had achieved in the bitter struggle of 1936 have also become scraps of paper, the last decrees suspend the decisions of Parliament. And finally the programme and the traditional progressive principles of the Radical Party, on which is founded its influence on the middle classes and on sections of the working class itself, have also become scraps of paper.

In this symbol of denial and betrayal, Daladier, who hitherto had gladly posed as a "Jacobin," presented himself in Marseilles as the spokesman of the "Two hundred Families," of that "oligarchy" against which the fighting traditions of the Radicals are directed. And behind this oligarchy could be seen the shadows of the men of Munich, Hitler, Mussolini and Chamberlain, who fear nothing so much as the successes and the effects of the People's Front on the whole world, the hopes and stirrings which it arouses among the oppressed peoples. Daladier openly fulfilled his obligations to his Munich partners when he declared furious war on the People's Front and aimed his most vicious blows and slanderous accusations at the working class, the backbone of the People's Front, and the Communist Party, its most ardent champion.

The saddest spectacle at this Thirty-Fifth Congress of the Radical Party at Marseilles was the systematic obstruction and the organised howling which the notorious gangsters of Marseilles raised against all those speakers who dared to defend the purest traditions of their Party. Albert Bayet, who had the courage to denounce the "Pacifism of fear and cowardice," can tell a tale of this. One could almost say that it was sufficient to mention the principles of the great French Revolution, to stand up for the ideas of Democracy and Freedom, to call to memory the February days of 1934, in order to be "out-lawed" at this Congress of the Radical Party. They were decidedly fascist customs that were shown at the Congress of this Party which has so often broken

a lance for the freedom of opinion, the press and of meetings. One might almost believe that in Marseilles they wanted to apply Goebbels' "direction" "The year 1789 must be erased from history," and many delegate said bitterly that the Radical Party had allowed Fascism to "build cells" within it.

Nothing less than the whole authority of Herriot was necessary in order to give the Congress to understand that Daladier's policy was leading the Radical Party to Fascism, that is, to its own suicide as a party. At the Congress, Herriot gave expression to the desires of the middle-classes in town and country for closer unity with the working class, the fortress of democracy and of the independence of France. At this Congress, at which real discussion was impossible, Herriot was able to say:

"Without the unity of the middle classes and the mass of the people, our Party will suffer bankruptcy ;"

and

"Without the help of the working class it is impossible to get France on her feet again."

It was Herriot too who spoke against the policy of isolating the Soviet Union and for the maintenance of the Pact between France and the Soviet Union. Only by staring Daladier straight in the face was he able to compel a weak nod of agreement. And when Herriot praised the attitude of Roosevelt during the crisis, and in his closing appeal pointed with emotion to the Austrian and Czechoslovak Republics on the one hand and to the republics of China and Spain on the other and cried:

"How many more examples do you need in order, at last, to make you reflect a little ? Will you sacrifice Freedom ? Will you give up the political conditions which are founded on it ?"

Then one felt at this Congress the breath that still animated the Radical Party.

In the days following the Congress it became still clearer that the mass of the Radical Party was in no mind to allow to Daladier his arbitrary measures against the Party and against France, to that Daladier whose desire is to use their Party as a screen under which to carry on the policy of Flandin, Tardieu and Laval, of Reaction allied with Fascism.

At the Congress, Daladier declared, "The People's Front exists no longer." But after the Congress, Daladier could see that the People's Front, even though sentenced to death, was by no means dead. So then he brought the Party Executive, by thirteen votes to six, to the decision that the Radical Party should

withdraw from the People's Front. But numerous organisations of the Radical Party replied by strengthening their loyalty to the People's Front! Daladier had forgotten one small thing, that the People's Front is no voting agreement, not just an alliance of different Parliamentary factions, but a *mass movement*, and that the masses have been *convinced by their own experience* that only by their unity in the struggle have they been able to ward off Fascism until now, and that only by still more unified and more energetic struggle will they be able to achieve victory over Fascism.

In the Radical Party, demonstrations of sympathy with the People's Front are on the increase. The Radical Party, which holds itself to be the axis of the whole political life of France, can play its part only in understanding with the working class that to-day has at its disposal a united C.G.T. (French Trade Union Congress) 5,000,000 strong. If the working class *alone* under present conditions cannot triumph over Fascism, then the middle classes *alone* are even less able to do so. And it is this community of interest which is the foundation and the strength of the People's Front and is embodied in the closely woven net of local mass organisations throughout the whole country.

The enemies of the People's Front had counted on introducing the seed of dissension in the C.G.T. in order to break the People's Front. But they miscalculated. The Declaration which the C.G.T. issued actually during the Radical Party Congress, in answer to the slanders of Daladier against the working class, was Daladier's first failure. It was as if Daladier received a box on the ear in the middle of the Congress from this truly proletarian declaration in the name of the workers of France, who through their struggle have made France a leading power for social progress.

A second warning for Daladier and the *Comité des Forges** was the unanimity with which the C.G.T. Congress at Nantes opposed the Emergency Decrees and decided on the General Strike. Further warnings are the wave of strikes and mass demonstrations passing over the whole of France; the strengthening of unity of action between the Communist and the Socialist Parties; the strong protest of the ex-Servicemen whom the "Two Hundred Families" again tried to use as a shield against the workers; the declaration of the retailers and craftsmen expressing their solidarity with the proletariat; and finally, the increase of aid on a mass scale for the Spanish Republic.

When, in the face of this determination and will to fight the *Temps* declares that: "The Communist Party, the Socialist Party and the C.G.T. are the

opposition to-day," one can only smile, for it could just as well be asserted that the majority of the nation has joined the opposition. The truth is that the union of national forces now taking place occasions profound differences in the Radical Party itself, the Parliamentary Party being already split into three groups. The swaggering Daladier who is not afraid to speak in the name of his country cannot even say with safety that the majority of the Party of which he is President, is behind him.

In spite of, or rather because of, the opposition that he feels rising against him, Daladier declared that he would go on "to the end." Where is this "end" then, that he would so gladly reach? Certainly, in order to get there quicker he has taken the path of the miserable Decrees for liquidating all achievements of the People's Front, worsening the conditions of living for the middle classes as well as for the work-classes, the path of suppression of democratic liberties. In order the quicker to reach this end, Daladier's Government is still silent in the face of the monstrous Nazi pogroms which have called forth a storm of protest from all democratic Nations. Does not the introduction of a press-censorship which would allow Hitler to bludgeon and poison French public opinion also lie on this road? Does not the agreement which Daladier presented to the French people between France and Hitler Germany, belong here also?

Is it not a sign of the times that Daladier was only able to secure a majority in the Financial Committee by the threat that he would "put off" the visit of the English Prime Minister? Is not that the best proof of the fact that in reality Chamberlain directs French finances? And when Daladier declares that the present strikes of the French workers against the Emergency Decrees are directed against his foreign policy, is not that the best proof of the fact that between him and Chamberlain and Hitler there exist agreements over the wages, the hours of work and the right to strike of the French workers? How otherwise could he describe these problems as problems of Foreign Policy? Is this the "end" to which the people of France are to be led?

The growing movement of the French people gives room for hope that in spite of the advice and warnings of Downing Street and the Wilhelmstrasse Daladier will not reach this end but will stop by the way—to the benefit of France and of Democracy.

Daladier who wept at the fighting in 1934, Daladier who got drunk with words when it was necessary to organise the struggle against the "Two Hundred Families"; Daladier who to-day postures as an imitator of Napoleon so that no one shall see that he is only a puppet of the *Comité des Forges*, of Chamberlain and Hitler; Daladier dishonours France before the whole world.

* Employers' organisation of heavy industry, representing the most powerful reactionary section of finance capital.

SPIES OF GERMAN FASCISM IN THE U.S.A.

FOR several weeks a number of German spies have been in the dock in New York. From this case, readers of the daily reports of proceedings could obtain the picture, already pretty notorious, of Germany's widespread spying activity. They saw that German fascist agents spare neither trouble nor money to get acquainted and conversant with technical and military units in the U.S.A. German spies were steadfastly working to gain possession of plans of construction, sketches, and chemical formulae. And in New York it was also shown very forcefully that wherever they work, the spies of German Fascism lend a specifically anti-Soviet note to their activity. The spy Rumrich organised the theft of American passport forms, with which agents were to be equipped for entry into the Soviet Union, and which would probably have served also, as was the case in Holland recently, to equip provocators and assassins. The facts established by the trials of **Rights and Trotskyists in the Soviet Union**, regarding the unity and collaboration of the German fascists with the Trotskyist wreckers, were also confirmed by the results of the proceedings in New York. The dirty fingers of German Fascism are at work in provoking quarrels between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. Is not one involuntarily reminded, when reading of the admissions of Rumrich, of the hypocritical hysteria of the Goebbels press and its foreign offshoots whenever the Soviet Union brings to book spies and wreckers who are the holders of foreign passports? Before the New York court it was proved once again, how the German fascist wolves try to sneak into the Soviet Union in the sheep's clothing of honest "foreign citizens."

Together with actions that can definitely be put down as spying, affecting the army, air force, navy, and industry, others were brought to light which give testimony, beyond the borders of the U.S.A., of the methods by which the fascist agents constantly strive to influence the political events in their "field of work." The Berlin wire-pullers of espionage and the fascist propaganda which is harmonised with it, are filled with deep scorn for the points-of-view, opinions and wishes of other nations. They are impatient that their power does not reach far enough to build concentration camps on the German pattern in other countries, to burn and ban newspapers and books, and to introduce the fascist order of things everywhere, into everything, by force. In order to some extent to make up for this shortcoming, certain agents are installed whose job it is to tamper with public opinion. Two birds are to be killed with one stone: the acquisition of fresh contacts for spying,

and the bringing of pressure on politicians and journalists by nursing personal influence, holding evening receptions, and by outwardly harmless club life. His connections with Henry Ford, with the Press king Hearst, and other pillars of American reaction, gave Griebel, the leader of the German spy net in the U.S.A. who fled the country in good time, many opportunities of exercising direct influence on American political life. He was active in opposition to Roosevelt, even the wireless was at his disposal, and presumably at his instigation many lesser reactionary agitators and snakes-in-the-grass were at work—people operating similarly to the printer Heperle, reported arrested on November 13 for having printed and distributed quantities of anti-Semitic incitements prepared from German copies of the notorious *Stürmer*, the purpose of which was to influence the elections in the interest of German Fascism. In the trial mention was again made of the smuggling of anti-Semitic "literature," which was sent to the U.S.A. in large quantities in the big German liners. The German fascists hold this kind of export to be their special "right," on which they stand as on the "right" to open international mailbags on trans-oceanic ships, examine their contents and make copies of them. One of the employees of the spy ring actually had the face to claim the right of extra-territoriality for smuggling anti-Semitic fascist compositions, and for spying activity. Nowadays "extra-territoriality" means in German, immunity for gangsters in diplomatic uniform and their accomplices. One can scarcely draw a line between their accredited diplomats and their secret agents. The name of that gentleman of spying, Papen, whose adventures during the world war in America gave him an impossible reputation, now pops up again in the sphere of spying. Papen is busying himself alternately as Reichs-Chancellor, Minister, Envoy, and specialist in the deception of Catholic political circles. And even yet, as shown by his being named in the New York trial, there are threads leading from his person to the spies. The ambassador Dickhoff obviously played a similar role as official abettor of the agents in the U.S.A. like, in his time, his colleague Welzeck did in Spain, in whose hands a mass of threads accumulated, of espionage, fascist propaganda, and preparations for an uprising. The names also turn up of specially-commissioned persons like Wiedemann, who have to make, through special political missions, vital political offer or enquiries, and are at the same time transmitters of directives to the military spies and fascist "propagandists."

This broadly based work of the German fascist

agents in the U.S.A. is only a part of the great, methodically conducted campaign of German Fascism against the U.S.A. "Spokesman and vanguard of Judaic Bolshevism" is the title used by the *Völkischer Beobachter* (November 26) for the U.S.A. and it is known that descriptions of this nature are the forerunners of an intense vilification. The German wireless is conducting a campaign against "Yankee Imperialism." In official publications, *e.g.*, in the "Deutsche diplomatisch-politische Korrespondenz," every political measure of the Government in the U.S.A. is automatically made the occasion for an attack. What is the purpose of such conduct? Formerly the Goebbels propaganda asserted that the U.S.A. must not meddle in European affairs. But now it is becoming clear enough—Germany is fighting for the dominating position in South America. For German imperialism the South American States are simply colonial areas. Germany, explains the "Deutsche diplomatisch-politische Korrespondenz," makes the assumption that she is entitled to take part in the "opening up and development" of the "great open spaces" in South America. These words about coincide with the ideas now being disseminated by German propaganda regarding the colonial exploitation of Africa. For its African programme the fascist regime looks for concrete support from Chamberlain. For realising its South American programme it sees as an essential condition the discrediting of the U.S.A. in South America, the weak-

ening of the military strength of the U.S.A., and the furthering of reactionary tendencies in the United States. To hinder the collaboration of the North and South American States is, for Berlin, a step nearer to the exercise of unlimited pressure on the internal affairs of the South American States, for the "promotion" of which there exists a particular bit of machinery, the "Ibero-American Institute" (known for its military and political paper in the Spanish language, which played an important part in preparing the war of intervention in Spain).

For undermining the United States of North America, tried specialists have been installed by Berlin, and it is no accident that these are chosen from the ranks of the old terrorists and the "Freikorps"—like the terrorist Schultz and the notorious Manfred von Killinger, who has won himself sorry fame as a butcher of the workers and an organiser of White gangs. (Von Killinger coined the phrase "Peitscht das Mensch aus!"—literally, "Scourge the man to death"—"the man" being a woman who had been taken prisoner and raped).

Considered from this point of view, the trial of the German spies in New York takes on something more than episodic significance. For it now appears as the exposure in public of a tiny section, albeit most meaningful in its tininess, of the prodigious underground struggle which German Fascism is consistently waging to repress and sap the U.S.A.

SCHOOLS IN HITLER GERMANY

"IT is the function of education to equip the pupils with the views and sentiments of an enlightened humanity." So runs one of the first principles established by Wilhelm von Humboldt in school teaching. German Fascism has seen to it that nothing remains of this principle. The cane and the barracks, physical and spiritual drill, have made their way into the school. To-day any attempt to equip the pupils with the views and sentiments of an enlightened humanity would be crushed, since the task now set is that of "forming and strengthening bodily and spiritual energy in the service of the fighting spirit and the will to self-assertion, equally in boys and in girls." (*Völkischer Beobachter*, 7/6/1937).

In building the youth into soldiers, Fascism does not confine itself to the male sex; nor does it wait till the young people come up for military service, to start their military training. Whilst yet school children, boys and girls are likewise brought up in fealty to militarism and war fever. "School subjects

and lecture courses are both given over to the cause of training for defence. The concept of defence is welded into one inseparable unit with that of home and race, which adjusts the whole education and forms the real teaching principle of all education" (V.B., 7/6/1937).

For this "adjusted" school curriculum, "adjusted" teachers are also necessary. The former training of teachers does not suffice fascist needs. The aim of school education has certainly altered under Fascism. In the Germany of to-day what interests the rulers is the promotion of a very carefully defined "knowledge." To this end the knowledge of the teachers has to be "overhauled." So there were set up so-called "overhaul centres" in which during the school holidays all teachers are instructed in the principles of fascist education. In these "overhaul centres" are held courses in military training, in national sport, in surveying, shooting, cartography, etc. and lectures on the Nazi Party, racial questions,

sterilisation, on political teaching in the elementary schools and on political affairs.

That which is presented to the teachers in the "overhaul centres" as worth-while knowledge, they must relay to the children with strict discipline. "Discipline, even in the classroom, need not play Cinderella to learning," so run the directions of Lieut.-General Horst von Metsch. One may wonder how a Lieut.-General of the War Ministry comes to be able to give orders to the teachers. But in fascist Germany everything, including culture and education, is made subservient to war preparation. So it is no wonder that even the compiling of school curricula is not left to the highest school authorities nor to the Ministry of Education alone, but that the Ministry of Defence has the decisive say therein.

Now let us glance quickly through a few of the subjects as taken in the schools, beginning with the German lessons.

One would suppose that German lessons are given in order to impart to the children an understanding of the German language in speech and in writing. But for that one would need a textbook written itself in good German. "*The Story of Adolph Hitler*" (by Annemarie Stiehler) cannot satisfy this condition. She certainly tries to show off little Adolph as an example to be followed, but with the German language—in fact, with ethnology and geography too—she is but poorly acquainted. Amongst many other blunders in style we find in this book, in a description of the world war, the following passage: "The Japanese, who live far away in Asia, also joined in, then the Americans and other small States, which dwell in the very farthest parts of the world. . . . And when he (Hitler) heard that war had arrived, he first gave thanks to God . . ."

So the children learn that war is something rather like a Christmas present, they learn that the small states also have a home, which one must break into if one wants to be a proper young Hitler, but in the meantime the German language suffers. At least they can comfort themselves to think that the "Fuehrer" is also at sea in this language.

But perhaps in spite of this they do learn how to construct a German sentence? The press of the Hitler Youth has published a small booklet containing only samples by children under fourteen. Among them is the following report: "I am about to turn round . . . a whistle. I run and scream out. The Roll Commander comes up. The others plunge into the hay again. Everything is over very quickly. In front of us two forms can be seen, trying to disappear. Already they are surrounded and killed. Those were Hummel's messengers. Our runners now spring off in the direction "Fighting-line," West door diagonal. We squat in the gutters and wait. Again two come. Everything ducks. The garrison mes-

sage is delivered. The Roll-Com. slinks back to the hay-loft and snoozes till the next whistle." That is the new German style of writing, of children steeped in Fascism.

In the history lessons the Germans are called the "Moulders of Europe." How could it be else? "The physical and spiritual (?) qualities of the Germanic races made a deep impression on the Latins," so it goes in the *History for Elementary and Preparatory Schools*.

The impression must have been much enhanced when the Romans experienced the deception of the Germanic chiefs, when the vandals plundered and burned down Rome and the Barbarian tribes laid waste to Italy. Perhaps in these days one should add: The appearance of the German fascists made such a deep impression on the Roman fascists that they, too, adopted the practices of anti-Semitic cannibalism.

Alongside love of their own country, hatred for other nations is fostered. Noteworthy is the campaign against the bourgeois democratic countries, and against France in particular. In national politics, it is true, the campaign against France was pushed into the background for a short while after Munich, by the public gratitude which Hitler expressed to Daladier, but the children at school are still taught why France is the "mortal enemy."

In the history book already quoted, treating of the Franco-German war of 1870-71, we have: "With envious eyes the French watched the growing power of Prussia. But whereas Prussia's territorial growth was necessary for national considerations, France was attempting conquests on the Rhine in a simple quest for power and prestige." And in the colonial question, too, which since the Munich betrayal has come very much to the fore, Fascism works up the youth against France. *Wille und Macht*, the leading organ of the Hitler Youth, wrote on January 15, 1937: "Therefore we must answer the question, whether France vitally needs so vast a colonial empire economically, in the negative. She could live equally well without colonies. A strong sea power, dividing France from her colonies, could impose its will upon her." In the *Deutschlandfibel*, Alsace, among many other territories with German-speaking populations, is described as a "German state." Even an excuse is found for "liberating the German brothers in Alsace, in that apparently "benighted France" has set itself to wipe out all the Germans "who live in Alsace-Lorraine."

And what fascist novelties are to be found in the arithmetic lesson? Do they perhaps calculate by how many per cent. taxes have been increased under Hitler the dictator; or to what degree prices have risen? Oh no! They do not worry over such "materialistic" questions. Instead it is thought

suitable to let the children work out the flying time of day-bombers which can travel at 280 kilometres per hour, and of night-bombers which can travel at 240 kilometres for the journeys from Breslau to Prague, Munich to Strassburg, and Cologne to Metz. Nowadays the sums are of the following order: "A flight of 46 bombers drops incendiary bombs on an enemy city. Each plane carries 500 bombs weighing 1,500 kilogrammes apiece. What is the total weight of the bomb load and how many fires are started, if one third of the bombs make hits and fires are started by twenty per cent. of the hits only?"

In physics and chemistry too, they deal not with scientific problems of social value, but simply and solely with destructive elements; with incendiary materials and explosives, with means of chemical warfare like vesicants, asphyxiants, etc. The actual textbook of physics, published by Chief Director of Studies, Dr. Guenther, under the title *Wehrphysik* (The Physics of Defence, Frankfurt, 1936), has been adopted by the Reich Education Ministry and approved by the Reich War Ministry.

Like a red thread running through every school subject are racial hatred, insults to other nations, war preparedness and militarism. It is perfectly clear that this type of schooling gets the desired response neither from the teachers nor from the children and parents. Anger at the fascist school method is already so keen that the *Völkischer Beobachter* of November 18, 1938 is compelled to state that people are used in Germany "to see the school as an opportunity to amass knowledge, which each individual puts to whatever use may accord with his capacity and preference. This idea being several hundred years old it is painful to some people, affected by wrongly conceived "veneration," to see it "debased" to a problematical, or at any rate a disputed, matter." Yes, the school in Germany is debased, it is so deeply debased that capacity and industriousness have no meaning any more. German youth can no longer learn anything in school, it can acquire no more knowledge. Even the much disputed "individuality" of the human being has gone into the melting pot in Germany. Fascism's current ideal is

to promote not "individualities," but rather "types." Types, as they were formed "by the military upbringing in the old cadet institutions, as they were turned out by the brave education of the Middle Ages, but which were subsequently betrayed to oblivion as 'too carnal' and 'too crude' by humanist spiritual fanatics." These "forms proved to be richly useful and successful," Fascism wants "to fill them with its content." That is true for the elementary as for the higher schools.

But apart from these there are in Germany two further special kinds of schools: The "National Political Institutes of Education," founded and run by the Reich Minister of Education, Rust, the inspector of which is S.S. Chief Group-leader Heissmeyer, and the "Adolph Hitler Schools," which Robert Ley and Baldur von Shirach started. Whilst Dr. Heinrich Olms grandly declares in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in reference to the "entire school system"—"National Socialism is not fundamentally inimical to culture," he says in his further utterances that the Adolph Hitler Schools and the National Political Institutes of Education alike have the same general object: "Training instead of amassing knowledge."

Added to this calamitous condition of the German school system is a chronic shortage of teachers. Even the fascist *Studenten Pressdienst* of August 27, which has no kind of interest in publishing the real facts, had to admit: "The dearth of elementary school teachers grows ever greater. Whereas in Prussia in 1936 only 285 school posts could not be filled, this number rose in 1937 to 870, and by reliable estimates will reach 1,500 by the end of 1938. In the other provinces of the Reich the situation is exactly repeated. In the whole of the Reich territory the numbers of unoccupied teaching posts in elementary schools are: 1936, 1,335; 1937, 2,038; 1938 the figure may perhaps reach 3,500."

Even this brief report on the fascist school system confirms most clearly Gorki's declaration: "Fascism is the offspring of bourgeois culture, a cancer that has already lapsed into rotteness and decay."

HENDRIK DE MAN—HIS PATH AND HIS AIM

SHORTLY after the betrayal at Munich which threatens the democratic liberties of all countries, there took place the Conference of the Belgian socialists at which there was a very full discussion of the Foreign Policy of the Belgian Government, for which the Premier, Spaak, is responsible. Both Spaak and de Man spoke at the debates on this subject and both spoke, among other things, in favour of recognition being given to the Spanish Rebel Government of Franco. They also had a word to say on behalf of an "understanding" with German Fascism as a continuance of the policy of "neutrality" which they had approved and implemented and which in fact only plays into the hands of the fascist war-criminals.

This is a sufficiently important reason for giving somewhat closer attention to de Man, who is one of those reactionaries in the working-class camp who in theory and practice have long smoothed the way for Fascism.

In their settlement of accounts with Höchberg and his comrades Marx and Engels wrote in their circular letter addressed to Bebel :

"These are the people who, under pretence of continual activity, not only do nothing themselves, but also attempt to prevent anything at all from being done, except talking; the same people whose fear of taking any action in 1848-49, hindered the Movement at every step and finally brought about its downfall, the same people who see a reaction and are then astonished to find themselves in a blind alley where neither resistance nor flight is possible, the same people who try to confine history within their own petty bourgeois horizon and over whom history passes on, each time, to the order of the day."

This description is borne out in part in Hendrik de Man. He is the son of well-to-do parents and, just before he left school, he joined the Belgian Socialist Movement in the desire to raise the "poor, helpless, uneducated workers" to the heights of the educated bourgeoisie. Like the German Social Democrat, Paul Göhre, a parson by profession, he worked for a time as a factory hand but found himself uncomfortable when surrounded by dirty hands and considered how it might be possible to overcome dirty hands in factories without touching Capitalism. The young student who had read Voltaire and Rousseau and who spoke and wrote four languages was unhappy about the "rough" and "uneducated" workers to whom Voltaire was a book with seven seals. But they have other cares. Far in advance of him they possess a consciousness, which de Man could never acquire in the whole of

his political activity, class-consciousness. They united in the Socialist Party. They carried on a political struggle against the infamous capitalist system which looks on the worker as nothing but a tool with the gift of speech and allows him to exist only within such limits. Nevertheless, Hendrik de Man who never acquired the proletarian outlook but remained full of bourgeois prejudices, joined the Socialist Youth Movement in 1905, not in order to fill it with socialist spirit and socialist energy but to introduce into it those accomplishments which to him had meant happiness and fortune from his University days onwards.

At the time when reformism flourished most luxuriantly within Belgian Social Democracy, he wrote, together with de Brouckère, a treatise on the Socialist Movement in Belgium, in which he, too, threw light on the morass of reformism. But he answered the question, what was to be done, in the spirit of the petty-bourgeois socialist: "The problem which we are facing, is a problem of education." And that was all. That was the invitation to the workers to lay aside their "rough proletarian passions" to acquire under the leadership of educated philanthropic bourgeois "good tone" and "good taste." The World War put an end to his "reclamatory efforts."

There is a film which shows how a man lost his memory as a result of the Great War. With de Man the opposite was the case. Immediately on the outbreak of the war he remembered that he was a sprig of the bourgeoisie. He joined the army and became an officer. In 1917 he went to Russia in order to move the Russian workers to further "resistance." They held out, but not in the way that de Man had expected. Their "holding out" was a mighty historical reckoning with the capitalists, bankers and landlords. And this reckoning bears the proud name: The Socialist October Revolution.

But de Man had never before imagined the way to Socialism to be like this. When, with the end of the war, the flame of revolution flared up in yet other countries in Europe, the "humane" de Man, now suddenly become a pacifist, stayed no longer in Europe. He fled before the glare of revolution to the new continent and there hurried from country to country forever looking behind to make sure the Revolution was not still following him.

However, when the Counter Revolution stabilised itself in Germany, thanks to the help of the reactionary Social Democrat leaders, de Man went to Ger-

many, settled himself firmly in the lovely scenery of Darmstadt in order to dedicate himself, in ten years of contemplative quiet, to "theoretical" work. At the same time he lectured at the Workers' College in Frankfurt-on-Main. Thus in 1926 appeared his book *On the Psychology of Socialism*. In this he produced a distorted caricature of Marxism in order to "refute" it. Greatly rejoiced, the bourgeois hacks cried: "At last a correct refutation of Marxism!" Here scientific Socialism is only "social knowledge in the service of socialist conscience." Here he jeers at the workers and writes: "The working class is socially at a disadvantage because it feels itself to be so, not the reverse," a sentence which the Nazi, Ley, repeated dozens of times after 1933. But already in this book, peace at any price was set up to be the most important and immediate task of Socialism. For the rest, the book drips with nothing but "Justice" and "Righteousness" and "Divinity of Conscience." In his mechanistic outlook de Man is reminiscent of the metaphysics of a Büchner or a Häckel, and, in his psychology, of Freud and Bergson.

De Man "studied" and went on writing. In 1931 he was already so far advanced as to come out with a criticism of *Abuses of Democracy*, to attach himself to local and professional organisations of "Self-government" and to appeal to ancient legends. As one sees, he was marching in step. But with whom? With Hitler and Goebbels.

In 1933 the German workers, whether they were socialists or communists, were routed by the fascist bandits, murdered, thrown into concentration camps. The books of the finest minds were burned on funeral piles. But de Man's works were protected by Goebbels, as he himself was, watching peacefully and unmolested from his Darmstadt study these events, without his "social" conscience being touched. Yes, he can describe himself as the only "socialist" who, under the fascist dictatorship of Hitler, was invited to continue his lectures at the University of Frankfurt. Thus under Hitler appeared his second great work, *The Socialist Idea*. In this he called for the dissolution of legislative assemblies and the placing in power of commissars with extensive personal authority. This is what Hitler did in practice.

De Man returned later to Belgium in order to develop his notorious "Plan." The *Peuple* of December 1, 1933, reported of him that he was sympathetically taken up in circles of finance and heavy industry. And in order to dispense all doubts about his character de Man described himself, in the *Peuple* as a "safety-valve." That was, and is, the substance of the "practical Socialism" which de Man presents to the workers as Columbus' egg.

Then came the time when, because of the capitulation of the Western Democracies, Hitler's threat to the small States became more and more serious. Instead of supporting Collective Security more strongly, de Man and Spaak supported a policy of "neutrality" for Belgium, in which they named the bourgeois democratic states and the fascist dictatorship in one breath and went on to flirt quite openly with the fascist dictatorship.

The Munich betrayal followed. De Man published an article in the issue of the *Peuple* of October 31 in which, with assertions that mock at historical experience, he spoke on behalf of an understanding with the fascist robbers. He called for nothing more nor less than capitulation to Fascism. He demands this in the name of that "Freedom" which Fascism has always destroyed wherever it has been victorious. Until now, only those people have argued thus who were consciously playing into the hands of Fascism and who openly made known their sympathy with it.

At the Belgian Socialist Party Conference Spaak and de Man went a step further. They again spoke in favour of recognising Franco and even went so far as to assert that this would be in the interests of the country. But for de Man and Spaak the interests of the Belgian working class and of the mass of the Belgian people are not the interests of the country.

In order to defend the policy of Spaak's Government, de Man asserted even that its activity was concerned with "sacred interests of the working class." De Man apparently sees such a "sacred interest" in the handing over of German anti-fascists to their executioners. Finally de Man went so far as to demand that in "necessary co-operation" with the fascist states, the Belgian people should make necessary sacrifices. The peoples of Czechoslovakia have only just learned the nature of these sacrifices: loss of independence and freedom, dismemberment of the country, fascist slavery. Of such a nature are the ideas of the "freedom" which Spaak and de Man defend.

Hendrik de Man speaks continually of "Socialism." But to-day the word "Socialism" in his mouth means no longer the demand that the worker should behave himself politely, but the demand that he shall not resist Fascism. The blood-dripping hands of the German fascists appear to the scion of the bourgeoisie less dreadful than formerly the "unwashed" hands of class-conscious miners appeared. As a youth Hendrik de Man set out to conquer Marxism. Ideologically he became a forerunner of Fascism. His way leads to Hitler Germany, his aim is the surrender of the working class before the fascist aggressor.

THE VICEROY AND THE GROUSER

THE German fascists are now taking vengeance for a shot attaché. At the same time their Japanese blood-brothers hunt a grouser. To their regret the people whom they pursue this time are not any longer in the land of the living, but figures of world literature whom they can neither persecute nor behead—William Tell, who shot the "Viceroy" Gessler, and Hamlet, the immortal "grouser."

Schiller's "William Tell" was banned from the repertory in Germany, and Shakespeare's "Hamlet" was prohibited in Japan.

World literature is an indictment of fascist barbarism. The ghosts of the German classics haunt Germany as did the ghost of the murdered Danish King, who appeared to young Hamlet and called to him angrily: "If thou hast nature in thee, bear it not!"

The voices of the great masters—Lessing and Herder, Goethe and Schiller, Heine and Humboldt—warn the German people to protect their culture from contamination. Hamlet's words are appropriate: "Well said, old mole! Canst work i' the earth so fast? A worthy pioneer!" The fascist rulers feel that the spirit of the old German culture undermines the ground of their dictatorship.

"Nathan der Weise," by Lessing, is a striking indictment against the Jew-baiters. The all-embracing humanity of Herder clearly brands the bestiality which holds sway in Hitler Germany. Goethe's ideal of world citizenship and Schiller's call for freedom in "In Tyrannos" ("Against the Tyrants") are in harsh contrast to the existence of the tyrants devilled by the fascists.

For some time past Schiller's "Don Carlos" has been disdained because its recognition of freedom of thought again and again called forth demonstrations against the regime. After the occupation of Austria "William Tell" was also taken from the repertory because the opinions expressed in it were "hostile to the State."

The fascist dramatist, Moeller, who manufactures S.S. pieces for the theatre, wrote in the periodical "Wille und Macht" ("Will and Power") that "William Tell" is a drama of "separation" because it glorifies "the breakaway of Switzerland from the old empire." And Gessler was not a bailiff but a "Viceroy," William Tell not a hero of freedom but an "assassin," while the upheaval of the Swiss people against foreign rule is "a separatist crime."

This breath of freedom which blows towards the people out of "William Tell" struck fear into the German fascists. That is clear.

Gessler, the bailiff, compelled the Swiss people to

consider a hat on a pole as an emblem of "His Highness," and to uncover their heads as they passed the emblem. He was a harmless dilettante of suppression compared with the "Viceroys," who, under the emblem of the Swastika, humiliate the people. Yet Gessler was condemned by the people and his citadels destroyed.

The words of Schiller become an actuality:

"Hollow is the ground under the tyrants;
Counted the days of their rule;
Soon their trace will be nowhere to find."

Could an Austrian remain indifferent to the effects of these words? And what fascist official can allow William Tell to point with his finger towards Germany and explain to his son: "There neighbour cannot trust neighbour." And what "Viceroy" has the nerve to listen to the words of William Tell to the dying Gessler: "Free are the huts, safe are the innocents; you cannot harm the people more!" And when Armgart lifts her children to show them "how a bloodthirsty villain dies." And when a peasant threateningly calls to Knight Harrass, who was not yet an S.S. leader: "Your rule is at an end! The tyrants fall! We do not suffer tyranny any more! We are free people!"

Is it not a direct challenge to the Austrian worker, peasant and citizen when the old Attinghausen conjures his countrymen: "Keep close together, firm and for ever; no place of freedom should be closed for anyone. Be united, united, united!" Is this not a call for a united front of the Austrian people against the foreign dictatorship, and is it not a solemn promise of the German people that sounds out of the drama to the conqueror:

"We will be one people of brethren,
United in every trouble, danger.
We want to be free as our fathers were:
Rather death than slavery!
Let the bills of the tyrants grow, till
One day they all pay together!"

This is the language of the national fight for freedom against foreign rule. The German imperialist dreads this spirit. He cannot allow the voice of the dead poet to say what the living people feel. He does not desire that the fall of a "Viceroy" on the stage should announce the inevitable fall of the fascist bailiffs.

Frederick Schiller died, in time, a century ago and escaped the concentration camp. German Fascism cannot put him, but only his works under the knife. Still it would be advisable to eliminate the Schiller monuments and to replace them by those of the

“Viceroy” Gessler. To make it more comprehensible it could be given the features of a Mr. Buerckel, or one of the other fascist bailiffs.

While the German fascist can prove incontestably that William Tell shot down a “Viceroy” the Japanese are not able to charge Hamlet with definite crimes against the Japanese State, for instance, any collusion with China.

But we have to admit that Hamlet is extremely suspect, not only as a foreigner, but in general. Hamlet thinks too much. Thinking is unhealthy. In Japan they are against thinking. Moreover, Hamlet is without doubt what the German fascists call a “Miesmacher.” He is lacking in smartness; he feels “the time is out of joint” and it is his task to set it right. His point of view about military undertakings, the war of conquest and occupation, is completely critical.

A captain in the service of a belligerent prince, Fortinbras, reports that his chief carries on a war of conquest that brings “no profit but the name,” and Hamlet scoffs at this “roguery.” He sees in it “the imposthume of much wealth and peace, That inward breaks and shows no cause without why the man dies.” He muses on “. . . the imminent death of twenty thousand men, That, for a fantasy and trick of fame, go to their graves like beds.” Such musings are not fit for goading on the patriotism of Japanese soldiers. On the contrary, these words come from the heart of many of them. Besides, it is absolutely impermissible to ask in Japan at present such questions as “To be, or not to be; that is the question.”

The Japanese people could snatch up such

questions and express through them their doubts and anxieties. These doubts and anxieties are becoming so great in Japan that the Japanese military circle is afraid that the people might see in Hamlet the interpreter of their own moods and try at the end, with less hesitation than Hamlet, to set to rights the time that is out of joint and to change a world in which one endures what Hamlet brands as “The pressure of the mighty, the ill-treatment of the proud, the wantonness of the officers who render services to the unworthy.” This is why the Japanese military clique have decided to ban Hamlet as an undesirable alien.

It will not escape the attention of fascist authorities that many other figures of world literature have no place in a fascist state. How easily one could confound the bloody Macbeth with the fascist dictators. How easily one could see in Mephistopheles an instigator of the Reichstag fire. How easily one could charge Antigone with criminal humanity. How easily one could see the brute Caliban as the personification of Fascism. How easily one could cheer Odysseus returning home as the liberator from vile blackguardism. How easily one could recognise in Dante’s Inferno the terror of the fascist underworld.

World literature contradicts the autarchy of vileness that Fascism has established. Hamlet will only return with those who establish a world in which one is allowed to *think*. William Tell will be in the midst of the people when they break the citadels of Fascism and when they prepare for the “Vice-roys” the same fate as they prepared for Gessler.

THE MUNICH CONSPIRACY AND THE DUTCH

THE dismemberment of Czechoslovakia caused the greatest uneasiness in all the small states in Europe. In Holland, too, the earthquake of European politics is being felt more and more plainly. Until after the World War, the Dutch bourgeoisie carried on a so-called policy of independence. After the war the Dutch bourgeoisie turned towards the League of Nations and undertook the obligations of the League Covenant. Inside the bourgeois camp there were two tendencies with their roots in the past, one towards England and the other towards Germany.

The leading group up to now, representing Finance and Colonial capital, has been the one with the bias towards England. The group which looked to Ger-

many has, during the past few years, created and supported the fascist party in Holland. This party has the closest connections with German Fascism.

In the face of the threats of German Fascism, which regards Holland as a “Border German” region and the Japanese advances towards the East Indies, the widest circles in Holland calmed themselves with the assumption that England would never permit Holland to be seriously endangered. Had not the English Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin (now Lord Baldwin) declared that the frontiers of England were on the Rhine?

This mood has been profoundly shaken by the Munich conspiracy. The leading section of the Dutch bourgeoisie supported Chamberlain. In the

fateful days of Munich the Government withdrew still further from the policy of Collective Security because this, as the Foreign Minister declared, might lead to "great conflicts." At the League of Nations Assembly the Dutch delegation declared for "Neutrality" and against the retention of the obligatory character of Article Sixteen of the Covenant of the League. This attitude, which was described as a return to the so-called "policy of Independence" meant in fact support for Hitler. At this time the Government carried out no military measures; only the frontier guards were kept under arms and it was emphasised that this was the case not only on the German but also on the Belgian frontier. It was only a day before the conversations at Munich that a further partial mobilisation was carried out. Parliament was not summoned and was not able to discuss the change in Foreign Policy. Only when the mobilisation took place was there a short session to approve credits for this purpose. The bourgeois opposition to the reactionary government was very weak. The Social Democratic Party also approved the credits.

The fascist wing of the bourgeoisie and the Fascist Party produced the slogans, "Holland must be the bridge between Germany and England." "A North German Alliance must be created." None the less, after the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia there was great concern even among adherents of the Fascist Party. The Leader of the Fascist Party, Musert, saw himself compelled to send the Premier, Colijn, a telegram in which he declared himself ready "to defend National Independence against all attacks."

While a great part of the bourgeoisie turned as before to Chamberlain, among the masses there arose ever-increasing opposition to the traditional policy.

For this reason the two historical groupings of the bourgeoisie, the one looking towards England and the other towards Germany united in an attack on the democratic rights of the masses and especially on the working class. The victory of German Fascism aggravated the general reactionary tendency in the bourgeoisie. One section of the reactionary Catholic press already demanded that the Democratic-Bourgeois Parties should take the example of Munich to heart and come to an "agreement" with the Musert Party. The rapidly ripening economic crisis also plays a great part, driving the sections of the bourgeoisie, for whom Colijn's Policy of Deflation does not go far enough in the direction of Fascism.

Opposed to this fascist development of the bourgeoisie is the anti-fascist development of the vast mass of the common people.

During the European crisis the Dutch people

showed an extraordinary interest in politics. The attitude of the masses turned against German fascism which in general was regarded as provoking war. The illusion that Holland was a peaceful island amid the towering waves collapsed. Among all classes of workers there was stirring a determination hitherto unknown to defend the independence of the country. National and Democratic sentiments were more strongly manifest in the army, too, where the majority of soldiers did not conceal their enmity to German Fascism and numerous officers took up a democratic attitude. Against this there were admittedly other feelings, fear of war and petty bourgeois hopes that Holland, by remaining neutral, might avert the danger.

The working class was more conscious than before that the workers and the mass of people must unite in order to check Fascism. None the less, great sections of the working class were not clear on the fact that the Government policy was assisting Fascism. The general feeling of relief after Munich was followed gradually by disappointment which, in the face of the persecutions of the Jews in Germany, rose to passionate animosity.

In the critical Munich days Dutch Social Democracy took up a better attitude than Social Democratic Parties in many other countries. It opposed the Foreign Policy of the Government and openly advocated a policy of collective security. It stigmatised the treachery of Chamberlain and Daladier, sharply criticised the policy of Faure and Blum and directed no attacks against the Soviet Union at this time. But at the same time in these perilous days the Social Democratic leaders allowed no kind of United Front. It did not demand the summoning of Parliament although it had the opportunity to do this and it neglected to organise any mass campaign.

None the less, among the masses of the working class, Social Democratic and Communist workers came very close to one another. Many Social Democratic workers attended Communist meetings and declared in discussions that the necessity of Unity was now clear to them.

The Communist Party appealed for unity against the fascist menace to the country, issued a warning against Chamberlain's policy and fought against the Foreign Policy of the Dutch Government. The Parliamentary fraction issued a public declaration to the Premier and demanded measures against the fascist organisations which support Hitler, democratisation of the army, democratic reforms in the East Indies, defence for the civil population, work for the unemployed and increase of Unemployment Relief. Finally the fraction demanded the immediate summoning of Parliament.

As in many other countries so in Holland, the

Munich conspiracy produced conflicting tendencies. On the one side reactionary elements were encouraged to make new advances, on the other side the anti-fascist movement among the masses was strengthened. In this situation it is of decisive importance that the working class should unite in order to secure the co-operation of all forces ready to defend Holland against Fascism, that the working class lead the nation in its struggle for freedom and independence. It became more and more clear to the workers, to the Catholic and Jewish employees and honest democrats that German Fascism was a direct threat to them and that the policy of "Neutrality," that is of isolating Holland, called forth the greatest dangers. The working class is in a position to make the widest masses of the people conscious that only a government supported by all the democratic forces in the country, which co-operates internationally with all forces which resist German Fascism, can maintain the independence of Holland. Such a government can find a powerful ally in the millions of people of the East Indies if it recognises their

rights to democratic freedom and regards them as equally privileged citizens of the State. The movement of the East Indian people for solidarity with China and its movement of opposition to Japan has reached a tremendous scale. It is here that the Dutch people can multiply its forces in the struggle against the fascist menace.

The Dutch Social Democrat, Albarda, condemned the Foreign Policy of the Dutch Government and stated that the so-called Oslo Powers (Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Norway) are a power to be reckoned with once they renounce the disastrous policy of "Neutrality," of capitulation to the fascist aggressors. If the Social Democratic Party would draw the conclusions and, through working class unity and the combination of all democratic forces would open a determined struggle for a re-organisation of Dutch politics, the decisive step towards the safety of Holland would be taken. The Communist Party of Holland, at all events, will leave no stone unturned to bring about this political revolution.

FORWARD ON THE FRONT OF THEORY!

THE Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published, towards the middle of November, a resolution entitled: "On the Form of Party Propaganda in Relation to the Publication of a 'Short History of the C.P.S.U.'"

This resolution, which we publish in full in this issue, is a document of fundamental importance. It not only demands a reorganisation of Communist propaganda in the Soviet Union, but is primarily a carefully studied, rousing appeal to all communists not to treat Marxist-Leninist theory as a thing to be preserved in museums but to employ it as our most important instrument of struggle.

The unity of theory and practice, the harmony between revolutionary knowledge and revolutionary action, has always been the "secret" at the basis of the historical victories of the Bolsheviks. The great Party of the Bolsheviks has always transformed reality by means of the resolute application of revolutionary theory, and has always tested and re-tested revolutionary theory by reality, and thus developed it to higher stages.

While in the Social-Democratic Parties Marxism was like a museum piece which was only brought out on high days and holidays, in the hands of the Bolsheviks it was always a banner in the struggle, a weapon that never rusted and whose flexibility increased with its weight. As Comrade Stalin told the delegates of the Sixth Congress of the C.P.S.U.:

"There is a dogmatic and a creative Marxism. I adhere to the second."

The resolution of the Bolshevik Central Committee is devoted to the preservation and further development of this creative Marxism-Leninism which has not become lifelessly embedded in print, but has developed in the course of struggle.

The greatness of a party which has built Socialism upon one-sixth of the earth's surface also gives this document its definite stamp. What other party in the world so straightly calls things by their right names, so openly demonstrates the errors and deficiencies in its own ranks, so candidly criticises its own insufficiencies, so powerfully strikes at the very root of the evil and then at once drives so forcefully towards a change?

Enemies had found their way into the Party. It was to their advantage to damp down the flaming spirit of Marxism-Leninism by means of bureaucratic measures, and to replace it by dogmatism and pedantry. Lethargic bureaucrats and "purely practical people," immersed in day-to-day questions,

aided them, directly or indirectly. The self-satisfaction of many comrades, who, with justified pride, looked back upon the many marvellous triumphs of the Bolsheviks, but who derived from this the inaccurate conclusion that now victory was decisively assured, produced the pre-requisite conditions for neglect of theoretical work, for a certain stultification of propaganda.

Many of these comrades did not keep in step with the swift development of Socialism in the Soviet Union, with the growth of a new socialist intelligentsia, with the tide of new tasks and problems which beset each member of the Party. The full current of Soviet democracy was sweeping through all institutions of the Soviet state. Ever wider masses of the people were participating in the management of the State. Young Stakhanovites and young collective farmers were becoming directors of factories and other concerns. Millions of young people were getting a scientific education. The struggle against the enemy with a hundred disguises, the problem of the capitalist world surrounding their country, which had deeply penetrated the consciousness of the Soviet people, aroused them to the need of all-round political education. To inculcate all these people, active in the constructing of Socialism, with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, so that Bolshevism becomes part of the very fibre of their being—such is the definite task of the present day.

The fulfilment of this task is served by the *Short History of the C.P.S.U.*, and by the Resolution on the Form of Propaganda.

The desire to learn, the bold resolution to tackle the most difficult tasks, and the firm conviction that no difficulty is insurmountable, these are the distinguishing features of the cadres of Socialism in the Soviet Union. Marxism-Leninism is a science. One can make oneself thoroughly familiar with it; one can master it as one can any other science. It is nobler, more interesting and more vital than any other science.

But the approach to this science was guarded by all kinds of pedants, quibblers and pundits who juggled with quotations and paraded formulas they had learned by heart, thus discouraging and over-awing people who were eager to learn. They aroused in the minds of many the idea that Marxism-Leninism was inaccessible to them, that their natural intelligence and capacities were inadequate for the mastery of this difficult subject.

In this connection, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. states :

“The belief in their power and capacity to master Marxist-Leninist theory must be restored to the Communists.”

True, Marxism-Leninism is not a science which one may acquire effortlessly, but every thoughtful communist is capable of penetrating its meaning and applying its findings to his activities. And he is all the more capable of so doing when he encounters “Leninism in Action,” in studying the history of the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, when, gazing back into history, he realises how theory was developed in struggle, and how the struggle of the Bolsheviks translated theory into fact. The history of his Party, in this manner, becomes for him the history of the great creative ideas of Marxism which have changed the world and which will continue to change the world.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leading Party of the Communist International, is also of great significance for the communists and revolutionary workers in capitalist countries. Naturally one cannot mechanically apply it to the international working-class movement, but one can and one must utilise its essentials. Its *text* is for the communists in the country of Socialism triumphant, but its spirit applies to all Communist Parties.

It is the theory of Marxism-Leninism which is here concerned. Never before was it so important to strive for this theory to become part of the very fibre of all communists, so that we may view all world events in its light and, through its brilliance, attract to us new men and new sections of society. Fascism is carrying on a barbaric war of extermination against the working class and its revolutionary science. The bloodshot mists of Fascism's savage ideology are whirling over Europe. In the fascist countries youth is brought up to brutality, ignorance and the glamour of meretricious adventure. Without realising it, other persons are infected with this—people who are not fascists. The poison of fascist propaganda percolates even into the working-class movement. The imperialistic acts of violence of German Fascism, the occupation of Austria and of the Sudetenland, have been approved in principle by some social-democrats. German Fascism's insolent claim to subjugate all German-speaking people is not opposed with sufficient force by some anti-fascists. The cancerous growth of Germany's war economy has actually been characterised by some socialist “theorists” as progressive. Fascism's campaigns against the Soviet Union have been directly or indirectly supported by some socialists. In leading social-democratic circles Marxism is made responsible for the defeats of the working class, a new revisionism is being preached

which, in actual truth, is nothing other than ideological surrender to Fascism.

While, on the one hand fascist ideology is beginning to influence some anti-fascists, we may note, on the other, that new individuals and social strata are beginning to take a stand against Fascism, and are earnestly endeavouring to feel their way through to a sound anti-fascist ideological standpoint. We may observe such efforts, not only among social-democrats, but also among democrats, Catholics and non-party people, in whom their horror of Fascism has evoked a deep process of fermentation.

Many of these people regard Communism with traditional antagonism. Nevertheless, they will listen to what the communists have to say ; they have not made up their mind from the outset to reject Communism lock, stock and barrel. They are receptive to any light which may show them the path from out of the darkness of Fascism. Rarely has there ever previously existed such ideological confusion; but rarely also were there ever so many people who were prepared to accept a new, clear ideology which pointed towards the future.

In the light of this ideological confusion, then, and this search for a sound anti-fascist ideological attitude, the communists are faced with the great and welcome task of *developing fundamental and comprehensive propaganda for the teachings of Marxism-Leninism*. It is to-day no longer merely a matter of *agitation*, in order correctly and effectively to elucidate questions of the moment, but also, and to a greater extent, of *propaganda*, of the multifiform and vital application of the great basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

We communists can only fulfil this task if we are not submerged in the daily struggle, if we are able to respond to the decisive requirements of the day in all spheres of life. To be capable of this we must study the life-work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, must familiarise ourselves with the history of the working-class movement, and, above all, with the history of the Bolsheviks ; we must continuously extend and deepen our knowledge.

On the importance of the fundamental study of Marxism-Leninism in the practical struggle of the proletariat and of the people, Comrade Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International said :

“We Communists are people of action. Ours is the problem of practical struggle against the offensive of capital, against fascism and the threat of imperialistic war, the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. It is precisely this *practical* task that obliges Communist cadres to equip themselves with *revolutionary theory*. For, as Stalin, the greatest master of revolutionary action, has taught us, theory gives those engaged in practical work the power of orientation, clarity of vision, assurance in work, belief in the triumph of our cause.” (“The United Front,” pp. 123-4, Lawrence and Wishart).

Those engaged in practical Party work must not answer that they have no time. When that great Bolshevik, Kirov, once asked one of these Party workers why he read no books, the Comrade replied: "I have no time. You can see how my tongue's hanging out from overwork." Smilingly, Kirov answered: "Tuck your tongue in every day for an hour and read a good book." The division into "theorists" and "practical workers" does not represent the reality of a Communist Party. The Party of Lenin and Stalin may attribute its victories not least to the circumstances that the leading cadres of this Party—whether in the Caucasus or in St. Petersburg, in Siberia or the Ukraine, living illegally or as emigrés applied themselves with the utmost seriousness to Marxism, that they passionately discussed all theoretical questions; that in inexhaustible discussion they explored and developed scientific Socialism.

To read and think independently is indispensable for every active communist. It is not enough to gain political knowledge merely from the newspapers; every active communist must read books as well. To be able to repeat a few quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is not enough; for Marxism-Leninism is not a collection of quotations but a comprehensive and organic body of work, from which one cannot merely break off fragments, or let selected sentences stand alone. It is of little use to learn Marxist-Leninist aphorisms by heart; one must know their roots: the historical and political associations out of which they arose, the formulations of questions from which they were developed. It is the *essence* of Marxism-Leninism, rather than the *text*, which we should absorb.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stresses the importance of "creative discussion." In view of the endless volume of new problems, in view of the ideological confusion in the working-class movement and the extraordinarily complicated situations which arise and change in such swift succession in the course of the struggle, such creative discussions are as indispensable as the very air we breathe.

There are many questions about which the masses are not clear: questions of peace policy, of the anti-fascist struggle, of the struggle for national liberation, of the defence of democracy, and so on. In the case of many of these questions there are conflicting opinions even within the working-class movement. In some of these questions, certain differences of opinion might also exist among communists. We shall not be able to convince the hesitant, the doubters or the mistaken, if we only confront them with ready-made theses and resolutions. We can only convince them in open, frank, comradesly dis-

ussion. It is only in the process of such discussion that all opinions are ventured, that we shall get to know all the incorrect arguments, that we shall learn to discover and repair this or that weakness in the presentation of our own case.

But this is not all. Nowadays discussion is going on everywhere. Larger and larger numbers of people are being stirred mentally. We communists must participate in such discussions. We must have a sensitive ear for all questions. We must not content ourselves with stating that many of these questions have long ago been answered; we must deal patiently with them and answer them once again. And we must answer them in such manner that the questioners understand us—we must be convincing without arrogance. Nothing is more erroneous than to reply contemptuously to a question: "This is a problem that isn't a problem. It's all in Marx and Engels already." Or to reply complacently: "Why we communists laid that down twenty years ago, but ignoramus like you didn't understand us then. It's certainly taken you long enough!" Or when we expand our chests and boast: "Everything's clear to us communists. There's not a single question to which we can't supply an immediate answer."

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stigmatises such "as harmful pedantic-administrative methods, red-tape and routine," which so frequently mar the work in the communist study-circles. But is is not only a question of these study-circles; for the communists in capitalist countries, it is a question of the methods which we should employ in approaching all people who reject Fascism but who have not yet worked their way through to a clear understanding of things. Nothing can harm our cause so much as the contempt or arrogance with which we sometimes approach these people. Nothing can so repel an individual as to feel: "Here am I, worrying about this question, and then he comes along, reaches into a well-arranged drawer and pulls out a few ready-made formulas and quotations which he hands me as a solution."

We communists are the only people who are able to show the masses the way out, because our theory is correct and has been tested in the severest fighting and the greatest victories. But that does not mean that every communist always knows best in every situation, and that he has nothing to learn from non-communists. It is precisely because our theory is correct, because Marxism-Leninism is correct, that we are able to dispense with all swaggering, that we can be *convincing* without acting like schoolmasters. We do not come to the masses as carping know-alls, but as *friends* who want to help them to find the

right path; as *comrades* who wish to pass on to them the living doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, and who in their propaganda do not draw this teaching from abstract formulas but from present-day experiences and problems. Events themselves throw up the definite question; and it is with these questions that we must conscientiously and objectively deal.

This comradely discussion within the whole working-class movement, within the whole anti-fascist movement is the more important as to-day all active fighters against Fascism need for their fight a firm theoretical basis. A great deal of vacillation could be avoided, many errors overcome if not only the members of the Communist Parties, but also the active members of the whole working-class movement were conversant with Marxist-Leninist theory, if they acquired the ideological firmness which more than anything else gives the strength to stand up against difficult situations. In his article on May 1, 1938, Comrade Dimitroff wrote :

“Correctly to combine the operation of the policy of the People's Front with the propaganda of Marxism, with the raising of the theoretical level of the cadres of the working class movement, with the mastery of the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, as a guide to action—all this we must learn and teach our cadres and the masses day after day. We must not allow practice to become divorced from theory, a gap to develop between the fulfilment of the urgent tasks of to-day, and the further perspectives and aims of the working class struggle.” (“The United Front,” p. 236, Lawrence and Wishart).

To advance ideological development not only in the ranks of the Communist Parties but in the ranks of the whole working class movement is one of the most important tasks in the present period of struggle.

In the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the fact of a “serious backwardness on the theoretical front” is noted. Therefore, the Central Committee has decided as follows :

“All workers on the theoretical front are called upon to abolish, resolutely and swiftly, the intolerable backwardness of the theoretical front, to overcome the fear of boldly raising theoretical questions which would further develop Marxist-Leninist theory, and to put an end to hair-splitting and quibbling, and scholasticism, and to the vulgarization and superficial treatment of particular aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory.”

These decisions should apply to an even greater extent to the Communist Parties of capitalist countries. In discussion on the burning question of the anti-fascist struggle, we must pose theoretical questions boldly and determinedly; we must not re-

main behind theoretically. We shall not be able to convince the masses, and we ourselves will encounter severe difficulties, unless we proceed with the utmost thoroughness to construct the correct theoretical foundation for our policy of the People's Front, for our attitude towards struggles for national liberation, for our correct characterisation of Fascism as the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist elements of finance capital, for a world anti-fascist front, and for our defence of bourgeois democracy against the attacks of Fascism.

The policy of the Communist International has boldly and resolutely taken into account the new conditions of the struggle. But theoretical development is far behind political development. We have to make up a lot of ground in this sphere, in the ideological struggle against Fascism, against the neo-revisionist capitulation theories within the working-class movement, and against all the many errors and obscurities which so rapidly appear on every hand.

And finally we must not overlook the fact that nowadays many of the capitulators of the Second International themselves question Marxism; that a new generation is growing up which has been subjected to the concentrated influence of anti-Marxist propaganda; that the poison of decaying Capitalism has crept even into the working class; that it is of the utmost necessity to *explain the elementary bases of Marxism-Leninism* in connection with outstanding political events.

In these days the ideological firmness of communists, their capacity to keep step theoretically with political events, is of utmost and decisive importance. It becomes the urgent task of all Communist Parties to increase and intensify the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, to arouse the interests of communists in the theoretical problems, to encourage capable Party comrades to take up work on the theoretical front, to engender *an atmosphere of the creative interchange of ideas*. Undoubtedly it is more difficult in the conditions of the struggle in capitalist countries to carry out this task, but it is not impossible. We must resolve it hard enough, and then we shall succeed.

Thanks to the victories of Socialism in the Soviet Union, and because of the growing menace of Fascism, the masses nowadays listen to the voice of the communists. We shall gain their confidence all the sooner if they recognise in us, not only the bravest *fighters* of this epoch, but also the clearest thinkers. For this Marxism-Leninism provides us the opportunity. It depends on us whether we make use of it.

PACIFISM OR CLASS STRUGGLE ?

By PETER WIEDEN

Pacifism and abstract peace propaganda represent a form of deceit practised on the working class.—LENIN.

THE nations are awakening from the pernicious delusion that the Munich plot has saved peace. The doves of peace flown by Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier have assumed the form of bomber planes, the bells tolling for peace have been hurriedly recast into gunbarrels and the fascist warmongers have emerged strengthened from the witches cauldron of the "saviours of peace." The nations are beginning to recognize the monstrous deception practised on them by the reactionary accomplices of Fascism. They had been told that what had been at issue in Munich was the vital question: "War or peace?" In order to save Europe from an imminent war, the statesmen representing the British and French bourgeoisie had, they claim, sacrificed honour, fidelity to treaties and Czechoslovakia on the altar of peace. This allegation is a flagrant untruth.

The question at issue in Munich was not "war or peace?" but "capitulation of Fascism or capitulation of democracy?" The German fascists were not in a position to fight Czechoslovakia, France and the Soviet Union. General Beck, chief of the German General Staff knew very well why he resigned from his office. The information percolating out of Germany gives an idea of the disastrous situation in which Hitler found himself. There was no money, no food, no experienced military personnel. The mobilisation was a miserable failure and in many instances an unholy muddle. The soldiers were unwilling and angry. They deserted in batches over the French and Czechoslovak frontier, conveying the greetings of the German anti-fascists. The fortifications were unfinished and the German workers who were building them did not conceal that they were waiting for the French liberators to come. Mutinies revealed the rifts and cracks in the army. The popular masses were embittered and hostile to the existing régime. The opposition was steadily gaining ground and its militancy was growing from day to day. The military and economic experts had no doubt that a war would have meant certain defeat. Face to face with internally disrupted German Fascism stood the Czechoslovak army, inspired by the spirit of national defence and protected by almost impregnable fortifications, stood the French army which knew that it was defending the freedom

and the very existence of France, stood the mighty Red Army of the Soviet Union, incarnating the incomparable unity of a nation of 170,000,000. Such a war was hopeless for the German fascists from the very first day. They could not venture to wage such a war and were forced to capitulate. And if they had ventured on it in spite of everything, German Fascism would have collapsed after a few months on the home front and in the firing line. The German fascists knew this very well, their reactionary accomplices in France and Britain knew it very well and that it is precisely why the Munich plot was framed.

What this plot prevented was not war but the capitulation of German Fascism. Only the gifts of the reactionary British bourgeoisie and of its French counterpart, only the increase in power which fell into the lap of German Fascism without a struggle put the German fascists into a position to envisage a major war. If the forces of peace by their solid unity and by a supreme effort do not prevent this, now seriously menacing war, then the nations will pay with millions of dead for the work of the Munich "saviours of peace."

It is absurd and at the same time distressing that the fear of war felt by the nations goes to increase the war danger, that pacifism is pouring oil on to the flames kindled by the warmongers, that the forces of war are lining up behind the screen of pacifist peacemongering.

Let us not close our eyes to the fact that the imperialist clique has succeeded in exploiting the desire of the masses for peace and has used it to prepare the way for another world war. Let us remember that the German fascists exploited the anti-capitalist feeling of the masses in order to establish an unlimited dictatorship of capitalism. Let us teach the masses to overcome their terrible gullibility, to see through the wiles of the enemies of peace and freedom, even if they come with the words "peace and freedom" on their lips.

In 1914 the imperialist warmongers of all countries hid their sordid class interests behind the bloody smoke-screen of jingoism. To-day, however, they must take into account that millions of men and women hate war because they have experienced it in their own body and must therefore have recourse to less crude methods of deception. To-day it is the peace vapourings of pacifism with which they mislead the masses. United in their hatred of liberty, of the working class and of Socialism, the

fascist dictators and their reactionary accomplices in the democratic countries have it all worked out; in the countries where Fascism has won power, it increases jingoism to boiling point, and in the countries where the reactionary bourgeoisie must take democratic institutions into account, it attempts to paralyse the popular masses by a sanctimonious pacifism and hold them back from the struggle. While Fascism fosters the ideology of a war of conquest, the accomplices of Fascism in the democratic countries attempt to set up cowardice as a philosophy. While Fascism teaches its subjects slavish "obedience even unto death," its accomplices in the democratic countries attempt to make slavish non-resistance a principle of citizenship. In both cases the reactionary bourgeoisie is striving to degrade men into slaves.

The desire of the nations for the preservation of peace is most justified. But this desire is of little avail if those who want peace are not prepared to fight for it and not determine to defend it. The most precious possessions of mankind require the greatest determination to fight for them. An achievement for which none fight and none bring sacrifices is doomed.

No one knows this as well as the working class. The tiniest right, the most insignificant improvement had to be won by the workers by a hard struggle and at the cost of many sacrifices. Only by courage, persistence and solidarity could, and can they win recognition and uphold their human dignity. Only by a heroism unparalleled in history could they do away with capitalist exploitation and oppression on one-sixth of the earth and defend their freedom against a world full of enemies. Wherever this proletarian fighting spirit dies down, wherever the enemy succeeds in lulling this militancy to sleep, there the working class is driven back and suffers bitter defeats. The strength of the working class lies in its militant intrepidity. Struggle, and again struggle, is the innermost essence of the class which is destined to liberate mankind by its own emancipation, and by its victory to inaugurate the real history of mankind.

The reactionary bourgeoisie has always recognized that it was imperative for its interests to find its way into the working-class movement by hook or by crook, in order to undermine the militancy of that class and carry disruption into its ranks. The reactionary bourgeoisie could no longer maintain its rule and postpone its fall except by deceiving the working class. In this it has again been successful—it has again deluded a considerable section of the working class and smuggled the policy of surrender into its ranks. In 1914 the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement engineered such a surrender by using patriotism as

a stalking-horse; this time the stalking-horse was pacifism. Surrender is no better for that. Munich constitutes a defeat of the international working class. The working class owes this defeat to the direct agents of the reactionary bourgeoisie who have entrenched themselves in the leading bodies of the Labour and Socialist International and to the quaking, lily-livered petty-bourgeois, who waved the white feather of their cowardice as a palm-leaf to celebrate the "peace" of Munich. The imperialists, who have no objection to wars of conquest but who abhor wars of emancipation, suddenly discovered pacifist leanings in themselves. Their agents within the working-class movement are the standard-bearers of pacifism as they had been the standard-bearers of bourgeois patriotism in 1914. And the choir of quaking petty bourgeois within the working class, regarded pacifism as the back door through which they could escape the anti-fascist struggle.

Only too many workers allowed themselves to be misled.

This shows how dangerous the so-called "total pacifism" is for the working-class movement and renders necessary that serious attention should be paid to it.

FREEDOM IS MORE PRECIOUS THAN PEACE

Populaire, the official daily paper of the French socialists, published a series of articles dealing with problems of peace policy just previous to the Socialist Party congress. Some of these articles and an essay by the Belgian Socialist Henrik de Man (published on October 31 by *Le Peuple*, the official paper of the Belgian Workers' Party), contain every argument used by the "total pacifists."

"The worst 'settlement' is better than the best victory!" were the terms in which J. B. Sévéric, French Socialist, expressed the principle of unconditional surrender in its most pungent form. (*Populaire*, October 26).

The place of the struggle against Fascism is thus taken by a "settlement" with the fascist aggressor. Faced with the choice of inflicting a crushing defeat on Fascism or satisfying it with a "settlement," the working class is thus to choose a "settlement." What is the meaning of this? The meaning is that the working class should of its free will give up every chance of ever beating Fascism. Even Sévéric cannot suppose that Fascism could ever be overthrown by peaceful means. Fascism can be overthrown by no other means except a revolutionary rising of the people; it can be beaten back only by determined resistance, using every method, including that of arms. And as Sévéric rejects this solution, as he considers the worst "settlement"

better than the greatest victory won by the force of arms, what he actually advises the working class to do is to bend the neck to the fascist yoke by a series of "settlements."

It is obvious that the "total pacifism" of Sévérac rejects not only war but also revolution, also civil war against Fascism. The Spanish working class resisted the mutiny of the generals by armed force. The civil war quickly turned into a national defensive war; armed resistance to Fascism always holds a "war risk," and that is what Sévérac wishes to avoid at all cost. The Spanish working class could have averted war from Spain by a "settlement" with Fascism; it could have come to a "settlement" by renouncing its liberty and submitting to the bloody dictatorship of the Spanish fascists and the foreign conquerors. The German socialists had followed this road of "settlements" to the end. They acted according to the principles of Sévérac and in each situation preferred the worst "settlement" to the risk of a civil war and the chance of a victory over Fascism. The results of these "settlements" may be studied by Sévérac in Hitler Germany: he can see the concentration camps, the torture-chambers of the Gestapo, the unprecedented slavery to which the people is subjected.

The French Trotskyists have found an even more concise expression for the Sévérac principle. They have coined the term "Better a slave than dead!" The diplomatic word "settlement" is reduced to its real meaning in this phrase. The proud war-cry of the Frisian peasants "Better dead than a slave!" has been turned into the degenerate cowardly "Better a slave than dead!" This contemptible principle is being put forward by the agents of the Gestapo with the object of emasculating the working class and disrupting the anti-fascist ranks. It is contrary to the innermost essence of the working class. That class professes to the words of Pasionaria, the great Spanish national heroine, who said: "Better die upright than live on bended knees!" Its battle-cry is:—"Neither dead nor a slave," for the working class is not in the position of the Frisian peasants of the Middle Ages who threw themselves against a superior feudal power, it is the largest and strongest class of modern society which, if it is only united, bears victory on its flag. The great leaders and teachers of the working class have never been cowards who preached resignation and submission; they taught the working class that it should be resolute and militant but not that it should try to substitute "settlements" with the reactionary bourgeoisie for the class struggle. Nothing could be more welcome to Fascism than this demoralising propaganda which persuades the workers never to take up arms, lest they be tempted to use them and win a victory with them.

Jean Zyromski, the French socialist, was right when he said: "Freedom is more precious than peace!" (*Populaire*, October 27). But freedom cannot be defended by "settlements"—it can be defended only by a struggle in which even the "risk" of a war of emancipation must be faced.

IMPERIALIST WAR AND WAR OF EMANCIPATION.

The "total pacifists" are bitter opponents of every war of emancipation. "There is no such thing as a war of emancipation," asserted Henrik de Man (*Le Peuple*, October 31). Every war is "ruthless and absurd" says Sévérac (*Populaire*, October 26). And Léon Blum declared that he was speaking in the name of his party when he said: "We have definitely broken with the traditional belief come down to us from the French revolution that a war can also be the instrument of the liberation of nations or of oppressed classes." (*Populaire*, October 27.)

These pacifists, as one sees, do not distinguish between an imperialist war of conquest and a revolutionary war of emancipation. Still, they dare not as yet in so many words draw the conclusion from this theory which they have long ago drawn in their actions. They dare not openly declare: "The war of emancipation which the Spanish and Chinese peoples are now waging goes against the grain and we don't want to have anything to do with it!" Henrik de Man in concert with the Trotskyists develops the "theory" that the forces opposing each other today are not democracy and Fascism but only "satiated" and "hungry" imperialism. It is the nature of all modern wars, says de Man, to destroy liberty everywhere, "even of those nations who allow themselves to be dragged into a war by their love of liberty."

But what about Abyssinia? Was "hungry" Italian Imperialism opposed by a "satiated" Abyssinian Imperialism" in that war? Or was not rather the Abyssinian people waging a national war of emancipation, defending its national independence against an imperialist aggressor?

And what about Spain? Are "hungry" German and Italian Imperialism here facing a "satiated" Spanish Imperialism"—or is the Spanish people perhaps waging a national war of emancipation against the imperialist aggressors? And the Chinese people—is it not waging a national war of emancipation against Japanese Imperialism?

Henrik de Man has hatched a theory too clever by half. This all too clever theory has only one little flaw: that it is invariably contradicted by the facts. *Not all wars which we experience at present are wars fought between "hungry" and "satiated" imperialism but between fascist robbers and attacked nations who are defending their freedom and inde-*

pendence. These nations have no other way of defending their freedom and warding off the threat of slavery except a war—but Sévérac tells them that every war is “ruthless and absurd” and Léon Blum explains to them that a war can never be the instrument of the liberation of a nation or of an oppressed class. Henrik de Man for his part classifies them as nations which have allowed their love of liberty to drag them into a war and who are thereby destroying their liberty. Evidently he means to say that they would have preserved their liberty by submitting to the domination of alien Fascism !

This repudiation of the war of emancipation, this mechanical division of the world into “hungry” and “satiated” imperialism leads straight to conclusions which some pacifists are dodging in an embarrassed way. But what the Social Democrat pacifists pass over in significant silence is openly blurted out by their Trotskyist allies. M. Marceau Pivert had a poster pasted up in Paris saying that one could not sacrifice millions of human beings “for the sake of the Czechoslovakian ruling classes and in the interests of French big business.” While these posters were still on the walls, the Czech agrarians, ruthless representatives of the Czechoslovak ruling classes, were conspiring with German Fascism against their own country but the Czech people demanded armed resistance ; French big business came to terms with the German aggressors in contradistinction to the French workers who joined their regiments singing the “Internationale.” Mr. Maxton made the paper of his party (the I.L.P.) declare that Britain must not defend Czechoslovakia and on October 4 he paid homage to Chamberlain in the House of Commons. “The Prime Minister in that period of time, in that limited period of time, did something that the mass of the common people in the world wanted done.” This disgraceful panegyric was given its “radical” seasoning by the statement that world peace could not be achieved within the capitalist system and on the basis of the British Empire. From the doctrine that today the antagonism between “hungry” and “satiated” imperialism took precedence over everything else, Mr. Maxton drew the logical counter-revolutionary conclusion : he applauded the “satiated” imperialist Chamberlain because he threw Czechoslovakia to the “hungry” imperialist Hitler.

But the revolutionary workers who give their support to the war of emancipation waged by the Spanish and Chinese peoples are very well able to distinguish between an imperialist war of spoliation and a revolutionary war of emancipation. The imperialists themselves, the “hungry” ones as well as the “satiated” ones, also understand very well that there are such things as wars of emancipation. According to the schedule of Henrik de Man “satiated” British Capitalism ought to be opposing “hungry”

German and Italian Imperialism in Spain—and behold, “satiated” British Imperialism is to the contrary, supporting “hungry” German and Italian Imperialism against the fighters for Spanish liberty. So it appears that after all there are in this world of ours certain other, deeper antagonisms than those between “hungry” and “satiated” imperialists !

Marxism has always distinguished between imperialist wars of spoliation and revolutionary wars of emancipation, between just and unjust wars. Marx and Engels were by no means of the opinion that every war was “ruthless and absurd” ; on the contrary they thought that even war could in certain circumstances be the instrument of the liberation of nations and oppressed classes. Lenin developed this idea in the greatest clarity and perfection. In his polemic against Rosa Luxemburg (“About the Junius pamphlet”) he refuted in a masterly way the thesis that national wars were no longer possible in the era of unfettered imperialism. He showed how national wars can turn into imperialist wars and imperialist wars into national wars. He explained that in the circumstances of a general retrogression in Europe as a result of the weakness of the working class, great national wars were quite possible even in Europe. He pointed out that national wars of colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism were not only probable but inevitable. He added :

“National wars against imperialist powers are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable, they are progressive and revolutionary.”

According to the schedule of the “total pacifists” there are only imperialist states in existence and every modern war must be an imperialist war. Lenin’s genius for grasping realities scattered these figments of the brain and proved that even the participation of imperialist states in a war must not of necessity give that war the character of an imperialist war. He convincingly illustrated this contention by an historical example :

“In the Seven Years’ War England and France fought for colonies, *i.e.* they waged an imperialist war (which is possible on the basis of slavery or of primitive capitalism as well as on the present basis of highly developed capitalism). France was beaten and lost part of her colonies. A few years later the States of North America begin their war of emancipation against England alone. France and Spain, who themselves possess territories which now form part of the United States, because of their hostility to England, *i.e.* by reason of their imperialist interests conclude a pact of friendship with the states which have risen in arms against England. French troops in co-operation with the Americans defeat the English. We have here a national war of emancipation, in which the imperialist rivalry constitutes an additional element without serious significance—

in contrast to what we saw in 1914-1916 (the national element in the Austro-Serbian war had no serious significance compared with the all-important imperialist rivalries). This shows how senseless it would be to apply the term imperialism indiscriminately and then deduce from it the 'impossibility' of national wars."

It is precisely this mechanical application of the term Imperialism which leads the "total pacifists" to the false conclusion, entirely contrary to facts, that wars of emancipation are no longer possible today and that wars are only possible between the "hungry" and the "satiated" imperialists. *The object of this theory is to divert the workers from regarding the struggle between the forces of Socialism and Democracy on the one hand and the forces of Fascism and its reactionary accomplices on the other as the deepest, historically decisive antagonism of our time.* The fighting spirit of the workers is to be broken by persuading them that in our epoch every war must bear an imperialist character, i.e. be hostile to the interests of the working class. Their solidarity with the Spanish and Chinese fighters for liberty, with the nations subjugated or threatened by Fascism is to be degraded to the level of charity functions by telling them that in no circumstances can a war be an instrument of emancipation.

Henrik de Man asks: "Can war be taken into account as a means to bring about a victory of liberty in Europe?" His answer is: "No!" He bases this No on the contention that war would of necessity transform all states into "authoritarian and totalitarian" states and thus destroy liberty. The same contention is to be found in the article of the French socialist, Robert Lazurick: "War would be the end of liberty. It would deliver up our country to a totalitarian régime under which life would no longer be worth living" (*Populaire*, October 28). In the same strain the French socialist, Louis L'Heveder, says that in war there is neither freedom nor democracy (*Populaire*, October 31).

The representatives of "total pacifism" have obviously agreed on this point. According to their argument the nations, in order to prevent an "authoritarian or totalitarian" régime of warfare, should surrender of their own volition to Fascism. In other words they should commit suicide for fear of death. According to this argument the Spaniards and Chinese ought to have submitted to the fascist aggressors without a struggle—because a war might put democracy in jeopardy. Such is the logical conclusion of "total pacifism." The German socialists found it necessary to demolish democracy in order to preserve it from breaking down—the "total pacifists" go even farther and advocate surrender to Fascism, because "life would not be worth living"

in a democracy restricted through war. Obviously life is "better worth living" under Fascism.

It is most characteristic that these "total pacifists" carefully avoid using the expressions "fascist states" or "fascist régime" and mention only "totalitarian states" and "authoritarian régimes." The explanation is that they class the Soviet Union as a "totalitarian" state and obviously regard the Spanish Popular front government as an "authoritarian" régime. Henrik de Man and his friend Spaak have up to the present never hesitated to advocate the restriction of democracy and the "authoritarian" conduct of the affairs of state—but they appear to fear that a war of emancipation against Fascism might not lead to a strengthening of their authority and that the people in arms might be in a position to enforce its own authority. For what these "total pacifists" affirm is by no means true, i.e., that a national war of emancipation against fascist aggression must of necessity destroy democracy. Let us keep to reality instead of the schedules of the "total pacifists." The war of emancipation in Spain has strengthened and stabilised the democratic institutions of the republic; in the whole of capitalist Europe there is to-day no government even approximately as democratic as the Spanish Popular Front government. The war of emancipation in China has compelled the Kuomintang to agree to a far reaching democratisation of the country. The authoritarian régime in Austria, when it considered armed resistance to Hitler Germany, granted part of the democratic demands put forward by the working class. Czechoslovakia was never as democratic as in the days when the people swept away the Hodza government and demanded a national war of emancipation against Hitler Germany. Experience up to the present has by no means confirmed the contentions of the "total pacifists" but has rather shown that one is far more justified in assuming the contrary. It is probable that every national war of emancipation against a fascist aggressor leads to a consolidation of democracy, if for no other reason, because the democratic system is more efficient in war than the fascist system; if for no other reason, because it is easier to win a victory under the flag of democracy than under the flag of tyranny; if for no other reason, because a people in arms is able to defend its freedom against treason at home as well as against the enemy at the front. What is decisive is whether such a war against a fascist aggressor is waged as an anti-fascist war of emancipation or as an imperialist war, as a war for the conquest of foreign countries and the subjection of foreign peoples. The reactionary British and French bourgeoisie would object far less to an imperialist war against Germany and Italy than to an anti-fascist war of emancipation. They are afraid

not of war in itself but only of a war bearing the imprint of an anti-fascist popular movement. In order to wage a war to their own liking they would first have to subdue the forces of liberty in their own countries and substitute the blind intoxication of chauvinism for the anti-fascist fighting determination of the people. The prevention of such a development is one of the foremost tasks of the working class. But the working class will not be able to prevent it if it listens to the whisperings of the "total pacifists," if it is prepared to surrender to Fascism and by so doing to leave power in the hands of the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialist cliques, without striking a blow.

Zyromski, the French socialist leader, was right in saying that the working class has less to lose in a war against a fascist aggressor than under a universal régime of Fascism which was victorious because democracy surrendered. (*Populaire*, October 27). It is far worse to endure the régime of concentration camps, of fascist oppression and humiliation, than to fall in the struggle for freedom.

THE INTERNATIONAL STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM.

The revolutionary workers do not reject war in all circumstances. They distinguish between imperialist wars and wars of emancipation. They put freedom above peace. But they are determined to defend peace. They do not regard another world war as inevitable. But they are well aware that surrender to the fascist aggressors does not save peace but leads step by step into another world war.

Under what conditions can another world war be avoided? That is the question now facing the nations. In order to give a correct answer to this question one must not allow oneself to be misled as to the nature of Fascism.

The profound and dangerous confusion created in the working class by "total pacifism" is based mainly on illusions as to the nature of Fascism.

If one considers the expedients recommended by the pacifist quacks one can understand the amazement of the French socialist, Lebas, at the fact that these people discuss the question of peace as if Fascism did not exist. What should one do to protect oneself from a mob of gangsters? Pretend that they are not gangsters at all, establish friendly relations with them, put no obstacles in their way. That is the trend of the advice the "total pacifists" give to those faced with fascist aggression. "Good relations must be established with all nations, not only with a few!" preaches Sévérac (*Populaire*, October 26). "In order to escape war one must keep the peace with *all* nations!" is the oracle of Henrik de Man (*Le Peuple*, October 31). The Ger-

man poet, Friedrich Schiller was a far more clear-sighted politician than these pacifist preachers when he coined the phrase: "The mildest cannot live in peace if the truculent neighbour does not want to." Good relations cannot be established unilaterally and the most fervent desire of keeping the peace with *all* states remains quite ineffective if some of these states are determined to subjugate their neighbour states. If Henrik de Man and Sévérac expect that their recipe will save peace, let them amicably persuade the German, Italian and Japanese aggressors to withdraw their troops from Spain and China and keep the peace with all nations; their quack remedy would be just about as effective as if one tried to cure rabies with smelling salts.

The disastrous argument of the "total pacifists" is most clearly expressed in the warning uttered by the French socialist, Lazurick: "Let us beware of transferring our domestic anti-Fascism into the international sphere!" (*Populaire*, October 28). At a time when the fascist aggressors attack foreign countries, Lazurick dares to describe Fascism as the "domestic concern" of the several states. It was not the Spaniards who transferred their interior anti-Fascism to the international sphere—it was the German and Italian fascists who transferred not only Fascism, but soldiers, guns, aeroplanes to Spain. But Lazurick and his friends pretend to be blind and deaf; they make believe that the fascist states are concerned only with their own domestic affairs; they behave as if the fascist states had not the remotest intention of interfering with the internal affairs of other countries and as if the danger of international high-handedness came from the democracies and not from the fascist states. Austria never interfered with the internal affairs of Hitler Germany—and yet she was attacked and subjugated by Hitler Germany. Czechoslovakia refrained to a point almost suicidal from opposing German Fascism—and yet she was attacked and dismembered by German Fascism. German Fascism preaches a crusade against democracy. It talks of its "vocation" which is to exterminate "Bolshevism" in all countries. It has demanded and enforced the resignation of British Cabinet Ministers, the dismissal of Danish editors, the confiscation of foreign newspapers. It is organising irredentist movements in Alsace-Lorraine, in Denmark, in Lithuania, in Poland as it did previously in the Sudeten area. It has set on foot conspiracies and putsches in Austria, in Rumania, in Brazil. It is arming the French cagoullards. It describes the "rearrangement of Europe" as its historical task. And in the face of these monstrous fascist attacks on the security of all nations and states, in the face of this world offensive of Fascism, these pacifists of the de Man and Lazurick kind come and urge the adherents of democracy not to

transfer their anti-Fascism to the international sphere !

These pacifist importunities are a deliberate distortion of facts, a deliberate deception of the working class. They all have the same trend : the contention that in our world to-day the antagonism between hungry and satiated Imperialism is the decisive factor ; the insolent assimilation of the socialist Soviet Union and the fascist aggressors under the elastic description "totalitarian and authoritarian states"; the negation of the possibility of wars of emancipation and finally the rascally insinuation that at bottom it is democracy which is endangering world peace—all this fits together into a system which misrepresents the facts and assists fascist propaganda.

The working class must understand that the world has changed radically since 1914. What is decisive to-day is not the antagonism between "hungry" German and Italian Imperialism and "satiated" British and French Imperialism, *but the antagonism between the forces of Socialism and democracy—whose strongest support is the Soviet Union—and the forces of Fascism and reaction, who regard Hitler Germany as their policeman.* Doubtless there are also serious antagonisms between the imperialist states, these antagonisms as well might undoubtedly blow up in a warlike clash—but they will always be overshadowed by the antagonism between the socialist and democratic movement on the one hand and the reactionary bourgeoisie on the other. The war of 1914 began as a war of conquest in which two groups of imperialist states came into collision—the present war started in a completely different way: as the attack of a group of fascist states on peoples who are defending their freedom and independence. From the very beginning and in a very high degree it shows the characteristics of a counter-revolutionary war, with the imprint of a civil war, of a class struggle : the Spanish reactionaries are fighting side by side with the fascist aggressors against the Spanish people ; reactionary sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie support the foreign Japanese enemy against the Chinese people. The fronts run right across the countries ; while wide sections of the British and French working classes regard themselves as allies of the Spanish republic, the reactionary cliques of Britain and France conspire with the fascist aggressors against the Spanish republic. While the workers and wide sections of the working population of all countries take sides with the Soviet Union, important parts of the reactionary bourgeoisie in all countries favour the counter-revolutionary machinations directed against the Soviet Union. The governing circles of "satiated" British Imperialism see their chief enemy not in the "hungry" German and Italian Imperialisms but in

the socialist and democratic movement whose strongest support is the Soviet Union.

The "total pacifists" of the kidney of a Lazurick urge the workers to limit themselves to the class struggle within their own country and not to transfer their anti-Fascism to the international sphere. Thus, the French workers are asked deliberately to overlook the fact that the reactionary section of the French bourgeoisie allies itself with foreign Fascism in order to be able to carry on the class struggle against the industrial and other workers of their own countries to greater effect. They are deliberately to overlook the fact that German Fascism arms the French fascists and that not a hair on the heads of these mercenaries kept by Hitler Germany within the frontiers of France is touched. They are deliberately to overlook the fact that the anti-working-class speeches and measures of Daladier are immediately linked up with the Munich conspiracy and that the surrender to Hitler is accompanied by an attack of the reactionary French bourgeoisie on the French working class. How can the danger of Fascism be averted from France if one surrenders to German Fascism ? How can the workers carry on the class struggle against the 200 families if they disregard the fact that the 200 families are linked up with German Fascism ? How can one defend democracy against the attacks of its enemies at home if one offers no resistance to the foreign allies of those enemies ? "Take no notice of the fire in the next house ! Take no notice of the wind which blows the flames your way ! For God's sake beware of leaving your house to help in the street in checking the spread of the fire !" Such is the advice given to the working class by the "total pacifists."

To tell the workers, in the face of an international conspiracy of Fascism and reaction against the working class, democracy and Socialism, that they should on no account regard the class struggle as an international struggle, that they should retire within their own four walls and there wait in complete isolation until the united gangsters break into their house—that is a barefaced betrayal of the interests of the working class!

HOW THEN CAN PEACE BE SAVED ?

"Best of all through weakness," say the pacifist "saviours of peace." "All one needs to do is to weaken and isolate oneself, and then peace is saved."

Nothing could be more dangerous, says Henrik de Man, than to bar the way to Fascism with an overwhelming superiority of military forces on the side of democracy. That leads straight to war. "That means playing with fire without thinking of a conflagration" (*Le Peuple*, October 31). Sévérac seconds him : "Good understanding with everyone, alliance with none !" (*Populaire*, October 26). For,

he adds, every alliance involves the danger of having to wage a war for which one is not oneself responsible. Every military alliance increases the sense of power of a nation and hence makes it less cautious and less inclined to prefer settlements to solutions by violence. In other words, the more a nation is isolated, the weaker it is, the better chances it has to escape a fascist attack. Up to the present, it is true, the fascist aggressors have shown a persistent leaning towards attacking weaker opponents and turning tail before stronger ones—but the “total pacifists” obviously believe in miracles and are expecting the fascists to be converted to new principles. They believe that the German fascists would be so moved if France mutilated herself of her own accord, that in their emotion they would fall round the neck of France instead of springing at her throat. The French socialist, Lebas, is of a different opinion, however; he says what all those think whose brains have not been crushed by the juggernaut of Fascism: “To run away from the risk of war means that France will have to face the cannibals on her Eastern frontier in isolation.” (*Populaire*, October 29).

Even the “total pacifists” cannot seriously believe that German Fascism, which has made a speciality of killing defenceless opponents would respect weakness more than strength. As we do not regard them as babes in arms but as men who, after all, should be able to estimate consequences, we cannot but see behind their proposals the intention of weakening and isolating the democratic states to such an extent that they would no longer be able to offer any resistance and of avoiding war by submitting to German Fascism without a struggle and without conditions.

While some of them oppose all alliances, others advocate an alliance with Hitler Germany, e.g. L'Heveder who is openly sponsoring a Franco-German entente. As if in consolation he adds that there was no need for France to approach Germany “in a shirt with a rope round her neck, ready for every humiliation and slavery.” Obviously the circles of the “total pacifists” are not excluding even such possibilities; seeing that they consider the “worst settlement” better than a victory! The way in which German Fascism observes “bilateral treaties” was demonstrated to the world by the occupation of Austria. How it treats states which offer no resistance was experienced by Czechoslovakia.

The true motive behind these absurd proposals is being revealed more or less openly: the pacifists of the Sévérac and L'Heveder type want to do away with the pact of friendship existing between France and the U.S.S.R. Sévérac declares shamelessly: “Would we have had the war in 1914 if we had not been bound to Russia by a military alliance?” L'Heveder, with unprecedented cynicism, applies the

justified criticism levelled by Jaurès at the imperialist pact with Tsarist Russia to the pact of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R.; this pact is to make France run the risk of having to go to war “for some Bulgars or others.”

These pacifist men of honour know as well as everyone else that France treated the pact of friendship with Czechoslovakia like a scrap of paper while the Soviet Union indicated to the very last its readiness to comply with the terms of the pact. They know as well as anyone else that it was not the Soviet Union who needs the help of France but France who needs the help of the Soviet Union. The by no means left-wing socialist, Lebas, stated the true facts when he said: “France had a system of alliances which appeared to all to give a most serious guarantee of peace for France and everyone else. Of all this nothing is left. The signature of France has lost much of its value. The French people, shut in between Italian and German Fascism, threatened from the Pyrenees, needs such pacts of assistance for her security more than any other nation.” Zyromski has stressed the decisive significance of such pacts of assistance and described the pact with the Soviet Union as an important stage in the process of combining the forces of France, the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States. He pointed out that France is interested in collective security more than any other state.

In fact German Fascism has effected its conquests always on the line of least resistance. Its fear of any major war is obvious. Before a strong opponent it habitually retreats: witness May 21, 1938. And that being so, the pacifist keeners come and try to persuade France to castrate herself because that would induce the German fascists to attack, not weak France, but the mighty Soviet Union in the plenitude of its strength. German Fascism would hardly oblige them to that extent; it would undoubtedly prefer to attack a weak France instead of exposing itself to the blows of the Red Army.

The pacifists who seek salvation in the weakness of democracy have no difficulty in finding the right means of weakening democracy as much as possible. As they wish the democratic states to be weak, it is no more than logical that they advocate concessions to the fascist aggressors “to the extreme limit.” They hasten to outbid even the demands of Hitler Germany with their offers. L'Heveder is all for satisfying all colonial claims of Hitler Germany and in addition “to revise certain problems of the national minorities,” i.e. the “problems” which are of interest to German Imperialism. Lazurick on the other hand thinks that Europe should be given up to Fascism and that France should compensate herself by directing her “national dynamism” towards

the colonies. All of them, including Léon Blum are for concessions "to the extreme limit" without however defining these limits.

"There is a limit to what is acceptable" declared Léon Blum and added: "War becomes inevitable when the integrity of the territory, the independence of the state, the liberty of the citizens are being attacked." (*Populaire*, October 27).

These words are by no means unequivocal. Sévérac tried to formulate it with greater precision. He said that the party would issue a call to resistance "if material violence is offered to France (e.g. aeroplanes over Paris or foreign armies in French territory)." Only in that event and in no other should war be waged. When he says "France" he thinks "only of the great historic reality to which Frenchmen are attached inasmuch as they are free." (*Populaire*, October 26). It must be admitted that all this sounds as obscure as an oracle from Delphi. It must further be admitted that these words are capable of a variety of interpretations in every situation. We have experienced all this before: the German and Austrian Social Democrats were indefatigable in hatching out such "limits of the acceptable." But as reality never took into account these schedules, the "limits of the acceptable" were continually revised until Fascism was strong enough to step over them without risk and establish its own rule. The limits of "extreme concessions" are drawn not by figments of the brain but rough reality and when they are reached they are no longer capable of being defended. *For every fresh concession again modifies the balance of forces*; the attacked party grows ever weaker and the aggressor ever stronger. The result of this policy of surrender is inevitably that the day arrives when it is no longer the attacked side which defines "the extreme limit" but the aggressor who dictates it. When Czechoslovakia gave up her fortifications to the German aggressor, many politicians spoke of a "second line of defence" which would be held in all circumstances. They never came to man this "second line of defence." They no longer had the strength to do so. The "extreme limit" no longer depended on their wishes but on the will of the fascist aggressor.

Léon Blum seems to have felt on what unsafe ground one ventures if one tries to define the "extreme limits" of concessions. He pointed out that "owing to the crisis last month" as he cautiously circumscribed the Munich betrayal, the integrity and independence of the French nation were threatened though not "directly," only "indirectly." He brought up the question of "indirect national defence" but did not answer it. (*Populaire*, October 29). The French working class will have to answer this question very seriously. France has sacrificed her allies in Central Europe. She is about to throttle the

Spanish republic. The reactionaries of France supported by the "total pacifists" in the Socialist Party, are demanding the termination of the pact with the Soviet Union. Further "concessions" are under consideration. All this weakens and isolates France to such an extent that she might one day be placed in the position either of accepting a challenge in the most unfavourable circumstances or of submitting to German Fascism without a struggle. By continuing the policy which led from "non-intervention" in Spain to the capitulation of Munich and now leads towards further concessions and surrenders, France might one day no longer be in a position to draw an "extreme limit" but would be compelled to leave the fixing of limits to the German fascists.

Should the workers then advocate a "preventive war"? No, the point is not to wage a "preventive war," but to check the fascist aggressors by a "preventive peace." Such a peace is still possible today.

It is possible, if the working class overcomes all pacifist illusions; if it understands that the fascist aggressors can be checked only by the strength, never by the weakness of their opponents.

It is possible if the working class unites in each country and on the international scale in order to face Fascism with its combined might everywhere.

It is possible if the working class is determined to defend its freedom by all means and, if necessary by the force of arms, as did the Spanish fighters for liberty, and that not only against Fascism at home but also against every fascist aggressor.

It is possible if the united working class allies itself at home and on the international scale with all those forces which are prepared to defend the freedom of their people and the independence of their country by every means at their command and in all circumstances—and if together with these forces the working class establishes governments of determined anti-fascist national defence in the place of the governments of national betrayal.

It is possible if all democratic nations, all nations menaced by fascism ally themselves with the great Soviet people in order to erect a defensive barrier of armed and determined nations against fascist aggression.

It is possible if the fascist aggressors see before them an overwhelmingly superior bloc of democratic states, which would be given irresistible force and power of attraction by the adhesion of the Soviet Union.

Thus and *only* thus can peace be saved.

The working class will not be able to fulfil this historic mission unless it gets rid of the agents of the bourgeoisie who spread the germs of disruption and surrender in its ranks, unless it drives out the hypocritical pacifists and proceeds to organise anti-

fascist peace in the spirit of the proletarian class struggle.

"Pacifism and abstract peace propaganda are forms of misleading the working class" (Lenin at the conference of the sections abroad of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Russia).

These words of the greatest revolutionary leader of the working class are highly topical to-day. We fight for peace—not by "settlements," by concessions, by capitulations, by pacifist sleeping-draughts, but with proletarian intrepidity, firmness, determination and solidarity.

THE POLICY OF THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE FASCIST OFFENSIVE

By KURT FUNK

FOR most workers, including the majority of the Social Democratic Workers, the events which led to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia were an occasion for very serious thought. It was not by chance that all those who are true to the cause of the working class turned their attention to Spain immediately after Munich. They all felt that it was on that point that the next dangerous move of Fascism and of their accomplices in the bourgeois democratic countries was to be expected. All sincere friends of the Spanish Republic harboured no doubts that if another violation of a country wrestling for its liberty was to be prevented, immediate and uncompromising conclusions would have to be drawn from the events which led to the Munich Agreement, and these conclusions made the basis of immediate action.

Shortly after the Munich Agreement José Diaz wrote in an article, the ideas of which were welcomed by all active anti-fascists:

"It is necessary that we should examine these happenings immediately in greatest detail and consider all they involve. We must mercilessly point out and eliminate all our own mistakes. In the history of the class struggle there are many defeats which were not followed by the demoralisation of the masses and the decline of the working class movement because they served as eye-openers to the exploited classes and showed them the way to resistance and to new victorious struggles."

Without a doubt there are in existence within the working class the prerequisites for the prevention of any demoralisation or decline of the working-class movement and the possibilities for the strengthening of its forces as the result of a serious examination of the position.

George Dimitroff described the feeling among the working people and the conditions for a successful struggle against Fascism in these terms:

"Never yet, since the end of the world imperialist war, has the hatred felt for the war-mongers been so profound and strong as at the present time. A wave of popular

indignation against the vile deeds of Fascism is rising in all countries. . .

"It would be difficult in post-war political history to find another moment like the present one, when the interests of the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, when the interests of the small nations, of the dependant and colonial countries, when the interests of culture and science, the interests of peace and democracy so coincided and merged in a common current against Fascism, the worst enemy of mankind. This is quite a real basis for the establishment of the united front of the working class and of the peoples of all countries against fascist barbarism and the incendiaries of imperialist war." ("After Munich." G. Dimitroff, pp. 13 and 20. Modern Books, price 2d.).

If it was now only a question of the workers coming to an agreement with regard to the next joint steps to take, if real representatives of the working masses of all countries were to meet with the intention of discussing how to co-ordinate and unite their forces, then only a short time would be needed for rallying and organising the forces capable of materially weakening and repulsing Fascism.

But as yet no such clear situation exists. It would avail us little to close our eyes to the fact that the attack of Fascism coincides with an attack in progress within the working-class movement itself against the most elementary and fundamental principles of the proletarian class struggle and the tenets of Marxism. The documents issued recently by the Labour and Socialist International, the congresses held by various parties affiliated to that body and the discussions conducted in the columns of Social Democratic newspapers prove that influential Social Democratic politicians are implanting, fostering and developing bourgeois tendencies within the working-class movement. We are witnessing the ideological disarmament of Social Democracy in the face of the fascist offensive. We see that the open enemies of Marxism within the working-class movement are given every facility to develop their activities. Cowardly surrender to Fascism, swimming along with the others in the muddy stream of chauvinism are at present

regarded by the Labour and Socialist International as quite acceptable or, at least, as something to be discussed. All this is going on while the Spanish working class, in a gigantic struggle in which communists, socialists and anarcho-syndicalists unite their efforts, are wrestling to defeat the technically far superior forces of the fascist invaders, whose intervention is given the strongest support by the attitude of those "democratic" governments who still cling to "non intervention." All this is going on while workers, intellectuals and progressive citizens in all countries are ready to join hands in resisting Fascism and helping Spain!

The leaders of the Labour and Socialist International, whose solemn councils cannot be roused from their monotonous course even by the most glaring disproportion between decisions and actions, stressed in their resolution of October 18-19, 1938, that the Social Democratic parties must demand "a frank explanation" from their governments so as to prevent "the persistence or recurrence of the murderous ambiguities to which Czechoslovakia has fallen a victim." The leaders of the Labour and Socialist International did not go so far as to name these "murderous ambiguities" directly. They are too fond of ambiguities themselves and they surrendered to the men of Munich. The Italian socialist P. Nenni in a letter to the Belgian Social Democratic *Le Peuple*, pointed out that the sections of the Labour and Socialist International had adopted a resolution demanding sanctions against the fascist aggressors and that next day socialist ministers in Geneva demanded the modification of Article 16 of the League Covenant, thus making sanctions against fascist aggressors practically impossible. Furthermore, the Labour and Socialist International in a unanimous resolution demanded the end of the policy of non-intervention, "but its several sections subsequently pursued an entirely different policy," writes Nenni cautiously, and says that the contradiction existing between the resolutions of the International and the decision of the governments of the countries in question must be eliminated.

This much is even now quite obvious: that the ambiguities are to be found within the Labour and Socialist International itself. They must be openly called by their proper names in order to prevent Spain and finally the whole international working class from falling victims to these ambiguities.

WHERE DOES THE POLICY OF THE AUTHORITATIVE LEADERSHIP OF THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL TAKE US?

Léon Jouhaux, general secretary of the C.G.T. (French Trade Union Congress), called attention to the fact (in *Messidor*, middle of October) that internal and external dangers run parallel and that it is

impossible to submit to the ultimata of the foreign fascists without smoothing the way for the enemy at home. Developments in France have now taught even that section of the working population which at first allowed itself to be drugged by the peace dope so diligently handed out, that surrender to the black-mailing threats of foreign Fascism prepared the way for the advance of reaction with the country itself. But in the discussion preceding the session of the National Council of the Socialist Party of France, certain leading socialists put forward the suggestion that Hitler should be given what he demands, that France should break off relations with all those forces throughout the world which offer resistance to Fascism and that coming to an agreement with Hitler was perfectly compatible with the principles of socialist policy. The unconditional "pacifism" advocated by Sévérac, L'Heveder, Chochoy and others in the final analysis leads from surrender to Hitler onward to the betrayal of the French working class into the hands of the reactionary deputies of Hitler within France herself.

The Dutch socialist Albarde, in an article published on September 22, 1938, by "Het Volk," gave a devastating description of the policy of surrender pursued by the socialist ministers in the guise of "neutrality." He wrote:

"The leniency shown the fascist powers will make them even more insolent. In my opinion the small European states, especially Belgium, Holland and the four Scandinavian states are to a very considerable extent responsible for the present situation. It seems to me to be one of the most alarming events of recent weeks that on September 13th, at a time when the whole world was a prey to feverish anxiety (this was the day after Hitler made his well-known threatening speech in Nuremberg, K.F.), the governments of Holland and the Scandinavian states declared in the League of Nations session at Geneva that they would certainly remain neutral whatever happened . . . The German General Staff must have been very pleased . . . And while Germany is making war on the democratic powers, she will be able to provide her armament industry with ore, steel and wood and her army with meat, dairy products and vegetables from the Scandinavian countries, Holland and Belgium. . . . The international policy of the Oslo states leads to the disruption of the power of the League of Nations to preserve peace."

With the exception of Holland all the States mentioned have governments in which the socialists are strongly represented or head the government as the strongest party. How do these responsible socialist statesmen justify such a policy to their supporters?

Spaak, socialist Prime Minister of Belgium,—who is distinguished by a cynicism of a very special kind,—at the last congress of the Belgian Workers Party (P.O.B.) gave a so-called "realistic" explanation of this sort of policy. He said that although it is a noble thing to fight for Spanish liberty, "we have something even more important to do." And what is this "more important thing?" To fight for freedom and democracy in Belgium," answered Spaak.

Let us leave out of consideration for a moment the bourgeois cynicism with which Spaak speaks of Spain. But let us keep in mind that Spaak is prepared to give up Republican Spain to Franco, in order, as he says, to preserve freedom and democracy in Belgium by so doing. Can the working class except such a policy? Can it save freedom and democracy in its own country by such means?

In Czechoslovakia a government, in which Social Democrats held key positions, recognised Franco. It was alleged that this step—which was condoned even by many honest friends of both Czechoslovakia and Spain,—was taken in order to secure the assistance of Britain in resisting the attack of German imperialism. Did Czechoslovakia gain anything by abandoning Spain? It is far too obvious that this was not the case for us to say anything more about it. This was a grave step downwards on the slope at the end of which stood the betrayal of Czechoslovakia to the fascist blackmailers at the instigation of Czechoslovak reaction.

Similar in its effects was the policy of blockading Republican Spain. This form of favouring Franco again led only to the strengthening of reaction in France, served the immediate ends of German Fascism, the chief enemy of France, and was one of the foundations of the Munich capitulation. And to the extent to which these developments took place the great political and social achievements of the French working class were put in jeopardy.

As for the “freedom” of Belgium which Spaak purports to defend by his policy, Albarda has already dealt with that. This freedom is the freedom to supply German Fascism with material reserves and to serve as a strategic point of support for it should it so desire. The leaders of the Labour and Socialist International recently gave us a sample of this Belgian “freedom” when they wrote in a document entitled “Information on the situation of political prisoners” (October 17, 1938), that in Belgium refugees from Germany and Austria were being “questioned, arrested and deported without mercy,” by the police. “Many of these unfortunates prefer to commit suicide rather than expose themselves to the appalling fate awaiting them in Hitler Germany.”

Albarda, himself a Social Democrat, wrote that the policy of the socialist governments who have declared themselves unconditionally “neutral” meets with the full approval of German imperialism and leads to the disruption of the power of the League of Nations to preserve peace. After the statements of fact given above one may safely say that this policy also leads to the disruption of the strength of the workers in every country and thus constitutes an aid to Fascism.

These Social Democratic politicians who now ad-

vise the working class to remain within the bounds of each country and give up all international obligations (no matter whether this is done openly or in a camouflaged form), are doing the working class the worst possible service because they deprive it of the strongest weapon it possesses: of international solidarity and organisation. Without such international solidarity and organisation the workers, even in their own country, are at the mercy of reaction, and are unable to defend even their most elementary interests and rights. Precisely because the reactionaries and fascists are so well aware of this they spare no effort to destroy the international cohesion of the working class. The reactionaries and fascists are quite willing to tolerate and favour so-called “working-class organisations” which make the defence of “professional interests” on a narrow national scale their aim. Why is it that the socialist working-class organisations have always been so sharply opposed to these yellow pseudo-working-class organisations? Surely because the yellow organisations sooner or later, more or less openly, but inevitably became instruments in the hands of the capitalists and because they held the workers back from the class struggle. Why should it be different now, when the bourgeoisie possesses, in Fascism, a very high degree of organisation and concentration. Now more than at any other time circumstances urgently demand that the working class be internationally linked up and internationally active.

Karl Marx wrote in 1864 in his “Inaugural Address,” the document which served as a basis for the First International:

“Still another principle inspires the assembly. If the freeing of the working class of the various nations demands their brotherly working together, how shall this great aim be reached while foreign policy is carried on which is directed to the furthering of infamous purposes, arouses national prejudices and in robber wars squanders the goods and blood of the people?”

And Marx drew the conclusion that the duty of the working class

“... lies in mastering the secrets of international politics, in keeping a watch upon the activities of their governments and when necessary with all the power at their command counteracting such activities. And when these designs of the ruling class have been brought to nought, the workers must come forward in a united fashion with the simultaneous demand that the simple laws of morality and justice which are considered right in the relations of private persons, shall be recognised as the supreme law governing the intercourse of nations. The struggle for such a foreign policy is embraced in the universal struggle for the emancipation of the working class.”

But if one remembers the attitude taken up by the Hungarian and Polish socialists, for instance, when their bourgeoisie, led by the most reactionary military cliques, annexed territories of democratic Czechoslovakia, then one must come to the conclusion that

principles very different to these are being observed to-day in the Labour and Socialist International. The Hungarian Social Democrats, in a resolution of their party executive dated October 7, acclaimed the annexation with enthusiasm and affirmed that "only this new order," *i.e.*, only this policy of annexation, "could create a lasting peace." The leaders of the Polish Social Democrats made a very similar statement in their resolution dated October 4.

The Belgian Social Democrat Henrik de Man, gave as a reason for the abandonment of an international policy of the working class and the turn towards a "reconciliation" with Fascism, that at the present moment he himself did not believe a revolution in Germany and Italy possible and that, therefore, he, instead of putting his trust "in the chimera of a revolution in Germany and Italy," was in favour of "making the necessary sacrifices." (Quoted from the congress report in *Le Peuple* of November 6-7, 1938).

The great British Labour Party also took up the position that responsibility for Munich rests with the German people. In a message sent to the German people on September 28, the National Council of Labour declared that the British working class movement had done everything in its power and that it was now the turn of the German people to bring its influence and power to bear on the German Government and restrain it from plunging Europe into a war.

After all that has happened such declarations can only be qualified as attempts to camouflage the true intentions and factual background of the policy of surrender to Fascism and to the reactionary allies of Fascism which is now being pursued by these socialist leaders. They remember their internationalism only when they require a scapegoat and want to put the blame for their own guilt on someone else. In so doing they do not stop at the falsification of facts; witness de Man who knows very well that the reactionaries of Britain and France have entered into negotiations with the fascist governments of Germany and Italy precisely because they were afraid of a further growth of the popular movement in Czechoslovakia and in their own countries and because they had an interest in excluding the Soviet Union from the counsels of Europe and in isolating the workers' republic and further because the fascist régime seemed to them the comparatively safest guarantee for the preservation of their own class domination.

Henrik de Man and the British Labour leaders were certainly aware of the fact that the position of the fascist régime in Germany during the time of the Munich Agreement was less secure than it had ever been before that a firm attitude of the Western powers might have consolidated the opposition in Germany to a very considerable degree. How strong the dislike of the Hitler régime is in Germany was

recently shown again during the anti-Semitic pogroms, when the majority of the population took up a negative and in part openly hostile attitude to this feat of the Nazis. A similar state of affairs is reported from Italy. The Socialist Party of Italy, in its appreciation of the rejection of the fascist war policy by the majority of the population, has come to conclusions very similar to those of the German anti-fascists.

In these circumstances the question forcibly arises: are perhaps Henrik de Man and the likes of him not in the least anxious for a revolutionary transformation of Germany and Italy? Are they afraid of a wide popular movement against Fascism in the European countries? Do they, like their reactionary bourgeois backers in the democratic countries, fear a weakening of their position in such an event?

This is the situation into which the policy of the Labour and Socialist International has already led us.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF INTERNATIONALISM TO-DAY?

The working class to-day stands in urgent need of an international policy uniformly carried out in principle in all countries.

But there can be no question of internationalism while decisions are taken but the contrary is done.

It is not internationalism if the Social Democratic parties and various trade union organisations allow themselves to be influenced by the British Labour leaders who in their own country carefully refrain from doing anything that might help the formation of a real united front against Chamberlain and seriously endanger his reactionary régime.

Nor is it internationalism when the responsible politicians of Social Democracy attempt to put the blame on the working class of the countries subjected to fascist rule.

In the decisive days preceding Munich, the leaders of the Labour and Socialist International observed an obstinate silence. The leading bodies of the Second International fobbed off the working class with pompous communiqués worded in the style of cabinet reports.

Such a policy brings the working class into the wake of Chamberlain and Daladier, because it deliberately refrains from using the strength of the working class for the purpose of driving forward and encouraging the hesitant bourgeois-democratic forces and checkmating the reactionary forces who are prepared to make a deal with Hitler.

What is needed to-day more than anything else is that the forces should be concentrated and firmly directed against the main enemy, German Fascism and its allies and vassals.

Such is the basis on which the working class in each country can rally all forces sincerely desiring

to defend and protect their country from the attacks of Fascism. On this basis and on this basis only will the working class succeed in rallying and uniting all truly progressive forces. Progressives are at present all those who are willing to resist Fascism while those who in words advocate "progress" but in their deeds promote a cowardly "humanitarian" compromise with Fascism and are prepared to vegetate in the conditions magnanimously conceded by Fascism must be regarded and treated as out-and-out reactionaries.

The working class will encourage and attract these progressive forces to the extent to which the workers themselves appear as an internationally united force. But the working class will demoralise and discourage these forces if it pursues a policy such as the policy of the British Labour Party, which puts up a barrier against the union of all forces opposed to Chamberlain and which glories in the part of an inoffensive opposition, an opposition received at Court. The Labour leaders who act thus are well aware of what they are doing. They are doing it deliberately. Did they not at the last Trade Union Congress reply to the motion of the Amalgamated Engineering Union proposing that an embargo be placed on the transport of goods from Japan and other aggressor States, that that would mean a general strike, which is just what these leaders do not want?

True internationalism would exclude such a policy of "murderous ambiguities." True internationalism is governed by the desire to use the growing forces of the working class and its allies to the best purpose so that they exercise a pressure on the bourgeois-democratic governments and at the same time forestall the aggressive plans of Fascism by their own action.

The socialist and trade unionist workers are willing enough to pursue such a policy because the Social Democratic workers want to fight Fascism, they want to help Republican Spain and they want the international working class to unite in this struggle.

THE DANGERS OF DEFEATIST AND PSEUDO-REVOLUTIONARY TENDENCIES

The Social Democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, of Basel, of October 8, 1938, had an article containing the following passage, written obviously under the immediate impression of deepest shame and discouragement after Munich:

"Now that the French socialists under the 'glorious leadership' of Léon Blum—whose policy is devastating the fertile lands and wonderful cities of Spain and has found its culminating point in the Munich betrayal—have given Monsieur Daladier absolution without penitence and have on top of that granted him full powers, it seems time for the traditional Swiss sense of cleanliness to come into operation. Not another hour should we remain in an

International which has for a long time been a mere shadow of itself and in which men have a decisive voice who not only approve but applaud the triumph of injustice."

However comprehensible such bitterness may be, it does not help at all. For the working class must demand more from its leading newspapers than occasional outbreaks of unbridled despondency and the repetition of impotent convulsions in all critical moments. The strength of the capitulators and of the enemies of unity within the Social Democratic ranks consists precisely in that the forces which reject their policy have never up to the present put up a resolute and united resistance to that policy. Neither the belated and weak warnings of Vandervelde nor the helpless gestures of De Brouckère can break the brutal ambition of Spaak, for neither Vandervelde nor De Brouckère have as yet been able to make up their minds to draw the only possible conclusion which is to take action for the unity of the working class. Up to quite recently they did the exact contrary and competed in this with Spaak himself. As recently as in the municipal elections of Brussels, Vandervelde came out against the united ticket. So what is the position from which he wants to fight Spaak, the nationalist enemy of unity?

In the Swiss Social Democratic party from the ranks of which such energetic protests could be heard as the one quoted from *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, it was possible for the reactionary Ilg to foist a flagrant change in home policy on the party. Against the wishes of the majority of the members of the Social Democratic party, this Ilg, secretary of the Metal Workers' Federation, obtained the consent of the party to the financial projects of the bourgeoisie and thus presented the Swiss reactionaries with new power which they are using against the working class and the small landholders. By all this he once again split the incipient democratic popular movement directed against reaction at home and the menace of German Fascism. Ilg and his friends are so anxious to cooperate with Motta, the reactionary head of the Government, that they do not even stop at splitting the Social Democratic party.

No, a mere occasional burst of indignation is not enough. The enemies of working-class unity, the carriers of bourgeois tendencies within the working-class movement have too strong a backing in their own bourgeoisie to be affected by mere words.

They are even prepared to countenance the sort of "Radicalism" which is at present represented by the "Revolutionary Socialists" of Austria in common with certain German left-wing Social Democrats. With the motto "We want to contribute to the intellectual clarification and re-orientation of German and international Socialism" these socialists take up an attitude which cannot constitute a serious menace to the confirmed capitulators but

which will cause a lot of harm in the ranks of those Social Democratic workers who are searching for a real renovation of the movement and are groping for support. From the reverses suffered by the working-class movement and anti-Fascism these socialists draw conclusions which must not be left uncontradicted.

They deny the possibility of creating a broad united democratic fighting front against Fascism and persuade the proletariat that it should become self-sufficient. This conception has for its practical consequence a resignation to fascist expansion which in the case of the "Revolutionary Socialists" is decorated with "revolutionary" frills by the discovery of "progressive tendencies" in Fascism. By force of "laws" inherent in Fascism they expect Fascism to evolve into Socialism and direct the thoughts of the workers towards a "total" "European" revolution. In this they are not deterred by the fact that the spread of Fascism worsens the conditions of the struggle for the working class. They who in their own country, despite favourable circumstances, were unable to hold up Fascism are now placing all their hopes in the "total" domination of Fascism as a result of which they predict a "total" turnover to Socialism, "total" throughout Europe.

For the working classes of the countries menaced by Fascism such a doctrine is fatal, for it discourages the working class, and to an even greater extent than formerly in Germany inspires it with the disastrous illusion that Fascism is a necessary transitional stage towards Socialism. That such a conception, on top of everything else, isolates the working class from all possible allies, requires no special explanation.

No less fatal are these theories for the anti-fascist movement in the countries under fascist rule. Here too, they split the forces instead of uniting them. Here again they raise a barrier between the active members of the working class and the large section of the population who are in opposition to the régime. Finally they render more difficult the development by the Marxist workers of class-consciousness among the National socialist workers and the workers under fascist influence, for this "total" conception leaves no room for the systematic development of the revolutionary day-to-day struggle in the shops, in the localities, on the countryside, &c. Nor does it afford an opportunity to link up with the tendencies of opposition, now spontaneously beginning, the movement for autonomy, for national independence, for freedom of conscience, for a clean administration, &c., &c., and to support and help on such movements.

The roots of these pseudo-revolutionary theories are to be found in a decided lack of confidence in

the strength of the working class. Their advocates see only the negative aspects of the working-class movement, thrown into relief by the policy of Social Democracy. In reality they are afraid of a consistent development of the anti-fascist struggle, and in this they are curiously in agreement with capitulators, the representatives of the ideological and practical co-operation with the bourgeoisie.

What is it they fear? They prefer not to speak of this openly, but their articles and the speech of the "Revolutionary socialist" representative at the meeting of the Labour and Socialist International executive gives them away: What they fear is the Communist International and the U.S.S.R.

Sincere Social Democratic workers must surely be struck by the fact that in the leading circles of Social Democracy right-wing and pseudo-revolutionary "left-wing" leaders raise their voices in unison against the Soviet Union. What is it they want? Is there any connection here with the anti-Bolshevik, anti-Soviet bloc, the ideological leadership of which is in the hands of the German fascists? There are quite a number of personal links through the Menshevik émigrés and the Trotskyist agents of Fascism. In the present serious situation, in which the fascists and imperialist reactionaries are making extensive preparations for a war against the Soviets, Social Democrats who are faithful to their class can no longer tolerate such ambiguities. The Soviet Union is the strongest and most reliable asset of the international working class. Whoever incites against the Soviet Union or who allows his attitude to the Soviet Union to appear in an uncertain twilight, cannot be a reliable fighter for the working class, nor an uncompromising enemy of Fascism.

RALLY AROUND THE FIGHTING UNITED FRONT IN SPAIN

The great task before us to-day the fulfilment of which is a vital necessity for the working class of all countries is to render every kind of effective assistance to Republican Spain.

This means a determined struggle against reaction and against fascist forces in the countries participating in the blockade or in the intervention in Spain.

This means further a determined struggle against all elements within the working class who support the blockade of Republican Spain.

The resistance opposed by Citrine and his ilk within the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions to the breaking of the blockade and to an effective assistance for Republican Spain must be broken in the interests of the future of the whole international working class.

If the workers of each country give their support to the working class and the fighting people of Spain, if the socialists and trade unionists see to it that their organisations take seriously, discuss and fulfil the demands and suggestions of the Spanish working-class organisations, then the sound and sincere forces of the international working class who rally to the Spanish working class, will finally gain the ascendancy over the capitulators and will thus make the most valuable contribution to the advance of the international working-class movement.

In Spain, communists, socialists and anarcho-syndicalists have given a brilliant and vital example of the unsuspected forces which the working class can develop in itself and in the whole people if in joint action against Fascism it throws off the hindering fetters of Social Democratism.

The words of R. Lamonedá, General Secretary of the Socialist Party of Spain, who said that the most important thing was the unity of socialists and communists in the struggle against Fascism, are of all the greater significance for the international working class, as this unity did not drop into the

lap of the Spanish working class but was the fruit of a hard struggle, a struggle against the resistance of reactionary forces within Social Democracy who attempt again and again to gain influence and against the machinations of the Trotskyist agents of Fascism. "Only the capitulators want a split between socialists and communists" said Lamonedá, and these words again are of international validity.

All workers who in these times seek a way out of the confusion created by the ideology and practice of co-operation with the bourgeoisie are being directed into the right channels by the attitude of the Spanish working class. The struggle of the Spanish people against fascist intervention is a source of power and rejuvenation for the working-class movement. In Spain the working class has chosen to be the hammer instead of still being the anvil. In Spain and in the active struggle of the international working class for the breaking of the blockade, decisive milestones are being passed on the way to the political unity of the international working class which is the desire of all workers faithful to their class.

TOWARDS THE UNITY OF THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS

By WALTER ULBRICHT

THE Munich Pact was a severe blow to the forces of peace and liberty in Germany. Chamberlain and Daladier saved Hitler in a situation when conditions of crisis prevailed in German industry, military preparations were behindhand, and in the people itself, there was widespread opposition to the war of aggression.

During September, war panic prevailed in Germany. *The profound contradiction between the war of aggression of German Fascism and the desire for peace and yearning for freedom of the mass of the people*, was obvious. The attack on the independence of Czechoslovakia was unpopular. People were asking what this had to do with the "safety of Germany," and many said that Czechoslovakia ought to be left in peace. There was revealed a great community of interest of the anti-fascist workers of all grades who are against forced labour and speeding-up, of peasants and members of the middle classes who hate compulsory economic regulations, of women who fear for their husbands and sons, of Catholics and Protestants who suffer from terrorism and of many citizens whose quiet has been disturbed by the compulsion and burdens of the war preparations.

This deep mass dissatisfaction is occasioned by

the growing realisation that the reason for the war danger is the threatening of other nations by Hitler. The German people has no desire to serve as a police force to plunder other nations on behalf of the capitalist profit interests of the German trusts. Until the annexation of Austria, Hitler carried on war preparations under the disguise of "national liberation from the bonds of Versailles," and of "making work." Since spring of this year German Fascism has gone on to attack the independence and freedom of European States, to the struggle for the re-division of the world. In Munich it created a Versailles against Czechoslovakia. This war policy, which serves the interests of German monopoly capital is in *the sharpest contradiction to the real national interests of the German people*. After years of National Socialist deception there is growing among the German people a realisation that Hitler betrays their national interests for the interests of the small clique of armament millionaires and others who have an interest in war. Fascist propaganda can no longer assert that German armaments are directed against the Versailles Powers or against imperialist circles in Western Europe, for in Munich Hitler allied himself with the most reactionary circles of finance capital against the workers' move-

ment and against democratic, social and cultural progress.

The new factor was the wide opposition among the German people who blamed Hitler for precipitating Germany into the misery of war. Before, the Nazi leaders had said to the dissatisfied: You can grumble but you must obey us. But now the workers in the factories and fortifications expressed their opposition to the war policy. Indiscipline increased in the army and many soldiers were already saying that the best fortifications would be of no avail if the soldiers turned on the foe within their own country and joined forces with the armies of freedom on the other side of the border. The fascist leaders' revilings of "Intellectuals, Catholics and Communists" who did not support them in the critical months, as well as the Jewish pogroms, only prove that mass opposition to the rule of the fascist war-mongers is growing.

The widespread dissatisfaction of these September days shows the possibilities of the anti-fascist struggle, but also the weaknesses of the movement. The working class was not yet prepared for these new, great tasks in the struggle. There were splendid examples of solidarity and of mutual help by opponents of Hitler, of partial resistance to the burdens of armament and of propaganda against Hitler's war of aggression. Anti-fascist workers formed a United Front in which they repeatedly agreed about the "whispering propaganda" and the slogans against the intolerable exploitation. In the factories and at the fortifications the workers kept in close association and comradeship. But the Workers' United Front still stuck in its initial stages. The widespread opposition throughout the nation was still divided because the revolutionary forces of the working class did not as yet fulfil its great, historical, and truly national task:—United at the head of the nation, to lead the struggle for the salvation of Germany from the fascist war-mongers. In the May Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany it was emphasised that:

"The achievement of unity of the German working class has become a vital necessity for the German nation and for the future of Germany."

After the temporary defeat which the peace forces suffered through the Munich conspiracy, the German working class will also learn its lessons for the struggle in the future. Here the chief problem is: What are the reasons which have prevented the formation of a United Front up till now and how can the unity of the working class be brought about in fact? After the Munich conspiracy the unity of the working class is all the more urgent because Hitler Fascism more aggressively than ever, is

driving towards world war. Encouraged by the Pact with Chamberlain, Hitler is moving on to destroy the small States and intends to make France his vassal State as he announces in "Mein Kampf."

In these provocations to war Hitler increasingly runs up against the will of these nations to defend their national independence by force of arms and to destroy Hitler Fascism, the home of war provocation. Thus the struggle of the German people to save Germany from the fascist war-mongers is closely bound up with the struggle for national independence on the part of the nations attacked by Hitler. It therefore follows that the struggle against Hitler's war in Spain, against the "Greater Germany" demands and against the burden of armaments and tyranny are the first tasks in Germany. The difficulties which the German opposition made for Fascism during the mobilisation against Czechoslovakia have demonstrated to anti-fascists the possibilities of the struggle. The unity of the German working class is the most urgent necessity, because the inner weaknesses of the fascist régime are becoming more and more apparent, and Hitler's aggressiveness runs up against the growing resistance of nations.

II

NEW CONDITIONS AND NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

The unity of the working class is mainly a question of political agreement as to how and with what forces Hitler's downfall can be brought about, what it is possible and necessary to do now, with what international forces the German anti-fascist forces must unite and what is to happen after the downfall of Fascism. The political firmness, the development of mass initiative and the strengthening of the organised power of the working class depend essentially on political clarity with respect to these questions. The problem of unity is concerned primarily with the creation of political unity of Communist and Social Democratic Organisations and their members in the struggle and common activity with the Catholic and non-party anti-fascist workers. Many Communists report on the comradely relations existing with the other anti-fascist workers and that they are united against Hitler. That is doubtless a step forward. But as soon as questions as to the method and objectives of the struggle are put different opinions are often evinced.

The unity of the working class is especially complicated in Germany because its forces were split at the time when it was forced underground, and co-operation and exchange of opinion are made difficult under the conditions of fascist terror. But because of the changes since the fascist accession

to power the former causes of dissension exist no longer in the old form.

Anti-fascist workers have reflected a good deal on the misfortune of the split in the German working class as a result of the war policy of the Social Democratic leadership. To-day there exists wide agreement in the struggle against the imperialist war policy of German Fascism. And how often the revolutionary workers say: "If in 1918, we . . ." had given the war criminals the punishment they deserved, if the State machinery and the army had been cleansed from reactionaries and the great capitalist war profiteers and the great landowners had been dispossessed, then there would be no Hitler. In the policy of class conciliation which the Social Democratic leaders pursued they recognise more and more the reason for the victory of counter revolution in 1919 and of Fascism in 1933. They rightly point out that the United Front of the working class was made difficult by many political mistakes of the Communist Party of Germany. The influence of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, the personal experiences of the working class and the fine example of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union are bringing about a process of ideological change in the ranks of the workers. Thus new conditions have been created for the unity of the German working class. Typical of this are the following letters. A Social Democrat wrote to a leading Social Democratic official:

"In the ranks of the Party Comrades there is a longing for the restoration of the unity of the workers' movement. They follow attentively the proceedings of the International and see impatiently that the correct union still, unhappily, does not take place. There has been a great change in the estimation of events, in the workers' movement. As an example, and by no means an isolated one, I would like to quote the following:

"A Party Comrade, a member of the Party since 1901, always true to the line and always a defender of the official policy of the Party and until recently (1934) always opposed to co-operation with the communists, has changed his attitude entirely. He has got past the old events which formerly made unity impossible. This man, who was once going to turn his daughter out of the house because she went to the Socialist Workers' Party is now for unconditional co-operation with anti-fascist groups. To-day his only desire is for a successful struggle against the system. It seems to him that this struggle can only be made successful by a united workers' movement. It is also significant that he, who formerly, one might almost say, was an opponent of the Soviet Union, now sits evening after evening at his wireless and listens to the Moscow transmitter as if from there he could feel the only positive influence that maintains his Socialist attitude and strengthens and maintains his hope.

This change is no solitary phenomenon, that must be especially emphasised. It may be expressed differently by different comrades, but is essentially the same in all of them . . ."

And another Social Democrat wrote :

"We cannot allow this split in the workers' movement to exist any longer. We must everywhere work together

and for that reason it would be good if the experiences of joint work in big factories and towns could be brought to the knowledge of Social Democratic workers throughout Germany by means of illegal material, so that the comrades can learn from this and set up the United Front in places where it does not as yet exist . . ."

A Social Democrat from South Germany declared :

"It is necessary to-day for communists and Social Democrats and all anti-fascists to pursue a united policy at home and with respect to questions of Foreign Policy. Anyone who opposes this is helping Hitler."

A Social Democratic Official in West Germany said :

"I salute the close unity of action in Spain. In a similar way, we in Germany will, and must, secure co-operation. Our aim must be the United Party of the German proletariat."

These utterances of Social Democrat officials bring out the fact that the workers must reach political agreement on the method and objectives of the struggle, so that the workers can again appear as a class. It is not enough to strengthen solidarity and to organise the resistance of the workers to the monstrous exploitation, the forces of the working class must stand at the head of the masses as the true defenders of the national interests of the German people and point the way and the goal of the fight for freedom for the overthrow of the fascist wreckers of Germany. Only thus will the masses develop initiative. For this reason, the letters and broadsheets, published by small groups of communist, Social Democrat and Christian officials, on the struggle against the imperialist war-policy of Fascism and the common tasks in the fight against fascist tyranny are an important step toward the unity of the working class and thus too, towards the unity of all the forces of freedom. Thus the proposals of the Berlin Social Democratic Party for the creation of a German People's Front were passed on from hand to hand. Letters were circulated from Social Democrats from Berlin, the Ruhr District and Hamburg, which discuss why and how unity is possible. Leaflets have been printed in which the imperialistic character of the fascist policy was exposed, and it was proved how every success of Hitler's Foreign Policy, however small, leads to increased tyranny and exploitation of the German people. Concerning the effect of this propaganda a comrade writes :

"A communist told his colleagues how leaflets had been distributed in a neighbouring factory. The next day, encouraged by the interest taken, a Social Democrat Colleague produced such a leaflet, saying, 'Here you are, here is proof that the Communist Party of Germany is working, and how well it is working.' With respect to the leaflet itself, both Social Democrats declared that it was drawn up completely in accordance with the attitude of every straightforward anti-fascist worker. They too would contribute to making a reality of the slogan of Unity, proclaimed in the leaflet."

This example, too, emphasises the fact that the unity of the working class against Fascism is the central task.

III

UNITY REQUIRES A CONSISTENT STRUGGLE AGAINST "GREATER GERMAN" CHAUVINISM

German Fascism is conscious that the mass of the people desires the preservation of peace. Therefore it fights against the opposition, not only with the weapon of terror, but attempts also by its Chauvinist propaganda, to capture the masses for its plans of conquest and thus to confuse and divide its opponents. After Munich, Hitler even exploited the desire for peace among the people in order to revile the peace forces in other countries who demanded collective resistance to defend their national independence and freedom as "war-mongers." How many workers of all classes have been misled by the Fascist assertion that Austria and the Sudeten District are German-speaking and belong to Germany. The desire for peace of the German people will only become a force for saving Germany if it leads to the conclusion that the imperialist war policy of German Fascism is the cause of war and misery, and that therefore the downfall of Hitler is a truly national task.

German Fascism came to power under the slogan of "Liberation of the Nation from Versailles," and now, by its campaign against the national independence of the European nations is driving Germany and the world into the disaster of war. As Hitler's armed intervention in Spain has proved that the intention of German Fascism is to enslave foreign nations, the annexation of Austria and of the Sudeten District and the enslavement of Czechoslovakia proves that it intends first, not in far countries but in the middle of Europe, to bring the small nations under foreign rule in order to strengthen the strategic positions for the attack on the great Powers. The contradiction between the interests of imperialist conquest of German monopoly Capital and the desire for peace and freedom of the working class and the mass of the people, is one of the most profound contradictions in Fascist Germany. The unity and the power of resistance of the working class, and the common resistance of all opponents of the regime, demand above all a consistent struggle against the imperialist slogan of "Greater Germany." Does not the recognition of the annexation of Austria by many Social Democrat leaders as pretended "progress" mean help for Hitler's war policy and thus a blow against the anti-Fascist struggle in Germany? Does not the recognition of the annexation of foreign territories with German-speaking populations imply support

for Hitler's plans of world conquest and of the Nazi phrases about the ultimate "Unification of Germany." To this a Berlin worker rightly said: "What does liberating Germans mean? There are Germans all over the world. According to that the whole world has got to come under Hitler. And in whose interest would that be. Not ours! The worst thing is that Hitler is driving towards war. But he won't get much satisfaction out of us."

The German State was constituted in 1871. The hall-mark of imperialist policy is the expansion of large-scale capital beyond the framework of the national State, in the form that it was created in the period of rising capitalism. German Fascism exploits the fact that capitalist conditions forced many Germans to emigrate or were otherwise separated from their nation. These German speaking populations outside the frontiers of the German Reich, which have their own territorial community and a historical, economic and cultural development, are not a part of the German nation. The example of the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia proves clearly that the concern of German capital was not for the solution of national problems, but for the theft of the riches of the Sudeten District, the destruction of democratic liberties in the whole of Central Europe and the conquest of strategic positions for its further aims of conquest. The struggle in Spain, Austria and in Czechoslovakia against the foreign dominance of German Fascism and for democratic liberties, makes possible the development of the greatest popular forces against Fascism and is therefore also in the interest of the German people's fight for freedom.

IV

WITH WHOM MUST AND MUST NOT THE GERMAN PEOPLE UNITE

The Munich Pact showed who were the enemies and who were the friends of the German forces of peace and liberty in the world. Those Social Democrat leaders and bourgeois opponents of Hitler who put their hopes in the governments of England and France and therefore refused co-operation with the Communist Party of Germany and the creation of a great peace movement which would include all opponents of Hitler, see now that their hopes are betrayed. Thus one of the leading Social Democratic journalists, Kurt Geyer, reaches the conclusion that Social Democracy is powerless against war. In actual fact, the policy of dividing the working class and gambling on bourgeois forces has proved itself to be powerless. The example of Spain alone is sufficient to prove how, by means of the United Front of the working class, the people acquires sufficient power to check the armed intervention of the two major

European powers. Earlier on, many Social Democratic leaders expected to be saved by the German generals and then by the governments of France and England, and after Munich they gaze expectantly to America. After the removal of Generals Fritsch, Blomberg, etc., a Berlin Social Democratic official, described in a letter the results of this fantastic policy as follows :—

“ I will freely admit to you that the removal of the Generals has disappointed us very much. We were told by our Party leaders to remain calm and to do nothing. It is quite certain, they said to us, that the army will overthrow Hitler. Then we shall get a little breathing space and shall be able the sooner to do something.

“ We believed that all too readily, for we believed that all this was said on the grounds of good connections with the Reichswehr Generals. And moreover it was very comfortable to wait for freedom to be brought by others without ourselves having to struggle for it amid the greatest danger.

“ Our eyes are now opened. Now we realise that we must fight with all our might against war and that by so doing one is fighting for freedom. No, one must not sit silently by the fire and wait. We have lost precious time but we will make up for what we have lost. We will work together with you. It is only about the ways and means that we are not yet clear.”

This expression of opinion shows how gambling on mysterious forces of some kind hinders the anti-fascist resistance and the unity of the working class. In diametric contradiction to the surrender of the bourgeois governments the **Soviet Union**, continually slandered by Wels and other Social Democratic leaders again proved that the Socialist Fatherland is the only consistent force for peace. The Soviet Union helps the threatened States by the struggle for Collective Security, but also on Lake Khassan taught a very plain lesson as to how one must proceed with fascist aggressors. The struggle of the Soviet Union against the foreign armies of intervention was an example to the nations of how they can defend their national independence, when threatened by Hitler.

The great solidarity of the Soviet Union with the Spanish and Chinese peoples and her loyalty to the states bound to her by treaties prove the worth of Stalin's word. Thus living Marxism-Leninism in the country of Socialism strengthens the resolution of the workers in all countries and helps the German working class to unite. The consequence for the forces of peace and liberty in Germany is that the struggle against German Fascism stimulates a brotherly alliance with the heroic people of the Soviet Union.

“ The vital interests of all working humanity demands the strengthening in all directions of the Soviet Union, the decided strengthening of the connections between the great Soviet Union and the working class and the peoples of the capitalist countries. Therein lies the strongest guarantee of a successful struggle for world peace.”

These words of Comrade Dimitroff, the great

front-line fighter against Fascism are especially true for the German opponents of Hitler. Unbreakable solidarity with the Socialist Soviet Union, the struggle against the fascist anti-Bolshevik agitation and against its trotzykist and bukharinist spies is a supreme task in the struggle for the unity of the German working class.

V

ON THE DISCUSSION OF THE METHODS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

In the ranks of the German working class one hears more and more often the question: What forces can overthrow Hitler? Many opponents of Hitler have hitherto waited for a war on the assumption that then the military forces would bring about the downfall of Hitler and, so to speak, would relieve the German anti-fascists of their most important task. But since Munich a more realistic attitude has arisen. Victory over Fascism in war-time must in any case be prepared now. All the more because the second imperialist war has already begun. It has become more and more apparent that that downfall of the fascist war criminals is dependent just as much on the unity of the working class and its determined struggle for freedom within Germany as on the part of the working class in the struggle for the independence of the nations oppressed or threatened by Hitler.

Under these conditions, words alone are not sufficient for unity but deeds in the common struggle are necessary. The Communists and Social Democrats who, on the occasion of Hitler's attack on Czechoslovakia scoured the imperialist robber-policy of German finance capital and called for resistance to the burdens, sacrifices and regimentation of the war policy, set a good example. At the same time the political exchange of opinion already begun in the country concerning the tasks and perspectives of the struggle against Fascism, the alliance of the working class with the peasants and the middle class as well as the connections with other groups of opponents of Hitler by means of pamphlets, letters and the wireless, should be conducted as a matter of concern to the whole working class. In this connection, the experiences of the struggle of the Spanish People's Front, the problems of the fight for national freedom of the nations threatened by Hitler and the questions of the international struggle of the Soviet Union for peace and the freedom of nations are of the greatest importance.

At the present time it is not part of the process of clarification of German political matters to work out a long list of partial measures to be put into operation after the downfall of Hitler, but rather to answer the question put by the German people :

In what way is the liberation of Germany possible? How can peace, freedom and a happy future for the German people be achieved? Hitler's shrieking about his supposed strength must be opposed by a new united political force which will point out the road to the salvation of Germany and its perspectives and will thus liberate the initiative of millions of opponents of Hitler. It is time this problem was solved for, in the last few months, Hitler's war provocation has made it apparent to large sections of the population that Hitler is acting against the national interests of the German people. Subsequently, Goebbels himself testified to the fact that the Hitler Government had threatened other nations with war. Many who formerly believed that Hitler stood for the security and independence of Germany, now recognise that fact that Fascism sacrifices the interests of Germany to the robber plans of a clique of armament millionaires and Nazi leaders. How profoundly Hitler damages national interests by ruining agriculture, commerce and industry by the government controlled war industry, and all for further plans of conquest of German monopoly capital! Hitler acted against the interests of Germany when, at Munich, he offered the most reactionary circles in England and the Two Hundred Families of France the German Army and the Storm Troopers as a police force for suppressing democratic liberties in Europe. Hitler shames Germany's world reputation as the land of poets and thinkers by putting the mind in chains and banning the great works of our classical literature. It would be the greatest illusion to believe that there could be peace as long as Hitler Fascism ruled in Germany.

Another important problem is the relation of the German anti-fascists to the struggle of the Austrian people and the peoples of Czechoslovakia for their national independence. Just as little as Germany wishes to live under the dictated Treaty of Versailles, so little do other nations wish to live under a worse Dictation of Munich. The struggle in these countries for their national independence develops the strongest forces of the nation and weakens the forces of German Fascism. The anti-fascist forces in Germany feel themselves most closely bound up with this fight for freedom, not only because the injustice put upon these people must be put to rights, but because the power of Hitler Fascism is thus undermined and the struggle against tyranny in Germany itself is strengthened.

What ought to be done in the event of war is a subject of much discussion in Germany.

Anti-fascists often declare that if other nations defend their independence and freedom from the military attack of German Fascism, the struggle for peace furthers the organisation in Germany of the

national revolution against the fascist war criminals. The national interests of the German people, the salvation of Germany, demand that the German troops fraternise with the Freedom Armies of other nations in order with united forces to overthrow the Fascist war-mongers.

German Fascism endeavours to alarm the forces of freedom within the country with the statement that in such an eventuality, the other nations would dictate a new Versailles. This question also is much discussed in Germany. But here, account must be taken of the fact that the downfall of Hitler would take place under conditions quite other than those pertaining at the collapse of Hohenzollern Germany in 1918. Because of the unity of the working class and of the forces of freedom the German nation would have the strength to determine its own destiny. It is even less likely that Germany would become the appendage of foreign imperialist governments because Socialism rules over a sixth of the surface of the earth, and because in the meantime, in the other countries, too, the popular democratic force would prevent all attempts at a new Versailles.

Not less important is the question, what kind of a regime is to be set up in Germany after the downfall of Hitler? It would be idle at this time to discuss paragraphs of constitutions. What is necessary is to reach agreement over the basic problems of the democratic revolution in Germany. In this connection, many indications are given by the experiences of 1918 and of the fight for freedom in Spain. Above all, the power of the war-mongers must be rooted out and the army completely cleansed of Fascism. In industry the removal of the State's planned war industry is necessary to make possible a development of industry for the good of workers, peasants and the middle class. That would necessitate the dispossession of the saboteurs of industry, the monopoly capital rulers and great landlords.

The firm foundation of the democratic Republic is the united working class in alliance with the peasants and the middle class and the intelligentsia, that is the uniting of the living forces of the People's Front.

These are a few problems which are discussed among the German working class to-day. Clarity over method and aims strengthens fighting force and makes easier the alliance with the middle classes. It would be extremely important if as many workers in Germany as possible could take part in the settling of these questions, because each is needed for the fight for the destiny of every individual and the future of Germany.

A discussion has also begun in the Social Democratic emigré press. The creation of a "Social Democratic Programme" is suggested and the "Con-

stitution" and "Methods of Industrial Direction" after the downfall of Hitler are discussed. The workers are here recommended, after the downfall of Hitler, to choose their Parliamentary representatives and leave everything else to them. In industry, the application of the De Man Plan is recommended and the preservation of the "planned industry centralised by the State," for which the masses of the people will return polite thanks. It appears that many Social Democratic leaders want to repeat the mistakes of 1918. It is significant that well-known Social Democrats are quite silent on the questions with what forces and in what way Fascism can be overthrown and what ought to be done towards it at the present moment. The discussion gives the impression that some Social Democratic leaders would like silently to bury, by means of a "Discussion of Programme" their own programme issued in Manifesto form in 1934.

In this Manifesto it was declared on principle:

"The grounds for dissension are disappearing. The struggle for the overthrow of the Dictatorship can only be carried on in a revolutionary way. The enemy of the Dictatorship, whether he is a Social Democrat, or a communist, or an adherent of the numerous independent parties, under the conditions of the struggle will become the same Socialist revolutionary. The unity of the working class becomes a necessity which history itself imposes."

If this declaration became the content of the exchange of opinion on the problems of the fight against Fascism, then this would aid the unity of all the forces in the country to this end.

VI

TOWARDS A UNITED REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS' PARTY

The anti-fascist workers in Germany do not want a Social Democratic Programme but a common Platform for the struggle of the anti-fascists to achieve unity of the working class. It is reported in the Social Democratic press that the Social Democrat negotiations which strove to secure unity from the right Social Democrat leaders shown to the Socialist Workers' Party, have failed. That was to be expected because there exists profound political contradictions between the Social Democrats in the country and Wels. The attempt of left Social Democrat Groups to reject the United Front in order to organise the Social Democratic forces by methods similar to those of the Independent Socialist Party (U.S.P.) is also, in the present historical situation, no real remedy but only leads to further faction strife. The revolutionary Social Democratic independent and Christian workers rightly demand, like the comrades of the Communist Party of Germany that every exertion be made to create a united Workers' Party in Germany. There are

many accounts of this in Germany to-day. In a memorandum of a workers' group, which for the most part consists of Social Democrats, we read, for example:—

"The gap made by the split in the Workers' Movement is being gradually bridged. The common enemy demands the recognition of common interests and problems and removes from the mind of the fighters the remnant of the hate and the prejudices of former days. There is no object in division.

And it is further said:—

"We know that the spontaneous movement of the masses is in itself insufficient to settle great historical problems and tasks, that for this purpose there is need for the conscious force of an organised and organising movement, the political Party, which does not grow spontaneously and by itself out of the mass movement but must be created by untiring work."

The conclusion drawn from the experiences of the illegal fighters inside the country is the necessity for untiring political work to create the united Workers' Party of the German proletariat. Reports from different industrial centres show what great political work the unknown active workers are doing in this direction thus supplying the "building material" for the united Party of the working class.

There is no doubt that the unification of the German working class is especially complicated because the working class was driven into illegal activity, divided and not having had any great, common mass struggle. Understanding is made difficult by many bitter experiences of the past. In recognition of this fact the Communist Party of Germany, at its Party Conference held in Brussels self-critically extracted the lessons of the past in order to educate its own Party on the basis of the lessons of earlier mistakes and to further explanation and understanding throughout the working class. The great tasks of the proletariat can only be performed if the lessons of the past, above all of the revolution of 1918 and the period of the Weimar Republic are put to the service of the coming struggle. Many Social Democratic comrades who to-day condemn the earlier reformist policy point out in discussions that formerly the Communist invitation to the United Front was not taken seriously by them because at the same time a policy contradictory to the United Front was pursued against the Prussian Government, against the "Iron Front" and in the Trade Unions. Now that the historical situation is changed, now that the earlier causes of division no longer exist and the Communist Party of Germany has learned the lessons of the past it will be possible to clear up these problems still further in comradesly discussions.

It is necessary to remove all obstacles which stand in the way of the unity of the German working class. It is not without effect on the mass of un-

decided and wavering people, if Hitler can again and again declare contemptuously that his opponents are not united and that there is no other power that could lead Germany. It is all the more urgent that

above all, the revolutionary forces of the working class, the most consistent fighters against Fascism unite, in order to create the foundation of the great Freedom Movement in Germany.

THE REVOLUTION IN AUSTRIA IN 1918

By FRIEDL FURNBERG

TWENTY years ago the revolution overthrew the centuries old Austro-Hungarian monarchy, evicted the Kaiser and the aristocracy, rocked bourgeois authority to its foundations and began work on its own programme towards a real and genuine democracy of the people. The peoples of that dual monarchy of idlers were aroused into action. They gave voice to their national claims, whilst simultaneously the oppressed classes, the workers and in many districts even the peasants demanded the realisation of their social claims. The revolutionary movement gripped the masses. For the time being the ruling classes were, so to speak, scoured away. The socialist working class was able to grasp with its hands the object of their struggles. To-day, twenty years later, Fascism reigns over almost the whole territory of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The workers and peasants, in fact the entire nation, are paying in blood and in kind for the mistakes and treachery of their leaders. However, the experiences gleaned from this period of struggle, especially those of the 1918 revolutionary period, bear the greatest significance in the struggle against Fascism towards the freedom of the people.

The Hapsburg monarchy was a racial mixture occupied by the Austrian bourgeoisie and the Hungarian feudal aristocracy, with the Kaiser as its mutual chief. In these states national and social contrasts were closely intertwined. The Hungarian lord of the manor was both the national and social oppressor of the Slovakian and the Croatian peasant. The Czech worker often waged his class struggle against the capitalists as a national struggle, for in most cases, capital confronted him in the form of the Austrian ruling classes. This intertwining of national and social contrasts brought about the particular weakness of the imperial regime. The revolutionary forces embraced not only the class conscious workers of the ruling nations, Austria and Hungary, but also the oppressed peoples as a whole: the Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Ruthenians, Italians and Ukrainians. The props of the imperial regime were the Hungarian feudal aristocracy, the Austrian bourgeoisie, the Austrian aristocracy, and for the time being the Polish aristocracy, a small section of the Czech bourgeoisie and the clergy. The State

machinery of the monarchy was foreign to the people and corrupt even before the war.

The overwhelming majority of the 56 million people living in the former state of Austro-Hungary was therefore hostile to the regime and the rulers.

The four-year murderous World War not only exhausted the economic and military forces of the dual monarchy but broke up completely the political cohesion and the moral forces of its ruling system.

The hostility of the people became more and more stormy. Revolutionary watchwords appeared more and more frequently, sometimes as national and sometimes as social demands. The decomposition of State machinery and army assumed greater and greater proportions, especially in the last year of the War. The Great Russian Revolution produced the most immediate and penetrating effects on Austria. It instilled into the masses the revolutionary spirit. The break up of the ally Bulgaria dragged in its train the demolition of the Austro-Hungarian monarchical front. The revolution, which had already announced itself by strikes and rioting, now became reality and the Hapsburg monarchy fell to pieces. Within a few days nothing remained of the old régime, and new forces made themselves ready to assume power in the various parts of the State. Under this pressure from within and without, the old decayed structure of the Hapsburgs was completely demolished.

In summing up the reasons why the Austro-Hungarian Revolution of 1918 triumphed, six essential points must be remembered:

- (1) The four-year war had exhausted the country, had been an enormous drain on the population, had brought hunger, poverty and misery in unprecedented measures to the people and had ended in military collapse.

- (2) The October Revolution in Russia had shown the way out of war, hunger and oppression by overthrowing the ruling imperialists of their own country. The soldiers and prisoners of war on the eastern front became countless thousands of agitators for the violent uprising, the revolution. The watchwords of the Russian Revolution were caught up by the masses. That same organisation of the Russian

Revolution was applied in Austria as well. Councils of workers, soldiers and peasants sprang up.

(3) The oppressed nations saw the possibility of winning national independence and self-government. They strove towards the destruction of the central power in order to win their national freedom, and in so doing they linked up definite social demands with their national aims.

(4) Throughout the war the proletariat of each nation and the majority of peasants had not only become convinced of the necessity of the revolution, but they had the weapons in their hands. Henceforth they turned these weapons on the rulers and swept them off the picture at one blow.

(5) The ruling classes, the Hungarian aristocracy and the Austrian bourgeoisie were completely disorganised and what was more, the Austrian bourgeoisie could no longer see any method at all of maintaining their old rulers. They despaired completely and left the field in panic.

(6) The State machinery of the monarchy was not merely disarranged. It had simply fallen to pieces and in many places no longer existed at all.

Those are the chief reasons why the revolution triumphed in Austria-Hungary. From them, however, it follows that the peoples ruled by the monarchy had every possibility before them of establishing a real people's government.

The revolution that triumphed in Austria-Hungary in 1918 was a middle class democratic revolution. It succeeded, however, the Socialist revolution in Russia, and it took place in the period of transition from Capitalism to Socialism. From the beginning it bore the marks of the proletarian revolution and the question of the growing over of the bourgeois revolution into the proletarian revolution immediately arose. The revolution was directed against national oppression, against the monarchy, against the aristocracy and landed gentry, and in addition, against the imperial Austrian bourgeoisie and against capital.

The day after the national fetters had been torn off, and the aristocracy overthrown, the masses of the working people desired to go forward to Socialism. They made themselves ready to assume full control through the workers' and soldiers' councils. This, however, is where the tremendous and historic treachery of Social democracy become most notorious. This party, which for decades had spoken about the victorious struggle for Socialism, now ranged all its forces against Socialism, and what was more, declared the newly-begun revolution to be at an end. They stepped forth as the protectors of the bourgeoisie, in whose service they erected the new State.

The revolutionary masses of workers, the armed people fought against this betrayal. However, they

had not got the Bolshevik revolutionary party which, as organiser and leader, is indispensable to the struggle. The Communist Party which had only just been founded was ideologically and organisationally too weak to take over the leadership. The proletarian revolution was nipped in the bud, but even the bourgeois democratic revolution was not carried out to its logical end.

Lenin characterised the situation as it then stood in Austria as follows:

"The proletariat of Western Europe has risen and in Austria-Hungary it has not left one stone standing upon another. The government there shows the same helplessness, the same absolute stupidity, the same wild confusion as that shown at the end of February by the Government of Nicolai Romanov." (Volume XXIII., page 260, speech at the fourth All-Russian Soviet Congress.)

In November, 1918, in the new Austria that had arisen from the ruins of the monarchy, there was no longer a government or force capable of withholding victory from Socialism. Even Otto Bauer had to admit eventually:

"The railwaymen and workers employed in producing the necessities of life, could by great mass strikes have forced upon the State anything they wanted to." (Otto Bauer, "The Austrian Revolution," page 183.)

"In the barracks the real power was in the hands not of the officers, but of the soldiers." (Ibid, page 183.)

"Even the peasant had returned from the trenches, full of hatred against war and militarism, against bureaucracy and plutocracy. Even he hailed the new freedom, the republic, and the overthrow of militarism. The peasants' belief was not different from that of the industrial worker, namely that the political revolution must bring for the masses a revolution in property relations." (Ibid, page 122.)

Never before had the Austrian people been so united and resolute about a complete social change. Never before did the people have so favourable an opportunity to take all power into its hands. But the Social Democratic leaders, filled with disbelief and the deepest distrust in the forces of the working class, and taking alarm at the mass movement, strove with all their might to help the bourgeoisie back to power. They effected a coalition with the bourgeoisie and collaborated with them, declaring that their aim was to "maintain this coalition as long as possible, because it is the only guarantee that will preserve us from anarchy." (Renner at the state council on November 11, 1918.) In fact, the coalition government was maintained only until it was not longer a necessity to the bourgeoisie, until the latter could step into power again.

The Social Democratic leaders were only able to carry out this treachery because the masses took them at their word, when they declared themselves to be fighters for "complete democracy" and for Socialism.

"Socialism in this State will then be worth fighting for, above all because it contains no privileges, and also be-

cause the proletariat sees in it the foundation of its political existence, complete democracy," declared Otto Bauer (October 31, 1918).

However, Social Democratic leadership did not fight for "complete democracy." It did not even fight for the consistent, revolutionary achievement of bourgeois democracy. In opposition to the people and in constant conflict with them it registered the successes that the working class had gained in spite of everything. It abolished and destroyed the workers' and soldiers' councils.

The first decisive blow that Social Democracy struck at the revolution and at the consistent realisation even of bourgeois democracy, was to obstruct the union between industrial workers and peasants, although then more than ever before every possibility for this union existed. They continued with their pernicious policy of alleged "antagonism of interests between industrial workers and peasants" at a moment when the peasants were expectantly awaiting upheaval in property relations on the land as a result of the revolution and of the industrial workers' support. This change in the country districts would not yet have been by any means the proletarian revolution. It would only have finished the bourgeois revolution instead of uniting the peasants with the industrial workers. Social Democracy pushed the peasants into the camp of the Christian socialists. At a time when everything was in a state of flux. Social Democratic leadership helped this reactionary party to re-establish in this manner, its position in the country districts, "in order to preserve the country from anarchy." Can any doubt exist that herein lies the basic reason why at a later time reaction and Fascism was able to draw its reserves from the masses of the peasantry? Through the policy of Social Democratic leadership, the working class had missed a historic and brilliant opportunity of establishing a firm union with the peasantry, at least of supporting the creation of a progressive peasant party and by so doing, of providing a firm basis for democratic development.

Social Democratic leadership also obstructed the final breaking up and destruction of reaction in the towns. The reactionary forces had crawled away, but from the very first day they began to assemble their forces, so that they could advance once again. It was not difficult to see that these nests had to be smoked out and removed if the people wanted to win and preserve its democracy. But the warnings of the Communists were thrown to the winds. The Social Democratic leaders made fun of "the white mice," seen by the Communists. Thus the monarchist officers, the anti-working class bureaucrats and the reactionary strata of the middle classes were able to organise afresh. The Heimwehr

in fact had already risen in this period. Can there be any doubt whatever that herein lies the real reason why reaction and Fascism later succeeded in finding its reserves among the lower middle class of the towns? The revolutionary settlement of accounts with the reactionary criminals and blood-suckers, which the entire people demanded, was necessary in order to create a firm basis for democratic government by the people. Fearing the strength of the peoples' forces, Social Democratic leadership obstructed this settlement of accounts.

A consistent carrying out even of the bourgeois revolution required that the State machinery should be completely purged of all reactionary elements. Instead, the democratic leaders advised the officials of reaction to make themselves scarce for a time. Whilst workers, peasants and members of the lower middle class demanded that the old reactionary bureaucrats should be thrown out and brought to judgment, Social Democratic leadership was proud to work with the officials of the old order. They fraudulently called such procedure "democratic," although it was clear that a genuine fight for democracy would have demanded the renovation of State machinery inside and out. Can there be any doubt whatever that herein lies the fundamental reason why reaction and Fascism later found in the "Republican State machinery" such willing support for the fight against the people and democracy? A genuine fight for democracy would have necessitated putting the State machinery completely into the hands of convinced and unflinching democrats, who would occupy a leading position among the industrial workers and peasants; instead, Social Democratic leadership handed the young Republic over to the old reactionary officials.

A fight for democracy would have meant making sure that the people had weapons. That would have required the complete disarmament of all reactionary groups and leagues, and the arming of the people. The weapons in the hands of the people; that was the surest safeguard of democracy. Instead the reactionary leagues were not disarmed, but the revolutionary workers' formations were disarmed, as for example the 41st Battalion of the People's Corps. Social Democratic leadership tried to justify itself by recalling that the imperialist entente demanded the disarmament of the people. But this argument only reveals its anti-revolutionary attitude. If Social Democratic leadership had not prevented this question from being put in a revolutionary form, it would have been possible in spite of the pressure of the imperialist entente, to allow the workers to have arms and not the reactionaries. Can there to-day be any more doubt that the Coalition Government, by gradually disarming

the masses and simultaneously arming the reactionary groups, smoothed the path on which reaction and Fascism were to develop later?

A consistent carrying through of even the bourgeois revolution would have demanded an independent, bold and democratic foreign policy. Not a cowardly retreat before the imperialist entente, but an alignment with the revolutionary forces in other countries especially with the Republic of Soviet Russia, would have been necessary. Instead, Social Democratic leadership in an understanding with the Austrian bourgeoisie, "combined" with the reactionary forces of the Great Entente Powers and the States that followed them. Owing to its cowardly disbelief in the might and future of the revolutionary movement, it succumbed voluntarily to all the dictates of the imperialists, although it was evident that Austrian Democracy thereby must become weakened and isolated and not consolidated.

As Social Democratic leadership had no trust at all in the creative force of the people, in the active initiative of the working class, in the tough endurance of the Austrian masses and in the revolutionary energy of the people, it declared that Austria was not self-supporting, and wanted to surrender once more the independence of the Austrian people. It seized on the old slogan of the pan-Germans, "Union with Germany" ("Anschluss"), in order to bring the newly-begun and independent development of the Austrian people to an end as soon as possible. Of course, it did not dare to put the question for the people to vote on, since according to Otto Bauer, it was not by any means certain that a majority would be obtained for this German national solution, which contradicted the entire historical development of Austria. At that time Germany was too weak to make use of this protective help offered by the Socialist Party leadership. In view of the differences existing between Germany and the Entente Powers, and weighed down entirely by the might of the entente, Austria remained an independent State. Social Democratic leadership, however, did not cease to carry on their propaganda for the pernicious slogan of the "Anschluss" with Germany. Can there be any doubt, that the Socialist Party leadership, by following this pan-German policy, placed weapons in the hands of German imperialists that were later used by Hitler against the Austrian people, and that this policy of Socialist Party leadership facilitated Hitler's path into Austria? Instead of surveying the strength of its own people, the Socialist Party leadership went so far in its policy of capitulation that it carried on propaganda for the surrender of its own State's independence. Can there be any doubt that herein lies the reason why later reaction and Fascism,

through the direct interference of imperialist and fascist States was able to set the people in chains?

Thus the roots of the development in the past twenty years, the roots of the temporary fascist triumph in Austria and the occupation of Austria by the brown detachments, lie in the treacherous policy of Social Democratic leadership which opposed not only the further development of the revolution into its proletarian stage, but also the consolidation of Democracy. In the last twenty years the Austrian working class has had more than one opportunity of correcting the old mistakes. The Communist Party of Austria, which was at that time very small, waged a fierce struggle to set the workers on the right path. But this was all obstructed by Social Democratic leadership, which clung to its policy of pacts and capitulation and instilled in the people that they were powerless to effect any revolutionary resistance. The forces of reaction grew. The State machinery revealed its true face. The peasantry and major part of the lower middle class were able to be misled by reaction and Fascism. In spite of the stand made by the working class and the Communist Party, the fascist forces at home and abroad compelled the entry of fascist dictatorship.

The working class and the whole people have learnt their lesson from the past. If in 1918 the union between workers and peasants was balked; if the peasants were incited against the workers for twenty years, to-day the realisation is growing that the union of the people is a necessity. This realisation is becoming stronger and stronger even among the middle class town dwellers. The common front for all Austrians is being forged in the fight for freedom and independence against the fascist foreign rule.

If the union with the consistently progressive democratic forces of other lands was obstructed in 1918, the Austrian people understands to-day more than ever the necessity for the closest contact with these masses, which are fighting against Fascism and the aggression of fascist States, and at whose head the Soviet people stands. The front of freedom-loving Austrians wants to and will fight in the same ranks as the Soviet Union, the democratic peoples of the West and the anti-fascist masses of Germany.

If in 1918, the State machinery was not renovated, and the weapons were torn from the people, the aim of the Austrians in their fight to-day, is a democratic republic, in which the masses themselves provide for all assurances against reaction and Fascism, in which they disarm the enemies of the people, keep the weapons in their own hands and entrust the State machinery only

to those who have proved themselves the most faithful and trustworthy sons of the people.

The old Social Democracy of Austria suffered complete ruin in its ideals and its organisation. The Communist Party of Austria is holding high the revolutionary fighting traditions of the working class. It stands at the head of the struggle for freedom. It is forging the united front of the working class, and in doing this, it is prepared to join with all forces that are ready to fight fascist foreign rule, and to construct a free democratic Republic of Austria. The Austrian people is combining its fight towards this goal with the daily struggle against fascist exploitation and oppression, against fascist war policy and war preparation.

THE PEASANTS IN THE YEAR 1918-1919

By O. FISCHER

IN November, 1917, the fourth winter of the world war was at hand. Once more German soldiers were to endure the hell of winter on the Western Front. In the East, the Russian winter threatened with its snow-storms. In the Carpathians, in the mountains of the Balkans, among the glaciers of the Ortlers and in the swamps of the Piave, German, Austrian, Hungarian, Croatian and Czech soldiers would have to "carry on until final victory." The fourth winter of the war threatened the front and the home bases of the Central Powers with an intensification of the suffering, privation and torment of this apparently interminable slaughter of the peoples.

The brutal, soulless machine of the military dictatorship ruled in the towns and on the countryside of Germany and Austria-Hungary. The militarized factories were working for "war purposes"; the peasants sowed and reaped for "war purposes." War economiesqueezed the last remnant of well-being from town and country. Door-handles, kettles and other hardware were taken, together with bells from the church-towers, to the collecting depots, in order to be melted down. Poverty, sickness and starvation had attained unprecedented heights, while war profits were enormously swollen.

In this particular November peace was born in St. Petersburg. The victorious Russian October Revolution had borne upon its banners the slogan of "immediate peace, without annexations or indemnities." It showed the peoples the way out from mass murder. Neither the fronts which ringed the home peoples like steel bands, nor the blockade of the Allies, nor the censorship, could prevent the tidings of the power for peace of the revolutionary workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils from penetrating to

In 1918 the Austrian people could not establish and consolidate its rule because it lacked the Bolsheviki Party, the organising powers of leadership, clarity of aim and experience.

Now it possesses an experienced and revolutionary party, the Communist Party, as its leader in the struggle for national and social freedom. Moreover in this time of bitter struggle, the forces that will lead the people to victory, are being tempered. The fascists in Austria are gentlemen of passage. The immortal people learns from its history and from its defeats. It will speak its word and victoriously will take its destiny with its own hands.

all towns and villages, into every trench. The indissoluble connection between all hopes for peace and the new Soviet Power ensured victory for the idea of the councils.

THE PEASANTS' STRUGGLE AGAINST THE "MASTERS"

Not only the workers at the front, but also the peasants in uniform were prepared to accept the message of peace from the young Soviet Power. Over three years of experience in the trenches shared with workers necessarily made an impression upon the consciousness of the peasants who had been torn by the war from their villages.

Before the war, in the isolation of rural existence, they had been accustomed to look with suspicion upon everything which came from the towns. But in the trenches, the world assumed a new aspect: they were not divided into townsmen and countrymen, but into officers and soldiers. The class character of society was manifested in a grotesquely simplified form. The soldiers were workers, peasants and small middle-class people; the officers were the sons of nobles, the city and country bourgeoisie; the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

Thus, the antagonism between town and country—undoubtedly aided by the narrow industrial-proletarian-craft outlook of Social Democracy—vanished when faced with the antagonism between the class that commanded and the class which obeyed. There arose within the trenches a new sense of fellowship between workers and peasants. This experience of the solidarity between oppressed classes formed the soil upon which fell the seed of the Russian Revolution,

and from it there grew the anger of the peasant soldiery against the master class.

For the peasant, the term "masters" embodied everything that was hostile. The "masters" had started the war. They had taken the peasant and his son from their farm and flung them into the filth of the trenches. The "masters" had caused the cattle to be taken from their stalls, the grain and fodder from their barns. Here, the conception of "masters" is older than that of capitalism. For centuries these masters had been ruling the countryside and oppressing the peasants, they had their places in the civil service and the government, they dressed up in general's uniforms and filled their bellies at the rear.

The centuries-old hatred of the peasant for the "masters" grew mightily in the trenches and there was allied to the resentment of the workers and of all other victims of war.

An end to this war without a reckoning, without revolution, must have appeared increasingly impossible. But how vague and varied were the hopes and expectations attached to this idea of revolution!

However, one idea surpassed and preceded all others, namely, that of *peace*. They were nearly all agreed that the first act of the revolution must be the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns and Habsburgs. In the minds of those who were politically most mature there grew the certainty that the revolution could and would only be carried out by workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils. Nevertheless, on the question of the national self-determination of the peoples of the Habsburg monarchy, for example, there was no sign of an agreed, general plan.

In all social questions, the demands made on the revolution differed even more widely one from the other. The revolutionary workers were convinced that the coming revolution would overthrow the employers as well as the kaiser and the generals, that it would dispossess the capitalists and inaugurate Socialism; although they had no very concrete conception of how this latter aim was to be achieved.

What did the peasants and agricultural workers expect of the revolution? In their minds, the conception of the end of the war was linked up with that of the end of wartime economy. For, quite correctly, they saw that the fighting and the economy were but two aspects of one and the same catastrophe.

Beyond this, the agricultural population considered it the task of a revolution to break the power of the "masters." The kaiser was far away, but the lord of the manor, the lord lieutenants, and all such feudal or semi-feudal rulers, were close by. If this power were broken, there would be a peasants' land instead of what, through force and injustice, was the masters' land. If this power were broken, the farm labourer could get a piece of land, the small tenant farmer could become a peasant proprietor. To become an in-

dependent farmer, working undisturbed—such was the desire of farm labourer, cottager and tenant farmer. Were this power broken, the peasant would be able to take timber from the manorial woods, to obtain pasture-land, rights of way.

A great volume of hopes and desires arose in the minds of these men, many of them mutually contradictory in some details, but all having a common preliminary condition: the power of the "masters" must be broken, the soil freed from the ownership of the large-scale landlords. "Socialisation" was a meaningless term to practically all the rural population. They neither wanted it nor refused it. Thus it happened that all sections of the rural population—so long as they did not consider themselves to belong to the "masters," as did the peasant nobility—desired from the revolution, immediately following the establishment of peace and the abrogation of war economy, not the abolition of capitalism—which demand, in fact, they did not understand—but the downfall of the nobility and of all large-scale land-ownership.

This common desire covered over, at least to some extent, the class contradictions within the rural population. Undoubtedly the objective possibility then existed of uniting the agricultural worker, the tenant-farmer, the poor and middle peasant, and a considerable number of the larger peasants, under the leadership of the working class for bringing about an end to the war by revolutionary means and the abolition of feudal domination and methods of production. Naturally, any further development of the revolution would have caused the class antagonisms in the countryside to reawaken. But, in the late autumn of 1917, the further aims of the revolution were still completely shrouded in darkness. The arising revolutionary unity of the people visualized as the first and most definite objective, overshadowing all others, the ending of the war.

THE ALLIANCE OF WORKER AND PEASANT —AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Faced by this process of the spontaneous revolutionizing of the masses the Social-Democratic parties, in the minds of these masses, were called upon to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary movement. However, this expectation of the masses by no means coincided with the attitude of the leaders of Social-Democracy. For they had, in the meantime, worked out for themselves a much simpler and more comfortable manner of proceeding towards Socialism. Ballot in hand, striding from election to election, they foresaw eventually a parliamentary majority, and promised that, when they became the dominant party, they would introduce Socialism by means of legislative enactment.

Although they had long ago abandoned scientific Marxism, they believed—or, at least, wished others

to believe—that reformism was nothing other than the adaptation of Marxism to “altered circumstances.” And, in particular, they felt themselves called upon to rectify the “errors” of Marx and Engels with regard to the peasant question.

Marx and Engels had demonstrated the necessity of the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants, under the leadership of the working class, and, in view of the approaching revolution, had demanded that this alliance be realised; but as the reformists failed to see the necessity for the revolution, so did they also fail to recognise the need for such an alliance. Marx and Engels showed that the possibilities for such an alliance arose from the inevitable decline, from the frightful deterioration, of peasant economy under capitalism; but the reformists, on the other hand, affirmed that peasant economy under capitalism was neither deteriorating nor being ruined.

Beneath this difference of opinion was concealed one of the grossest falsifications of Marxism ever attempted. When Marx and Engels spoke of the decline of peasant economy, they referred to the peasant family farm, in which wage labour was never, or only exceptionally, employed. They drew a very sharp distinction between such farms and the definitely capitalist, labour-exploiting farms of the big peasant proprietors. But this distinction grew hazy and then altogether vanished, with the reformists; and it was precisely these latest, modern farms, intensively worked on capitalist lines, and existing in a relatively small proportion, to which the reformists referred as typical of peasant economy. While Marx and Engels demanded an alliance with the vast mass of the peasantry which was becoming pauperised and ruined, the reformists had quite lost sight of this great section of the peasantry and could perceive nothing but the rich peasants and the large-scale employing farmers.

This divergence was already made clear in Hilferding's book, “Finance Capital,” in 1909. Hilferding wrote that the power of large-scale land-ownership would grow through the disappearance or, at least, a considerable lessening of its antagonism to small ownership. With the removal of feudal burdens, the historical antagonism between large and small land-ownership would vanish. The common struggle over tariffs, he maintained, had united large and small landed proprietors. The large estate-owner had become the leader of the small farmer.

And Kautsky's claim—that Social-Democracy would never be able to beat the agrarian parties—was to exactly the same effect as Hilferding's. But all this applied only to the small agrarian capitalists. For them, and for them alone, the antagonism to large-scale farming is of secondary importance, an antagonism within the limits of capital. For the capitalist farmer only is the bourgeois revolution already con-

summated. Both the vigorous vestiges of feudalism, existing in both Germany and Austria—such as feudal landlords' privileges and the semi-feudal dependent relationships of both peasants and land workers with the landed “gentry”—determined, and do still determine, to a great extent, the consciousness of wide masses of the peasantry.

It is the conceptions which we have described above which were at the root of the policy of the Social-Democracy with regard to the peasantry. On the one hand, the “peasant” must be induced to vote the Social-Democratic ticket. For this reason, the Social-Democratic Party showed a continuously increasing grasp of all measures leading to further rationalisation of farming and increased productivity. Also, for this reason, they procrastinated in the organisation of the agricultural worker and sought to restrain his demands within specific limits, in order not to disgruntle the agrarian capitalists, who for them were the “peasants.”

On the other hand, they taught the Social-Democratic workers to regard the peasants as covetous capitalists with no other desire than to raise prices and grow rich on the hunger of the workers. While the first aspect of the Social-Democratic agrarian policy—as described above—was practically unknown among the urban workers, this hostile attitude towards the peasantry became deeply rooted and nourished the conviction that the revolution could only be the achievement of the working class alone, in struggle against all other classes in society. The teaching of Marxism, on the revolutionary alliance of the workers with the middle classes, and particularly with the peasants, which was further developed by Lenin, and propagated by the Bolsheviks, had been completely forgotten in the west.

Such was the situation in which Social-Democracy was taken by surprise by the war, which was perforce to reveal its deep degeneration. Such in its essentials was the situation in the autumn of 1917, when Social-Democracy was taken by surprise by the Russian Revolution and by the approaching revolution in Austria and Germany. Social-Democracy could only see in the revolution an elemental catastrophe which disrupted the normal course of events.

THE RETURN FROM THE FRONT

In the autumn of 1918, the Central Powers were at the end of their strength. In September Bulgaria broke down, and in October Turkey, and later, Austria-Hungary and Germany, sued for an armistice. After a few last bloody convulsions, the war was over.

The peasant soldiers streamed back from the front to their villages. They were resolved to settle up with those who were to blame for the war and for all the

ills from which peasants suffered. They brought back from the trenches the conviction that they would not have to fight this struggle alone, that the workers were solidly on their side, that it was above all the workers who would stand their ground in the fight with the master class. The last weeks in the trenches, the degrading and expulsion of officers and the formation of soldiers' councils, had considerably strengthened the revolutionary spirit of the peasant soldiers, particularly in Austria.

But the spirit was very different in the villages towards which the soldiers were travelling. The continual requisitions, the ceaseless harassing by officials, all of which in some way or other proceeded from the city, to which should be added the growing and unconcealed hostility of the starving urban population to the peasants—all this led, over and above class antagonisms, to a definite solidarity of the villages as opposed to the towns, to a sharpening of the antagonism between town and countryside.

The returning peasant soldiers knew about this, from letters or from visits home on leave, but their faith in the solidarity of the oppressed classes—gained in the trenches—was at that time stronger than their rural suspicion of the town. They helped the workers to chase out the officers; they sat with them in the soldiers' councils; they marched and rode homeward together with them.

How fierce must have been the disappointment and anger of the returning peasants, then, in Austria and in Germany, when they found the workers' councils requisitioning cattle and grain in their native villages. And even worse: the workers' councils proceeded in this to work together with the authorities, with the county officials—hand in hand with the hated apparatus of war restriction enforcement.

In his book on the Austrian Revolution, Otto Bauer described this as if it had all arisen spontaneously. In actual fact, however, the workers' councils in Austria had been led by the Social-Democrats ever since January, 1918.

Born as organs of revolution, the workers' councils had fallen under the control of skilful Social-Democratic demagogues. There was no revolutionary leadership, no Bolshevik Party, to guide this spontaneous movement of the masses. It is true that the "Left Radicals," out of whom later the Communist Party was to proceed, carried on an arduous struggle for the leadership of the worker's councils, but they were not yet a match for the skilled and experienced demagogues of social-democracy and the trade unions. It is true that the workers' councils were not invariably willing to accept instructions from the Social-Democratic Party, but the latter determined the direction of their activities. Social-democracy stood protectingly before the state apparatus; only under its protection could the war restrictions con-

tinue, could the county officials continue to function.

Social-democracy had trained the workers in complete aversion to, and misunderstanding of, the peasants. The terrible scarcity drove the workers' councils into efforts to obtain foodstuffs, and social-democracy allowed them a free hand as regards the peasants. The social-democrats saw how the revolutionary spirit in the villages vanished to be replaced by hatred of the workers; they noted how the political leadership, which, during the revolutionary uprising, the small peasants and rural workers had been able to grasp, was going back into the hands of the rural bourgeoisie—and against all this they did nothing.

"The peasant saw that the revolution denied him the 'freedom that he loved.' He saw that, in the place of military requisitioning, it was now the workers' councils which compelled deliveries, which prosecuted illegal trading, and opposed the abrogation of maximum price fixing. The peasant duly discovered that detachments of the people's guard would be quartered on his village—just as imperial troops had been formerly—until he turned over the required grain, cattle or wood. The peasants saw in the proletariat the enemy who denied him the free disposal of the products of his labour. Now the peasant began to hate the proletariat, as formerly he had hated militarism."*

But it was social-democracy and not the workers' councils that compelled the prolongation of war-time restrictions. It was not the workers' councils that prevented the peasants from driving out the hated county officials but the leaders of social-democracy. And when both secular and ecclesiastical land-owners denied thousands of small tenant-farmers access to the soil, it was thanks to the leaders of social-democracy who stood on guard over woods and meadows which had been stolen from the masses throughout the centuries, and would not permit the peasants once more to take possession of that which originally had belonged to them.

And if detachments of the people's guards were quartered on villages, in order to compel the peasants to deliver products, it was a people's guard which had been created and was led by social-democracy, and which carried out this act of force against the peasants by order of the government authorities and not of the workers' councils. The full responsibility for these crimes against the revolution may be laid at the door of the leaders of social-democracy and not of the workers' councils, which were only misused tools.

Naturally, the revolutionary spirit of the returning peasant soldiers could not survive these circumstances. The prevailing mood in the villages—previously neither revolutionary nor counter-revolutionary—now affected the returning veterans and was definitely directed against the working class.

*Otto Bauer: "Die Oesterreichische Revolution," ("The Austrian Revolution"); Vienna, 1923.

When the peasants' councils entered together with the workers' councils into municipal, district or agricultural commissions, it was not to work, together with the workers' and soldiers' councils, for the revolution, but in order to prevent the worst happening to the villages. In these commissions, they found support against the workers' councils forthcoming from their old enemies, the big land-owners and the bureaucracy. Their revolutionary hopes vanished rapidly; they forsook the camp of revolution and flung themselves into the arms of counter-revolution.

THE PEASANTS' COUNCILS IN GERMANY

Developments in Germany were similar to those in Austria. Here also the social-democratic leaders soon succeeded in investing the councils with their own character, and transforming them into auxiliary organs of war-time economy. In the manifesto of the social-democratic government of Germany, of November 12, 1918, we may read as follows (as reported in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 15, 1918):

"The new German Reich government hereby calls upon all sections of the agrarian population, without distinction of party affiliation, to the combined voluntary formation of peasants' councils, in order to safeguard the people's food, tranquillity and order in the countryside, as well as the unhindered continuance of agricultural pursuits."

Thus the peasants' councils were entrusted with the task of preventing that which should have been the sole objective of peasants' councils, namely: the achievement of the revolution in the villages. On November 19, there had already been constituted in Berlin a "National Peasants' and Land Workers' Council," formed by representatives of all existing agricultural bodies—which is equivalent to saying that they represented the big land-owners, the peasant nobility, and agrarian capital; for these forces controlled those bodies. The social-democratic trade union, the German Land Workers' Union, played a leading part in the formation of this remarkable national peasant's council. Its official report for 1914 to 1919 contains the following remarks on this affair:

"At our instigation there took place on November 19, 1918, the first meeting of agricultural organisations including those of the workmen. On this day, the 'national peasants' and land workers' council' was formed. This 'national peasants' and land workers' council' was primarily to have the task of ensuring the safeguarding of the people's food and the continuance of agricultural production. . . . We intervened in order to ensure that these peasants' and land workers' councils should not become political organs. This paradox of history, that the conservative representation of the farmers should contribute to the protection of the revolutionary achievements, was estimated by us from the first as a transitory phenomenon. . . ."

While the land workers were waiting their emanci-

pation by the revolution and by the German Land Workers' Union, the latter was engaged in savouring the "paradox" of setting up a peasants' council in common with the counter-revolutionary junkers.

Thus, in Germany the agricultural workers and the peasants were deprived of their revolutionary councils, right at the beginning of the revolution, and the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants was nipped in the bud.

The strength of the revolutionary spirit among the German rural population, and particularly among the agricultural workers, is shown by the tremendous growth in membership of the German Land Workers' Union. The total membership figures rose from 19,077 in 1913 to 695,695 in 1920, while in the same period the membership of the Christian agricultural workers' union rose from 5,576 to 69,520. An unprecedented wave of agricultural workers' strikes swept over Germany. In 1919 there were 163 strikes, affecting 932 undertakings. In 1920, 366 strikes, affecting 3,220 concerns. During the Kapp putsch in March, 1920, sections of the north-east German land workers—particularly those in Mecklenburg—rose against the counter-revolutionary rebels. The workers locked up the landlords in the pig-sties and attempted to form a Red Army. However, they remained isolated and without leadership. Von Lettow-Vorbeck, leader of the White-Guard bands, had some of them shot, after a "court martial." The social-democratic German republic tendered them no thanks for their heroic fight against counter-revolution.

While, east of the Elbe, the revolutionary wave had mainly affected the agricultural labourers, in south and west Germany it also embraced the peasants. Unfortunately, reports are very scanty regarding the efforts of the peasants to secure by revolutionary means satisfaction of their demands. In the manuscript of a work, not yet published, to which we have access, Edwin Hörnle writes as follows:

"The writer of this article remembers an episode he witnessed in the November days of 1918 in Württemberg. In Württemberg, about one-third of the parishes are 'feoffment-in-trust' parishes. In other words, a great proportion of the land within their boundaries is the entailed—that is, unsaleable—property of some noble family. Only a small portion—sometimes none at all—of this feudal land is farmed capitalistically; the greater portion is leased to the peasants by means of an auction, in small sections. In addition, the land-owners possess a number of rights in the parish—rights of way, hunting and usufruct—without having to contribute towards the costs of maintenance. On the other hand, the parishes do not possess sufficient vested rights, either of woodcutting or of passage, in the extensive feudal forests. Such rights are vigorously contested by the landlords who institute much expensive litigation.

"A village of this type is Donzdorf, near Geislingen-on-the-Steige. On November 9, the peasants and semi-proletarians of this village marched, armed and deter-

mined, on the castle and forced the count to sign a document renouncing his feudal rights and ceding the leased farms. Great excitement prevailed in the provisional social-democratic government of the state of Württemberg over this spontaneous action of the Donzdorf peasants. The minister of the interior, Crispian, then of the Independent Socialist Party, and the premier, Wilhelm Bloß, of the Social-Democratic Party, immediately cancelled the gains of the peasants, striving to appease them with promises of a 'legal settlement' of the land question at the forthcoming National Assembly, and issued a warning to all 'feoffment-in-trust parishes' in Württemberg against imitating the example of Donzdorf.*

This one example should suffice to show how far the revolutionary ferment had progressed among the peasants, and how, from the earliest days, it encountered the opposition, not only of the big landlords and the old bureaucracy, but also of the social-democratic governments. Under such circumstances, every movement of the agricultural workers and peasants must needs be nipped in the bud, arousing deep disappointment and resentment at this "revolution."

THE PEASANTS AND THE BAVARIAN SOVIET RULE

The situation in Bavaria was somewhat different from that in the rest of Germany†: Here Kurt Eisner had formed a social-democratic republic which on November 8 proclaimed a sort of Soviet republic, as follows:

"The Bavarian Soviet Republic is hereby proclaimed. The highest authority is the Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Council, elected by the population, which is provisionally nominated until a final people's representative body has been established. It possesses legislative powers."

At the same time, however, the temporary programme of the provisional government stated that: "All former officials are to remain in their posts."

One day later, there appeared a decree of the minister of the interior, the social-democrat, Auer, endowing the administrative bodies which had previously been entrusted with food control with the right to continue their work, and with exclusive rights to issue decrees. This would, of course, immediately affect the peasants, as it implied the complete preservation of all war-time economic measures. Thus, the power of the councils—which had just been proclaimed—was virtually simultaneously suspended, so far as such suspension was within the power of the government. The governing function remained in the hands of the old state apparatus.

The powerlessness of the councils in this "Soviet"

*Edwin Hörnle: "Das Deutsche Dorf und die Grosse Sozialistische Oktoberrevolution." ("The German Village and the Great Socialist October Revolution.")

†The following statements are based mainly upon "Die Bayrischen Bauernräte" ("The Bavarian Peasants' Councils"), by Wilhelm Mattes, a Social and Historical Investigation of Peasant Policy. Stuttgart and Berlin. 1921.

(council) republic was again proved by the "provisional directives" issued on November 26, 1918. According to this, the workers', soldiers' and peasants' councils were indeed to compose the constitutional "foundation of the new system," but they would have no executive powers. In effect, they were granted only the right to require information from the authorities, the right to advise the authorities and the right to make complaints about the authorities. They were also obliged to aid in securing the rendering up of all superfluous foodstuffs and in the combatting of illicit trading.

Thus far, then, the circumstances of the peasants in Bavaria did not differ from those in the rest of Germany and in Austria. The peculiarity consisted in the establishment of a central peasants' council which, right from the beginning, was not an organ of counter-revolution, as was the national peasants' council, but was to a certain degree an organ of the revolutionary peasants.

The formation of this council was entrusted to the Independent Socialist, Ludwig Gandorfer, and, after his death in an automobile accident, to his brother, Karl Gandorfer. Karl Gandorfer was the leader of the left wing of the Bavarian Peasant League, the sole progressive democratic peasant organisation in Bavaria. The Central Peasants' Council, formed by him wholly of members of the Bavarian Peasant League—the election never took place—stood by the councils right up until the violent overthrow of the Soviet power in Bavaria. The efforts of this Central Peasants' Council to persuade the Eisner government, and later the Soviet government, to adopt a policy which would receive the support of the peasants were mainly unsuccessful. The leaders of the council themselves had only a confused conception of peasant policy; and, moreover, they encountered on the side of the government a complete misunderstanding of the peasant question.

This was most clearly revealed in the "Complete Socialisation" plans for agriculture which the more than questionable "socialist," Dr. Neurath, had worked out. These plans embraced the nationalisation of large estates and the compulsory organisation of the peasants in productive co-operatives under a central authority. At the time of the Soviet dictatorship in Bavaria, Dr. Neurath was at the head of the socialisation department. The Central Peasants' Council, immediately before the proclamation of the Soviet dictatorship, had declared itself prepared to support the dictatorship of the councils on condition that socialisation of agriculture by Dr. Neurath's central department should take place only with the co-operation of the central peasants' council and that it should only affect farms of over 330 hectares (a hectare is nearly two and a half acres). This condition—which was accepted—reveals the defensive

position of the central peasant council as against "Complete Socialisation."

Essentially, this is what happened: a considerable number of the rural population had hoped that the revolution would give the large landlords' estates to the peasants and agricultural workers. When the slogan of "Complete Socialisation" first reached the villages, the peasants understood by it nothing but the division of the large estates among the peasants and labourers. Soon, however, they began to realise that "socialisation" meant something quite different. It was true that the land was to be taken away from the big landlords; not to be divided up, however, but to be worked by some central administration. And, in addition to this, there was to be an infringement upon the peasants' economic freedom, for their labours were to be subordinated in some way to a central department.

Thus "Socialisation," for the peasants, had been translated into its opposite. From the expectation of an increase in the peasants' holdings it had been converted into a menace to the land they already possessed. The better-off peasants—who suddenly began to fear that their land might be taken away, just as the big landlord's was to be—infected the smaller peasants with this apprehension. The central peasants' council sought to remove this fear by securing the adoption of the highest possible minimum area for farms liable to "socialisation." Yet it could do nothing to alter the fact that the peasants had lost all interest in the revolution, and that they continued to scent danger in "socialisation."

The disappointment of the peasants' hopes for the abrogation of the war-time economic measures and for a division of the large estates followed upon their fear of "socialisation," in which they could see nothing but an extension of war-time restrictive economy. Thus did the revolutionary elements on the countryside lose the leadership, which now fell into the hands of the counter-revolutionaries. The fate of the Bavarian Soviet regime was settled principally by the fact that even the Extreme Left of the German social-democracy was unable to liberate itself from the false attitude of social-democracy towards the peasant question.

THE PEASANTS WON OVER BY COUNTER REVOLUTION

The democratic revolutions of November, 1918, in Germany and Austria did not bring the peasants and agricultural workers a small fraction of that for which they had waited and hoped. The tasks of the bourgeois revolution remained unfulfilled as before. The position of the agricultural workers east of the Elbe had changed but little. Large-scale land ownership remained intact throughout all Germany and Austria.

It was an easy job for the bourgeoisie. A few trivial concessions to the rebellious peasants sufficed to alienate them for a long time to come from the influence of the revolutionary working-class movement, and to bring them over into the train of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the working class. Thus, in Austria, it was the bourgeoisie who, in the spring, 1920, liquidated the war-time measures, against the opposition of the social-democrats.

Also in the question of land reform, it was the bourgeoisie who, against the opposition of social-democracy, showed a certain tendency to make concessions. As Otto Bauer wrote, in his book, "Die Oesterreichische Revolution" ("The Austrian Revolution"):

"The provinces opposed to the socialisation of forest properties plans of a quite contrary nature. They proceeded by legislation to abolish the peasants' obligatory service in the state forests, in return for cession of land; thus, instead of socialising the forests, they divided them up among the peasants."

We see, then, that here, also, so-called socialisation aroused the peasants' hostility, just as it had done in Bavaria. According to the social-democratic interpretation, the demand in 1918-1919 for the abolition of war-time legislation was a "counter-revolutionary" struggle against "planned economy"; the demand for the land of the big landlords was a move against socialisation. And Otto Bauer believed that he had made a considerable contribution to Marxism by the following utterly false conception (from the book above cited):

"... large and middle peasants ... have no ... revolutionary traditions. Until 1918, they were in the camp of the Habsburg counter-revolution, and in their hearts they are still there. ... Their republicanism is really their fear of the Czechs. The manly love of freedom—without which true democracy is not possible—is alien to them ..."

In contrast to this, let us take the findings of an objective bourgeois historian:

"The attitude of the peasant population towards the revolution was far more favourable than the reports of the workers' councils [on the basis of a questionnaire.—O.F.] indicated. The latter, in their judgment, confused the attitude of the peasant population with that towards themselves. The peasant who welcomed the revolution nevertheless need not be an adherent of the workers' councils."*

Thus wrote Mattes of Bavaria. This applied, however, equally to other parts of Germany and to Austria. The attitude of the peasants towards the workers' councils was determined by the attitude of the councils towards the peasants. Under the influence of social-democracy, the workers' councils considered it "counter-revolutionary" if the peasants

*Wilhelm Mattes: "Die Bayrischen Bauernraete" ("The Bavarian Peasant Councils.") Stuttgart and Berlin. 1921.

did not agree with what they did. The peasants disliked the policy of the social-democratic party because this policy was inimical to the peasants. This is proved, to a considerable extent, by the fact that the peasants were in the camp of the counter-revolution. For it was first the policy of social-democracy which prepared the ground in the countryside for counter-revolution.

IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

Thanks to the policy of social-democracy, fascism, in the act of seizing power, was able to depend upon the middle classes and peasantry. Once in power, however, it did not hesitate to make adequate return for the aid of the city and rural petty bourgeoisie, in the form of the abolition of all liberties, of the establishment of a physical, intellectual and moral slavery which has no exemplar in history. Fascism also rewarded them by the forcible expropriation of the petty proprietors.

The land robbery of the old feudal lords was revived in new forms. The decline and pauperisation of the peasantry appeared not to have been checked but accelerated, and assumed a more brutal and coercive character. Fascism has itself severed the bond by which it was able to lead the peasantry into the struggle against the revolutionary working class. The way has now been made clear for a new alliance of workers and peasants, in a struggle against fascism and the rule of capital.

In 1918, social-democracy betrayed the revolution. In the meantime, according to the model and under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin and Stalin, Communist Parties have come into existence. In Spain, the young Communist Party knew how to

establish a solid alliance of the working class with the peasantry, in the struggle against Fascism and against foreign intervention. It was able to intensify this alliance in the struggle against the Trotskyist P.O.U.M. which, at the orders of Fascism, sought to disrupt the unity of peasants and workers by means of "radical," coercive measures of "Socialisation."

Under the leadership of the Gestapo, the Trotskyists have refined and amplified the fatal methods of "Complete Socialisation" which Neurath in the days of the Bavarian Soviet Republic practised against the will of the young Communist Party, in order to strangle the revolution on the pretence of radicalism. But the vigilance of the Communist Party of Spain has frustrated this strategem of the counter-revolution.

"Ten or twenty years of correct relations with the peasantry, and victory on a world scale is assured (even if the proletarian revolutions now developing are delayed); otherwise, twenty or forty years of the horrors of White Guard terrorism."*

These words of Lenin have been proved to be shatteringly true in the widest sense for Germany and Austria; while the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union was ensured by the establishment of "correct relations" with the peasantry by the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

The working class, and particularly all the Communist Parties, have the urgent and imperative obligation to root out the very last vestige of social-democratism in the peasant question. This alone can lead to a solid People's Front, and to the coming victorious revolution against Fascism.

*Lenin, quoted by Stalin in "Leninism," Vol. II., p. 78. Co-operative Publishers edition, Moscow.

ON THE FORM OF PARTY PROPAGANDA IN RELATION TO THE PUBLICATION OF THE "SHORT HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION"

A Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks).

I.

THE publication of the "Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," is the greatest event in the ideological life of the Bolshevik Party. With the appearance of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Party has received a new, powerful weapon of Bolshevism, an encyclopaedia of fundamental knowledge in the field of Marxism-Leninism. The "Short History" is a scientific history of Bolshevism. In it the vast experience of the Communist Party, which neither had nor has its equal in any party in the world, is explained and generalised.

The "Short History of the C.P.S.U." is the most important means of fulfilling the task of mastering Bolshevism and equipping Party members with Marxist-Leninist theory, in other words, with a knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle; it is a means of enhancing the political vigilance of Bolsheviks, both with and without Party membership cards, a means towards raising the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism to a worthy theoretical level.

In the production of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. had in mind the following tasks:—

1. It was necessary to give the Party a uniform manual of Party history, a manual representing the official treatment of the chief questions of the history of the C.P.S.U. and of Marxism-Leninism, tested by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., and which would admit of no capricious interpretation. Through the publication of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U.," approved by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., an end has been put to caprice and confusion in the exposition of Party history, to the whole volume of varied viewpoints and arbitrary interpretations of the most important questions of Party theory and Party history, which existed in a number of previously published courses on Party history.

2. By the production of the "Short History of the

C.P.S.U.," the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. undertook the task of eliminating the pernicious separation which had been made in recent years in the field of propaganda between Marxism and Leninism, and which led to the fact that some began to teach Leninism as an independent body of teaching, separate from Marxism, separate from dialectical and historical materialism, and separate from the history of the Party, whereby they forgot that Leninism originated and developed on the foundation of Marxism, that Marxism is the basis of Leninism, and that it is impossible to understand Leninism unless one also knows this—the foundation of Leninism.

In the production of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of providing a manual of the theory and history of the C.P.S.U., in which the artificially dissociated components of uniform Marxist-Leninist teaching—of dialectical and historical materialism and Leninism, of historical materialism but linked up with the policy of the Party—would be brought together into one united whole; a manual in which the indestructible unity, completeness and consistency of the teaching of Marx and Lenin, the unity of Marxism-Leninism, would be demonstrated; in which the new, which Lenin and his pupils brought to Marxist theory, on the basis of the generalisation of new experiences of the class struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, would be represented.

3. Contrary to many old manuals, which represented the history of the C.P.S.U. chiefly through historical personalities and aimed at the development of *cadres* through personalities and their biographies, the "Short History" deals with Party history on the basis of the development of the main conceptions of Marxism-Leninism, and aims at the development of *cadres* primarily on the basis of the *ideas* of Marxism-Leninism.

In producing the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. approached

the problem from the point of view of teaching Marxism-Leninism on the basis of historical facts. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. had in view the fact that such an exposition of Marxist-Leninist theory best represents the interests of the case that the basic ideas of Marxism-Leninism can be best, most naturally and most comprehensively, demonstrated by means of historical facts; for the history of the C.P.S.U. is in itself Marxism in action; for the correctness and vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory is tested in practice through the experiences of the class-struggle of the proletariat; and Marxist-Leninist theory itself has been developed and enriched in the closest association with practice on the basis of the generalisation of the practical experience of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

4. In the production of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of liberating Marxist literature from superficiality and vulgarisation in the exposition of a number of questions of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and of the history of the Party.

This type of vulgarisation and superficiality, for example, found expression in the opinions—expounded until quite recently, obviously anti-Marxist, and long since condemned by the Party—with regard to the role of personalities in history, when the question of the role of personalities is history was represented by certain pseudo-theorists and pseudo-propagandists in a quasi-social-revolutionary manner.

The incorrect exposition of the question of the victory of Socialism in our country belongs to this type of vulgarisation and shallowness in Marxism-Leninism.

Distortions of Marxist-Leninist conceptions of the character of war in the present epoch were widespread, as were also a lack of comprehension of the distinction between justified and unjustified wars, and the incorrect opinion that the Bolsheviks are "pacifists" in their own fashion.

In the science of history, the anti-Marxist distortions and vulgarisations were until quite recently connected with the so-called "school" of Pokrovsky, which represented historical facts distortedly, elucidated them, in spite of historical materialism, from the standpoint of the present, but not from the standpoint of those conditions under which the historical events took place, thus distorting true history.

The falsification of history in contradiction to the reality of history, the attempts to embellish history instead of representing it faithfully, led, for example, to the fact that, in our propaganda, the history of the Party was sometimes presented as purely a triumphal progression, without any temporary defeats or setbacks, obviously thus contradicting historical truth and hindering the correct training of cadres.

Anti-Marxist vulgarisation and confusion also showed itself in the dissemination of incorrect con-

ceptions of the Soviet State, in the disparagement of the role and the significance of the Socialist State as the chief weapon in the hands of the workers and peasants for the victory of Socialism and for the defence against the capitalist world of the socialist achievements of the working people.

The "Short History of the C.P.S.U." puts an end to these and similar instances of vulgarisation and shallowness in treating Marxism-Leninism and re-establishes the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

5. In the production of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of clearly demonstrating the strength and significance of Marxist-Leninist theory, which scientifically reveals the laws of social development, of the theory which teaches how to utilise these laws as a guide to the revolutionary action of the proletariat; the theory which, like all science, is constantly developing and improving, and which does not fear to replace this or that obsolete thesis or conclusion by theses or conclusions which represent new historical conditions.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. started from the viewpoint that, without a knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, without mastery of Bolshevism, without overcoming their theoretical backwardness, our cadres would be gravely trammelled; for the task of correctly leading all branches of socialist construction demands that the practical workers master the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory, that they be guided by theory in the solution of questions of practical work.

It is a mistake to assume that only a small circle of functionaries can master theory. The mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory is by no means unattainable. Precisely at the present time, under Soviet power and in view of the victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., unlimited opportunities have been created for our leading cadres to master successfully Marxist-Leninist theory, to study the history of the Party and the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In order to master the theory of Marxism-Leninism one needs only the will, perseverance and strength of character for the attainment of this end. If it be possible to master such sciences as physics, chemistry and biology, for example, there is even less reason to doubt one's capacity for completely mastering the science of Marxism-Leninism.

6. In the production of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. set itself the task of aiding the cadres who are engaged in theoretical and propagandist work to transform themselves, to improve the quality of their work, to eliminate their theoretical backwardness, to remove the insufficiencies and deficiencies in their ideological training, and to raise propagandist work to a worthy level.

All these tasks, which the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. undertook, have been solved by the "Short History of the C.P.S.U."

II.

Wherein lie the chief deficiencies in propaganda work?

In what direction must the propagandist and theoretical work of the Party be reconstructed?

1. The chief deficiency in Party propaganda is the lack of the necessary centralisation of the direction of party propaganda and the consequent rule-of-thumb methods and lack of organisation in propaganda.

Rule-of-thumb methods and lack of organisation in the sphere of propaganda are chiefly expressed in the fact that Party organisations have chosen oral propaganda in study-circles as the chief form of propaganda, thus forgetting that the study-circle method of propaganda was predominantly suited to the illegal period of the Party, expressing the working conditions of the Party at that time, and that under the conditions of Soviet power, when the Bolshevik party has in its hands such a powerful instrument of propaganda as the press, entirely new conditions and opportunities have been created for an unrestricted degree of propaganda and for the centralising of its direction.

Instead of utilising these opportunities, however, Party organisations continue to cling to the old forms of propaganda, and fail to take into account the fact that under present conditions, study-circles can no longer constitute the chief method of training our cadres in Bolshevism, that the chief method of training cadres in Marxism-Leninism must be the method—tested in practice by the older generation of Bolsheviks—of independent study of the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party; but, in this connection, the Party must come to the aid of cadres on questions arising in the course of study, through the Press and through a highly-qualified, centralised consulting body, by means of courses, lectures, and so on.

Party organisations which chose oral propaganda in study-circles as the chief form of propaganda permitted themselves to be led by the false conception of organising all Communists into study-circles; they aimed at the quantitative extension of the network of the Party study-circle, at striving for the complete "inclusion" of all Communists—for whom participation was obligatory, without exception—in the Party study-circles.

In their strivings for a large number of circles, Party organisations let fall from their hands the most important link in the chain, namely, the quality of the propaganda.

The superfluity of study-circles, which deprived the Party organisations of the possibility of controlling the nature of the propaganda, led to the Party

organisations permitting the direction of propaganda to slip from their hands; their activity consisted chiefly in the collection of statistical material on the "enrolment" of Communists in the study-circles, their numerical strength and the number of visits to the circles. The upshot was that the circles were transformed into autonomous, uncontrolled organisations, carrying on their work at their own risk and peril.

Furthermore, the super-abundance of study-circles led to the propagandist cadres being crowded to excess with people who were poorly trained theoretically and frequently politically uneducated and untested; who were unable to help the Party members and non-Party people to master Bolshevism, but, on the other hand, were only capable of substituting for the presentation of Marxist-Leninist theory an injurious superficiality, thus confusing their hearers.

In their striving for a large number of propagandists, the Party organisations permitted the theoretical direction of training, the further education of the propagandists, and control over the work of propagandists in the circles, to escape their hands. Instead of centralising the direction of propagandists, thus ensuring an improvement in the quality of work among propagandists, Party organisations also, in this respect, mistakenly aimed at large numbers, dispersing the aid for propagandist cadres by the establishment of a large number of Party education departments* in the factories, of training schools for propagandists, of short courses for propagandists, and so on. The striving for quantity of such institutions, at the cost of their quality, led to the Party education departments and the training-schools for propagandists being deprived of the necessary Party leadership, and the lack of qualified cadres as leaders of training-schools for propagandists and Party education departments led to a decrease in the quality of the work, to dissatisfaction among propagandists with the state of things, and converted attendance at training courses and at Party education departments into a formal obligation.

In connection with the fact that Party organisations made attendance at study-circles an obligatory duty for Party members, that they looked upon Party comrades as permanent pupils of the elementary classes, incapable of the independent study of Marxism-Leninism, they had recourse to a whole series of administrative expedients in order to enrol Party members in the circles and keep them there, they embarked on methods of petty supervision and of the regulation of activities of Communists in the circles.

Incorrect pedantic methods, restricting the ideological and political development of Party members, were

*"Party Cabinet," centre of Party education; special room set aside for a library, with magazines, periodicals, etc., with consultants to advise propagandists, etc.

rooted in the activities of the circles, and were manifest in the establishment of "uniform training courses" for all circles, of uniform regulations for work, and in the suppression of unrestricted discussion and comradesly debate in the study-circles.

Not restricting themselves to this, the Party organisations also lapsed into the bureaucratic and harmful conception of "controlling" everyone who read a Marxist-Leninist book and forcing him to give an account of what he had read.

The result of this incorrect attitude towards propaganda work is that Communists who, throughout several years, were obliged to visit one and the same study-circle, and who lacked suitable assistance in their home studies, lost interest in theoretical training, and attendance at the study-circle frequently became an oppressive burden.

The violation of the principle of voluntary enrolment in study-circles, the bureaucratic-administrative practice of the mechanical, compulsory inclusion of Party members in the circles, the incorrect estimation of the circles as the sole form of Party training, undermined the belief among Party members that they could successfully study Marxism-Leninism by means of independent reading. In this manner, an injury was done to the interests of thorough, independent assimilation of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism by Communists, to the ideological development of Party cadres.

The belief in their power and capacity to master Marxist-Leninist theory must be restored to the Communists.

It is necessary to destroy the harmful conception that Marxism-Leninism can be studied only in study-circles, for in reality the chief and basic method of studying Marxism-Leninism is in independent reading.

2. One of the chief causes of the excessive exaggeration of study-circle work and oral propaganda, mainly at the expense of press propaganda, was the injurious disconnection between the organisation of press propaganda and that of oral propaganda, which found expression in the existence, side by side, of propaganda departments and press departments in the area committees, the district committees, and the Central Committees of the various national Communist parties, as well as in the apparatus of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

In the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the most important weapon must be the Press: journals, newspapers, pamphlets; to which oral propaganda should constitute an aid and support. Inasmuch as the Press has the capacity of making the truth about this or that matter common property at one stroke, it is more powerful than oral propaganda. The separation of the direction of propaganda into two departments led to a depreciation of the role of the Press in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, and thereby to a

restriction in the extent of Bolshevik propaganda, to rule-of-thumb methods and disorganisation.

The departments for Party propaganda and agitation, which limited their activities to oral propaganda and strove for numerical increase of study-circles, have not made full use of the Party Press for propaganda purposes, and in the final result have deprived themselves of the possibility of directing propaganda in essentials.

The press departments, from which the requisite, qualified propagandists—who had devoted themselves almost exclusively to oral propaganda—had been taken away, proved themselves incapable of carrying on the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism through the Press.

3. The most important defect in Party propaganda is the under-estimation of political education, of Marxist-Leninist steeling of our cadres, of our Soviet intelligentsia—the cadres of the Party, of the Young Communist League, of the Soviets, of industry, the co-operatives, trade, the trade unions agriculture, the schools system and the army—through the Party organisations; in other words, the cadres in the apparatus of the Party, State and the collective farms, with whose help the working class and peasantry of the Soviet land govern. The practice of our Party propaganda, which concentrated chiefly upon the enrolment of the workers at the work-bench, was to ignore the leading cadres, our Soviet, Party and non-Party intelligentsia which consists of former workers and peasants.

One of the tasks of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." is to terminate this absurd, anti-Leninist, derogatory attitude towards our Soviet intelligentsia, and towards the requirements of their political, Leninist training.

The "Short History of the C.P.S.U." appeals in the first place to the leading cadres of the Party, of the Komsomol and of industry, and to other functionaries, to our entire Party and non-Party intelligentsia in town and country.

Our Party, Soviet, industrial and other leading Leninist cadres, who are engaged in practical work, have fallen considerably behind in the field of theory. When the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. produced the "Short History of C.P.S.U." it undertook the task of beginning the elimination of this theoretical and political backwardness of our cadres.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. proceeded from the standpoint that—

" . . . if we were able to train ideologically and politically educate our Party cadres from top to bottom so that they could find their way in the political situation at home and internationally, if we knew how to make them into complete mature Leninists, Marxists, capable of solving the problems of the leadership of the country without serious errors, we could thereby solve nine-tenths of our problems." (Stalin: *Mastering Bolshevism*.)

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. proceeded from the standpoint that the art of Bolshevik leadership demands a knowledge of theory, in other words, of the laws of development of society, the laws of the development of the working-class movement, the development of the proletarian revolution, the development of socialist construction, and the ability to apply these laws in practical work in the field of leadership of socialist construction.

All our cadres form the mighty army of the Soviet intelligentsia. The Soviet intelligentsia is bound by all its roots to the working class and peasantry. It is a completely new intelligentsia, without equal in any other country.

No country could or can go ahead without its intelligentsia and least of all the socialist state of the workers and peasants. Our intelligentsia, which has grown up during the years of the Soviet power, is composed of those cadres of the State apparatus with whose help the working class pursues its internal and foreign policy. They are former workers and peasants and the sons of workers and peasants who have been advanced to leading positions. The intelligentsia is of particular importance in a country like ours, where the State directs all economic and cultural activities, including agriculture, and where every government functionary must understand the policy of the State and its tasks, both at home and abroad, in order to carry on his work understandingly and successfully.

Thus, the task of the Marxist-Leninist training of the Soviet intelligentsia is one of the primary and most important tasks of the Party of the Bolsheviks.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. has substantiated the fact that the derogatory attitude towards our intelligentsia, in spite of the important part they play in the Soviet State, has not been overcome even to this very day, which implies the extremely harmful application to our own intelligentsia of those conceptions of, and attitudes towards, the intelligentsia which were propagated in the pre-revolutionary period, when the intelligentsia was in the service of the landlords and capitalists.

This derogatory attitude towards the intelligentsia finds expression in the neglect of the ideological training of cadres, in the abandonment of political work among the intelligentsia, employees, teachers, doctors, students, the intelligentsia of the collective farms, and so on, in a derogatory attitude towards the Party and non-Party intellectual, as towards a human being of a secondary order, even if he be a Stakhanovite of yesterday who, in virtue of his merits, has been appointed to a leading position in the Soviet State.

Such an anti-Bolshevik attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia is repugnant and churlish, and dangerous to the Soviet state. It must be realised that it is precisely the neglect of political work among the intel-

ligentsia, among our cadres, which led to the fact that a part of our cadres, who stood outside the political influence of the Party and also lacked political steeling, went astray politically, lost their way and became the prey of foreign espionage services and their Trotskyist-Bucharinite and bourgeois-nationalist agencies.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. is of the opinion that an end must be put to this anti-Leninist attitude à la Makhaisky * towards the intelligentsia.

It is necessary that the Soviet intelligentsia be educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

Without such an intelligentsia, the Soviet government cannot successfully lead the country.

The "Short History of the C.P.S.U." is a means towards such education of the Soviet intelligentsia.

III

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. resolves:—

1. That the practice of striving after the quantitative inclusion of Communists through the study-circle network of Party training at the expense of the quality of the propaganda, which leads to the dispersing of forces and the lowering of the level of propaganda work, shall be considered as incorrect.

2. That the Party organisations be obliged to liquidate organisational rule-of-thumb methods in Party propaganda, to establish the necessary centralisation in its direction, and so to transform Party propaganda that the raising of its quality and of its ideological level be ensured.

3. To take the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." as a basis for propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

The study of the history of the C.P.S.U. is to be differentiated in the following manner:—

For the *lower* group of cadres, in which there is a considerable number of insufficiently trained comrades, it is advisable to study the course within smaller compass according to three chief stages of the history of the Party: (1) The struggle for the creation of the Bolshevik Party (Chapters I to IV); (2) The Party of the Bolsheviks in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat (Chapters V to VII); (3) The Party of the Bolsheviks in power (Chapters VIII to XII).

For the *middle* group, which consists of relatively better trained comrades and which is the strongest group numerically of our cadres, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. recommends the study of the

*W. K. Makhaisky belonged to the Marxists until the 90's. Later he followed the "Economists," and, like them, represented the view that the working class is not justified in carrying on a political struggle but should concentrate on economic struggles. When the Marxist intelligentsia led the working class along the path of the political struggle, Makhaisky's supporters issued the slogan: "Down with the intelligentsia!" Later, Makhaisky went over to the camp of open counter-revolution.

“Short History of the C.P.S.U.” in its full compass, according to the 12 chapters it contains.

For the *higher group*—namely, for the best trained comrades—the study of the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” should be accompanied by the simultaneous study of the corresponding works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, according to the sources given, section by section in each chapter.

4. Arising from the fact that the chief method of study of Marxism-Leninism must be the method of independent study, the area, district and Central Committees of the national Communist parties are instructed to reduce the number of Party training circles.

In the place of the dozens and sometimes hundreds of study-circles now existing in each large factory, in institutions and universities, it will prove suitable, by a proper approach to the matter, to have in larger factories and the bigger institutions, about two or three circles for the lower cadres, two or three circles for the middle level, and one circle of a higher type for the most developed and trained persons; and in the universities a few circles of the middle and higher type.

In the rural areas, where the desire exists to study the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” in study-circles, and in which trained propagandists can be found, a few circles can be formed for the village intelligentsia; the Party and Soviet “actives,” the teachers, the trade and co-operative employees, the collective-farm “actives” and so on.

In the reduction of the number of circles, the task must be borne in mind of ensuring really trained propagandists for the existing circles.

5. That the administrative-bureaucratic practice of the compulsory inclusion of Communists in Party training circles be stopped.

That it be explained to every Communist that participation in the study-circles is absolutely voluntary.

6. The work of the circles must be built up on the basis of lively discussion and comradely debate. The harmful pedantic-administrative methods, the red-tape and routine, which restrict the ideological training of Bolsheviks both with and without Party cards, must definitely be eliminated. The propagandists must explain in a comradely manner the questions which interest the members of the circles.

An end must be made to the formal, bureaucratic regulation of study-circle work, as, for example, a uniform day for party training, a two-hour lesson immediately after work, discouraging the putting of practical questions which would interest the members of the circle, and so on. The time-table of each circle must be drawn up by the members, together with the propagandists, and with reference to local conditions. Each lesson should last just as long as the circle-members deem necessary for the fundamental consideration of the questions treated.

The work of the study-circles must be so organised that the instruction does not extend over too long a time. One of the basic deficiencies of the present circles, which must be avoided, is to devote unlimited time to the earlier subjects, thus failing to study the period subsequent to the October Revolution, which is of great importance in the history of the Party.

The circles for the study of Party history must be composed so as to ensure a more or less equal level of general and political knowledge of the members.

In accordance with these levels, three types of circles, in accordance with the three differentiated types of study, as follows, are recommended:—

(a) Circles for the lower group of cadres, which will study the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” in restricted compass, with simple explanations of theoretical questions;

(b) Circles for the middle group, who will study the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” as an entirety, chapter by chapter;

(c) Circles for the most highly trained comrades, who will study the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” by accompanying each section with simultaneous reading of sources.

7. That lectures be organised; these belong among the most important propaganda methods of Marxism-Leninism. A well-prepared, comprehensive lecture would be of real assistance to the comrades who are independently studying the “Short History of the C.P.S.U.” and the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Furthermore, lectures should be held dealing with questions of the international situation and various theoretical and political questions. It would be useful for the lecturer to answer questions after his lecture. Public lectures, with a small admission fee, should be inaugurated.

8. Rule-of-thumb methods and the lack of co-ordination in the work of propagandists, which was expressed in the effort to set up as many Party education departments and training-schools for propagandists as possible, must be eliminated. Party organisations are obliged, within a two-months term, to examine the network of Party education departments, to reduce their number, and, as a general rule, to leave to the town and area committees of the Party the Party education departments for aid to propagandists and for consultation by persons who are engaged on political self-education.

The Party education departments in factories and institutions which possess no qualified consultants, must be given up, or used as reading-rooms and libraries for persons who are engaged in individual study. The Party organisations are obliged to reduce the number of training-schools for propagandists, and to concentrate the work of these training-schools for propagandists upon the big Party committees in the

town districts, the town committees, district and provincial committees.

In the establishment of training schools for propagandists, the Party organisations must secure leaders for them who are trained Marxists and are politically tested. The town, district and provincial committees of the C.P.S.U. must exercise constant control over the content of the work of the propagandists' training-schools.

The work of the training-schools for propagandists dealing with the history of the C.P.S.U. must be developed and adapted to the three basic forms of study of the history of the C.P.S.U., whereby it must be taken into consideration that, in the study of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." the propagandists' training-schools must definitely have precedence over the study-circles.

The training-school must not be a place where propagandists are "pulverized." The instruction in the training-schools must be designed so as to assure each participant creative work, a lively handling of theoretical questions, and comradesly discussion on questions of theory and methods.

9. The department for agitation and propaganda of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. is obliged to gather together the most qualified propagandists of our Party, lecturers, "referents,"* consultants, who must contribute to theoretical reviews and central newspapers, deliver lectures and addresses in their districts, and afford effective help to the local organisations in the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

It is considered necessary to collect the experiences of the best propagandists, and systematically to publish in the Press the best lectures, addresses and consultations.

The town, district and provincial committees and the central committees of the national Communist parties are recommended to convoke regular gatherings of propagandists and writers for the Press in order to discuss basic questions of propaganda.

10. To eliminate the under-estimation of the Press as the most important weapon of Marxism-Leninism and as an all-Union tribune of propaganda.

To enhance the importance of the Press in the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism. To this end, the editorial staffs of *Pravda*, *Krassnaya Svezda*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, as well as of the Party and Y.C.L. newspapers of the Republics, provinces and districts are obliged systematically to publish articles on theoretical questions of Marxism-Leninism, consultations, lectures by the best propagandists, and "replies to readers." Propaganda departments are to be organised in the editorial offices of the *Pravda*, *Krassnaya Svezda* and *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, as well as in the Party and Y.C.L. newspapers of the

*Comrades responsible for collecting material, indicating sources, etc.

Republics, districts and provinces, at the head of which theoretically trained comrades must be placed, and the best propagandists must be drawn in to collaborate with the propaganda departments of the editorial offices.

It is considered necessary to transform the review "Bolshevik" so that it becomes the theoretical organ of the party and an all-Union consultation centre for questions of Marxism-Leninism, and in its pages to discuss and reply to theoretical and political questions which interest Party members and non-Party persons.

The department for Party agitation and propaganda of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the state publishing house for political literature are to be obliged to ensure the publication of popular pamphlets to help propagandists, and in particular the lower group of the active workers who are studying Party history; and also to draw up a plan for the publication of material for instruction in Party history.

11. To condemn the derogatory attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia, and towards the tasks of their ideological and political training in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, as repugnant and churlish. The Party organisations to be obliged to re-establish the correct Bolshevik attitude towards the Soviet intelligentsia, and to develop ideological-political work among the intelligentsia, the employees, students and the collective-farming intelligentsia. The elimination of the theoretical and political backwardness of the cadres of the Party and non-Party intelligentsia is to be considered as the first and most important task of the Party organisations in the field of propaganda, and every assistance must be rendered the Soviet intelligentsia in the mastering of Bolshevism and in the study of the history of the C.P.S.U. and the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

12. To recognise the serious backwardness of the workers on the theoretical front, which is expressed in their theoretical weakness, in their fear of boldly raising opportune theoretical questions, in the spread of hair-splitting and quibbling, in the vulgarisation and superficial treatment of particular aspects of Marxism-Leninism, in the backwardness of theoretical thinking, in the inadequate theoretical generalisation of the vast practical experience which the Party has gathered in all spheres of socialist construction. All workers on the theoretical front are called upon to abolish resolutely and swiftly the intolerable backwardness of the theoretical front, to overcome the fear of boldly raising theoretical questions which would further develop Marxist-Leninist theory, and to put an end to hair-splitting and quibbling, to scholasticism, and to the vulgarisation and superficial treatment of particular aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory.

13. To eliminate the negligence in ideological

work, which found particular expression in the unsatisfactory work of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute which permitted a number of distortions and inexactitudes to enter into the translation of works by Marx and Engels into the Russian language, as well as the grossest political errors, of a pernicious character, in the appendices, annotations and commentaries to some volumes of Lenin's works.

14. The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute to be obliged, within the shortest term, to rectify the distortions which have occurred in the translations of the works of Marx and Engels into the Russian language, and also gross political errors which are contained in appendices and annotations to the works of V. I. Lenin: for example, in Volume XIII.

The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute is required to accelerate publication of the new edition of the works of Marx and Engels and of V. I. Lenin.

15. To note the detachment of our theoretical reviews from the burning questions of the life and struggle of our Party, their isolation and their tendency to academicism.

That the editorial staffs of the theoretical reviews pledge themselves to transform their work, to ensure that in their pages will appear topical theoretical questions, the generalisation of the experience of socialist construction, the satisfaction of the theoretical demands of our cadres, the working out of new theoretical problems, and creative discussions on theoretical questions.

16. Complementary to the system of more advanced political training of leading Party cadres, as laid down in the February-March plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., to carry out the following measures for continuation studies and training of qualified propagandist cadres of the Party:

(a) To organise one-year courses for the further training of propagandists and writers for the press in the following centres: (1) Moscow; (2) Leningrad; (3) Kiev; (4) Minsk; (5) Rostov; (6) Tbilisi; (7) Baku; (8) Tashkent; (9) Alma-Ata; (10) Novosibirsk. The one-year courses for the further training of propagandists, which are to be organised in these centres, shall receive students, not only from their own particular province or district, but also from near-by districts, provinces and republics. The programme of the one-year courses for propagandists must be drafted with reference to the programme of the "Lenin course," and the instruction must be so devised as to ensure that a certain confidence is attained in propagandist work and in the independent thorough study of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

To set the total number of students for all one-year courses for the further training of propagandists

at from 1,500 to 2,000 persons, of whom about one-half must be collaborators on newspapers.

(b) To organise under the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. a university for Marxism-Leninism, with three-year courses for the training of highly qualified theoretical cadres of the Party.

17. To establish the instruction in Marxist-Leninist theory in the universities upon the basis of the profound study of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." And, in connection with this:

(a) To introduce, in place of the independent courses in Leninism and dialectical and historical materialism in the universities, a unified course in the "foundations of Marxism-Leninism," while retaining the general number of study-hours provided in the curriculum for social-economic subjects. Instruction in the foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory in the universities must begin with the study of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." accompanied by the study of Marxist-Leninist sources. Political-economic instruction shall take place after the conclusion of the study of the history of the C.P.S.U.

(b) To establish, in place of the existing various chairs for dialectical and historical materialism, Leninism and the history of the C.P.S.U. in the universities, one unified faculty for Marxism-Leninism.

(c) In those universities and institutes where there are faculties of philosophy, history and literature, to retain the courses in dialectical and historical materialism in those faculties.

(d) To instruct the department for propaganda and agitation of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Union committee for university affairs, for the beginning of the study-years 1938-1940 to select leaders for the faculties of Marxism-Leninism, and to refer their selections to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. for confirmation. To instruct the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, the provincial, district and town committees of the C.P.S.U., to select theoretically trained and politically tested teachers of the foundations of Marxism-Leninism.

(e) To organise in the University for Marxism-Leninism a six-month's course for the further training of teachers of Marxism-Leninism for universities.

IV.

In order fundamentally to improve the leadership by the Party of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. resolves:

18. To consolidate the departments for Party propaganda and agitation and the press and publishing departments of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., the Central Committees of the national Communist parties, and of the provincial and district

committees of the C.P.S.U., and to establish unified departments for propaganda and agitation.

19. To concentrate the entire written and oral propaganda work of Marxism-Leninism and of political mass agitation in the departments of propaganda and agitation (Party press, publication of propaganda literature and agitational material, the organisation of written and oral propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the control of the ideological content of propaganda work, the selection and allocation of propaganda cadres, the political education and training of Party cadres, the organisation of political mass agitation).

The present resolution of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. is to be practically realised on the basis of the work of the departments of propaganda and agitation.

20. In order to improve the quality of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, it is necessary that, in future, the Party organisations as a rule depend for propaganda upon cadres which have been freed from all other work, who are absolutely dedicated to this work and can work unflinchingly to improve their theoretical and propagandist qualifications.

In this connection, to instruct the district and provincial committees of the C.P.S.U. to select the best propagandists for permanent propaganda work.

21. The functionaries of the departments for propaganda and agitation must be taken by the Party organs from the ranks of the best qualified professional propagandists and Party writers.

Lecture-groups must be organised in the departments for propaganda and agitation of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., of the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, and of the provincial, district and town committees of the C.P.S.U.

22. In connection with the fact that, through the reduction in the number of study-circles and also of Party education departments in factories and institutions, some of the propaganda functionaries in the towns will be disengaged, to propose to the district and provincial committees, and to the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, that the best trained of these functionaries be sent to strengthen the propaganda work in the rural districts.

23. To reorganise the existing cultural and propaganda departments of the town and district committees of the Party and transform them into departments for propaganda and agitation. It is also considered necessary that, in every district committee where at present there are no cultural and propaganda departments in existence, departments for propaganda and agitation be set up. To stipulate that the setting-up of departments for propaganda and agitation in the district committees of the

Party, at the request of district and provincial committees and of the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, shall be sanctioned by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. to the extent to which qualified functionaries have been selected in each district.

To link up the town and district Party educational departments with the departments for propaganda and agitation of the town and district Party committees, so that the leaders of the Party educational departments can also function as substitutes for the leaders of the departments for propaganda and agitation.

24. To stipulate that the leaders of the departments for propaganda and agitation of the district committees and the provincial committees of the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, of the area, town and district committees of the Party, be approved by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.; all other responsible functionaries of the departments for propaganda and agitation of these committees to be approved by the bureaux of the district and provincial committees and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties.

That the district and provincial committees and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties be obliged, within a term of two months, to select and approve all functionaries of departments for propaganda and agitation.

25. In consideration of the close relationship between the work of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute and the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, it is considered necessary that the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute be placed under the control of the department for propaganda and agitation of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

26. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. requires of all Party committees that they seriously occupy themselves with the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, the most essential concern of the Bolshevik Party. The Party committees are obliged to lead in every respect the cause of propaganda and to acquaint themselves fundamentally with its content. The district and provincial committees, and the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, must take into their hands the leadership of the transformation of the entire organisation of the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, in conformity with this resolution.

Inasmuch as it is pointed out to all Party organisations that the transformation of the entire matter of propaganda work in the sense of this resolution of the Central Committee demands from all Party organs particular attention and care, the Central Committee warns the Party organisations against the danger of a mechanical and formal approach to the

transformation of propaganda, and against any attempt whatsoever at a summary disparagement of all former experiences of propagandist work.

To stipulate, for the improvement of the leadership of propaganda work, that in every town, district and provincial committee, in the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, a special secretary who will be occupied exclusively with questions of the organisation and the content of propaganda and agitation.

* * *

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. proposes to the district, town and provincial committees, and to the Central Committees of the national Communist Parties, that they explain this resolution to the Party "actives" and to all members of the Party.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. emphasises

that the publication of the "Short History of the C.P.S.U." must become the beginning of a change of course for our cadres—functionaries of the Party, of the Y.C.L., of the Soviets, trade unions, economy and culture; the cadres of the entire Soviet intelligentsia—towards the elimination of their theoretical backwardness.

The "Short History of the C.P.S.U." lays the basis for a new and powerful ideological and political impetus in the life of our Party and of the Soviet people.

Through the mastery of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, equipped with the knowledge of the laws of social development, our cadres will become truly invincible, and, under the banner of this theory, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, will even more successfully lead the entire Soviet people to the victory of Communism.

November 14th, 1938.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

THE contrast between the rise of the new world of Socialism and the economic, political and moral decline of the capitalist world was more glaring in November of this year than ever before. In the Soviet Union the workers in town and country were celebrating the 21st anniversary of their Great October Revolution. Proudly and joyfully they looked back upon their path which has always led and is still constantly leading to new economic and cultural successes in spite of all difficulties and the criminal sabotage undertaken by the Trotskyists and the Bucharinists. In a world where uncertainty, economic anarchy and modern robber knighthood hold sway, the Soviet Union is the only country in which the workers systematically and methodically pursue their work of socialistic construction, and where they are being urged on to still greater efforts and to a greater preparedness for the defence of their mighty achievements in view of the decline which the rest of the world is experiencing. The 21st anniversary of the Great October Revolution has shown the fascist warmongers of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis what is waiting for them, if they should try to disturb the Soviet People in their peaceful work of construction. Over all the towns in the Soviet Union cruised the countless squadrons of the Red Air Force. Across the squares thundered tanks and artillery of all sizes and calibres. Through the streets marched the endless columns of the Red Army and with them the armed workers from the factories together with the millions upon millions, who will hurry as one man to the defence of peace at the first call of their government. From the speeches made by the representatives of the Soviet people to the 21st anniversary of the Great Revolution, rang out the resolute determination not to allow the jackals of Fascism to reach the Soviet boundaries, but if they attacked, to annihilate them in their own dens.

THE CANNIBAL PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS.

Meanwhile events since Munich have proved that the treacherous sacrifice of Czechoslovakia has served only to whet the appetite of the fascist beasts of prey and to intensify their ravings. During the days when the Soviet People was reviewing its brilliant rise from the backwardness and illiteracy of the Czarist regime, a wild orgy of cowardly and murderous attacks on defenceless people, of systematic arson, of organised robbery, lit up the abyss, into which the once culture-proud German people has been pushed by the base and vulgar gangs of

the Nazi regime. Winston Churchill, one of the most far sighted politicians of British Imperialism, who is fully conscious of the dangers underlying the explosive nature of German fascist expansion, asked Hitler to tone down his regime after the "success" of Munich. Hitler's answer was a scornful "No." The economic conditions of the working masses of *Germany cannot be improved* by the annexation of the Sudeten territory. Hence the conscious and organised planning of the Jewish Pogrom. The *Angriff* itself unmasked the aim of this Jewish Pogrom, by publishing the photograph of a Jew, who was alleged to have hoarded onions, butter and eggs and was therefore guilty of contributing towards the shortage of food. Another means of distraction were the demagogical "statistics" published in the Nazi press, that were supposed to prove how on an average the German Jews were richer than the Germans themselves. By expropriating the Jews they hope to drive away the spectre of anti-capitalism.

Yet the proceeds from these thieving confiscations of property are flowing into the bottomless tills of war preparation. The posts in industry previously occupied by Jews together with the Jewish businesses and Jewish positions as professional men are being taken over by "deserving" Nazis. The regime is stripping the Jews of all their possessions in order to enrich its own Praetorian Guard.

However there are increasing signs that the Anti-Semitic bugbear is losing its effectiveness. Accounts in all the leading English, French, Dutch, Scandinavian and Swiss newspapers coincide in stating that the German nation in mass had no interest in the Jewish Pogrom. Several Nazi papers found themselves forced to start a controversy with a nameless but strong section of opposition among the people. German workers, soldiers and intellectuals dared to take it up in numerous cases. They went out of their way to express their sympathy to the Jews and to help them.

In order to express their rage at the opposition inside Germany, the Nazis are sharpening their attacks on the Catholic Church. Evidence of this lies in the wild insults hurled by the Nazi Press at Catholic dignitaries, and in the storming of Cardinal Faulhabers's palace in Munich by the Nazis.

The abominable Jewish Pogroms have called forth the protest of the masses throughout the entire world. The declarations of the Chamberlain Conservatives in England, the feeble protests of the French government press and Daladier's silence, all made it clear that the Jewish Pogroms in Germany came at a most embarrassing

moment for them all, since they fear them to be a stumbling block to their so-called policy of understanding with the Nazi regime which is being formed at the cost of Spain, Colonial peoples and Democracy. For the moment the outcry over the Jewish Pogroms has caused governments of the democratic countries to withdraw the colonial question from their programme. Just now they do not dare to hand the African peoples over to the Nazi regime, for they would suffer the same fate as the Jews in Germany. The working people of the bourgeois-democratic countries are insisting more strongly than ever that the opportunity for democratic development be given to the colonial peoples, and that they shall not be considered as a pawn in the understanding between the reactionary bourgeoisie of the bourgeois-democratic countries and the fascist regimes. With the help of Anti-Semitism Nazi agents are trying more than ever to bring internal confusion to the nations of South-east Europe and to overthrow them, so that they may be able to force them all the more easily under the Nazi yoke. The same German Fascism, which yesterday carved up Czechoslovakia is now playing the part of "protector" to the Slovakian and Carpathian-Ukrainian peoples against Hungary, whose territorial claims it traces back to the influence of the Jews in Hungary.

Now that Chamberlain and Daladier have handed over Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany in Munich, arrangements are being made to deliver

REPUBLICAN SPAIN,

to general exploitation and suppression by German and Italian Fascism. Chamberlain is adding to his previous violation of treaties the rupture of his own plan for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Spain. The fighters of the International Brigade have returned home. Yet fascist intervention on Franco's side continues to be more and more vigorous. In spite of all that, Chamberlain is playing with the thought of recognising Franco's government as a belligerent power, in order to support openly intervention against Spanish Democracy. The friends of Democracy and of Peace have started a new campaign against a repetition of the Munich betrayal. The English Trade Unions have protested against the intended selling of Republican Spain.

The International Peace Campaign is arranging a plebiscite in the democratic countries calling upon the democratic governments to insist on an immediate withdrawal of fascist intervention troops. It depends on the breadth and depth of this campaign, whether the game played in reactionary circles in England and France will be stopped. Simultaneously new efforts were made in the democratic countries to provide Republican Spain with food.

IN FRANCE,

Daladier's government is proving that a foreign policy in the service of the aggressive powers has its counterpart in a reactionary domestic policy. Encouraged by Munich, the 200 families and their agents in the middle class parties have started an offensive against the gains made by the People's Front, and have entrusted Daladier with the leadership of this offensive. At the Congress of the Radical Socialist Party, Daladier announced his new policy by slanderously attacking the French Communists. With his emergency decrees Daladier wants to put a definite end to the 40 hour week, to weaken the fighting power of the French Trade Unions and to transfer to the working people the costs of armaments and the burdens of the economic sabotage by big capital.

The discontent at the emergency decrees has reached as far as the ranks of the Radical Socialist Party. Daladier knows that even the Radical Socialist electorate is not in agreement with his policy. When voting took place in parliament and in the commissions, he was only able to carry through his policy by leaning on the representatives of open reaction. Fearing the masses he entertains the idea of prolonging the term of the present Chamber and of eliminating parliament. But the demonstrations of protest and the partial strikes that have taken place throughout France, have proved that the French masses are not prepared to allow their gains of recent years to be wrested from them. The Congress of the General Confederation of Labour expressed the determination to defend with all possible might the gains made by the People's Front. Even if certain Trade Union Leaders with a right wing tendency tried to extol the Munich result and simultaneously undertook to attack the French Communist Party, the Congress expressed the unanimous feeling that it had met to take up the fight against those undertaking the offensive, against the fascists who are beginning to raise their heads, against the warmongers and against the extraordinary decrees of the French government. Daladier, however, did not understand this warning. The French reactionaries have carried through the postponement of the parliamentary session which had been fixed for November 15, in order to prevent a debate on the emergency measures and the domestic situation in general. As a protest against this policy of Daladier's, the General Confederation of Labour fixed a 24 hour General Strike for November 30. As soon as this resolution was made known to them, the government and reactionary circles undertook all measures and preparations in order to frustrate the General Strike. They threatened to use complete war powers in the mines, on the railways and in the Postal and Telegraph services, and

not only to dismiss civil servants if they took part in the strike, but also to put them on trial. In addition police and military measures were ordered against the strikers. All railway stations were occupied, and the workers were partly driven to work with rifles. Arrests began already on the eve of the strike. This commandeering of the entire state apparatus in order to frustrate the General Strike was bound to have some effect. Nevertheless in some places and in various branches of industry, the General Strike was carried through 100 per cent, and in the remainder of the country as much as 75 to 95 per cent. Mass dismissals, the closing of entire businesses, and the lock-out of big staffs of workers, mass arrests and legal proceedings against those taking part in the strike prove that the General Strike did not fail to produce an effect on the government and reaction in France. Now, as before, Daladier's resignation is being demanded by the working people of France and in many democratic circles, for his policy is directed against all the gains made by the French workers through the People's Front, against the Communist Party, against the General Confederation of Labour and against the right of the workers to strike. On December 1 Jouhaux wrote in the *Peuple* that the General Confederation of Labour is carrying on with its activity and will continue to do so until a definite end is put to the emergency measures. The parliamentary section of the Communist Party published a declaration of protest against the illegal measures of the government.

IN BRITAIN,

the events of recent weeks point to the growing opposition of the British People to the policy of Chamberlain. The mass of the British people feels that Munich did not bring peace and that the dictatorial terms of Munich can only lead to a strengthening of the anti-democratic forces in all countries. At the Bridgwater bye-election the voters had their first opportunity of voting clearly and plainly for or against the policy of Chamberlain, the policy of conspiring with the fascist aggressors. The result at Bridgwater throws light on the real feeling of the English People. At the last general election the government candidate was returned with a majority of about 3,000 votes over the combined votes given to the Liberal and Labour candidates. At the present bye-election the Labour Party had not put up a candidate of their own. The Labour leaders of that constituency knew that a Labour candidate would not win by his own efforts in that district. They supported the Progressive candidate who openly declared that he would contest the election on the issue for or against the Chamberlain policy and that under this banner he wanted to unite the entire opposition to Chamberlain. The success was most striking. The Conservative candidate lost to the Progressive candi-

date by a minority of 2,000 votes. The voters had had the opportunity of openly expressing their opinion on Chamberlain's foreign policy and their judgment led to a negative result for him. Even the Conservative press had to declare that this election result had brought to light the uneasiness of the electorate over the policy of Chamberlain.

However, the Conservatives succeeded in winning a bye-election in the constituency of Walsall. There the Labour candidate had not considered the importance of placing Chamberlain's foreign policy in the foreground, or of calling upon all progressive forces to unite in dealing a blow at this policy. The result was a victory for the Conservatives. The Labour Party press systematically tried to minimise the significance of the Bridgwater election. The right wing leaders of the Labour Party and of the Trade Unions feel that the Bridgwater election result is the most positive argument for the union of all democratic and progressive forces in a common Peace Front against Chamberlain. Now, as before, they refuse to tread this one path on which it is possible to contest with success Chamberlain's policy.

In this way the British Labour Movement once again runs the danger of losing the possibility of placing itself at the head of the British people, of laying the foundations for a new peace policy and of protecting British democracy against all combined onslaughts by Hitler and Mussolini.

One section of the English bourgeoisie recognises with growing reluctance that Chamberlain is endangering the national interests of Britain by his pro-fascist policy, and regards with growing disquietude the series of sharp reverses in foreign politics for which Chamberlain is responsible. Under the leadership of Eden, Churchill and Duff Cooper a Conservative Opposition has been formed, which is openly striving to bring about a new government. Eden has drawn up in a programme a list of demands aimed first and foremost at an alteration in foreign policy and at the security of Democracy in the interest of the country's defence. Certain contacts were established between the Conservative Opposition and the Liberals, but the Labour Party refuses to collaborate with the middle class Opposition, although it must be clear to the Labour Party that a Labour government is not possible at the moment and that Chamberlain can only be overthrown by a united Opposition.

The Chamberlain policy is driving on towards its bankruptcy. Whether a progressive and democratic policy under the leadership of the British Labour Movement will cut it off, depends above all on whether the masses in the British Trade Unions and the Labour Party force their leaders to take over the leadership of the British People by forming a broad and progressive Peace Front.

IN THE UNITED STATES,

the elections for Congress and those for the Governorship of the individual states have produced a result which must serve to spur on the working people to reach the highest possible standards of growth and activity. The Republican Party, the party of the monopoly kings, the party of Hoover and Hearst, the party which favours Hitler and Japanese militarism was able to strengthen considerably its position in the House of Representatives and in the Senate and to win the post of Governorship in important states. The reforms brought to the American People by Roosevelt's New Deal policy, especially in the field of Labour legislation, of legalising Trade Unions, of Child Welfare and the fight against depression by means of large scale public undertakings, have penetrated too deeply into the conscience of the American People, for the reactionary Republican Party to have led an open attack against it. Hence reaction used the trick of declaring hypocritically that it would be fair to these reforms and would not be antagonistic to the principles involved in them, whilst on the other hand they held the Roosevelt government to be responsible for the lasting depression which was in reality brought about by the work and sabotage of the monopoly kings. In the field of foreign politics the Hoovers and Hearsts masked their approval of the Fascist aggressors by speaking on the alleged possibility of diverting the Nazis from South America by granting them a free hand in Eastern Europe. This reactionary policy which sailed along under the high sounding slogan of "Isolation" was able to win supporters, because Roosevelt in his election speeches, whilst putting forward a policy to outlaw and isolate the aggressor powers, undertook on the other hand no effective initial move to carry through these tasks, and favoured the fascist intervention in Spain by his Neutrality Laws. For this reason his foreign policy was considered in general to be ineffective.

The American upper bourgeoisie is now expecting Roosevelt, under the pressure of the Republicans in Congress and the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party, to make holes in the New Deal reforms and social legislation. The representatives of big capital declare that Trade Union rights should be curtailed and that the power of the state should be levelled at strikes, as it was before the Roosevelt government. Reaction carried through its election campaign against the New Deal under the cover of a demagogic hounding of Communism. The present demands of Capital show that the fight against Communism is identical with the fight against the gains made by the working people in recent years.

The reverse suffered by the New Deal is explained to a considerable extent by the sabotage of the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party, which pre-

vented the election fight from being waged as a real fight against monopoly capital. Wherever the Progressives openly defended the reforms of the New Deal and supported them, as for example in the State of New York, the American people unanimously voiced its hostility to reaction. Noteworthy, too, was the great victory won by the progressive forces in the State of California. True progressives discovered that the reactionary forces were among the leaders of both wings of the Socialist Party, who put up their own candidates possessing no programme and by so doing helped reaction in one state to a direct victory. In the State of New York the candidate of the Thomas wing in the Social Democratic Party was only able to muster 18,000 votes for himself, only a fraction of the total votes which this party had received previously in New York State. The U.S.A. Communist Party took part in the election fight as an inseparable component part of the Progressive Front in support of the New Deal. They gave strong support to the candidates who were true to the New Deal and simultaneously declared to the masses the necessity of building up and defending their previous gains. The growing trust of the voters was expressed in the number of votes that the individual candidates of the Communist Party were able to collect for themselves. The only candidate of the Communist Party in New York State, comrade Amter, who put up for the Senate, received about 100,000 votes as against 74,000 votes at his last candidature in 1937.

The step forward taken by reaction in the elections has considerably strengthened the urge to unite the Committee of Industrial Organisation under the leadership of Lewis, and the old American Federation of Labour, under the leadership of Green. Under pressure from the opposition in their own ranks the leaders of the American Federation of Labour see themselves forced to speak of their readiness to come to an understanding. The American Federation of Labour Congress was a proof of that. At the Congress influential delegates spoke about establishment of Trade Union solidarity. At their own Congress the leaders of the Committee of Industrial Organisation expressed their readiness to unite on the condition that the American Federation of Labour leaders recognise the new Industrial Trade Unions and are ready to accord them equal rights in the great Trade Union Federation which is to be formed. The unity of the American Labour Movement can become the new factor producing the consolidation of progressive forces and which will win the middle classes and farmers over to a stronger unity than ever before with the working class movement. By doing this it will facilitate the rise of a mighty democratic front in America which will be able to halt the forward march of reaction and assure the victory of Democracy.

AFTER MUNICH

by

GEORGE DIMITROFF

Contains 48-page pamphlet on

**United Front of the International
Proletariat and of the Peoples.**

*By the General Secretary of the
Communist International.*

**Manifesto of Communist International
on 21st Anniversary of Great Socialist
Revolution.**

**Obtainable at all
Workers' Bookshops**

**PRICE
2^{D.}**