

THE UNITED FRONT IN FRANCE

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



September 5th, 1934

VOLUME XI

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No 17

THREEPENCE
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 17

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

1. The Struggle for the United Front in France.
2. The San Francisco General Strike and its Lessons. By B. Sherman.
3. We are for the United Front. By V. Chemodanov (Secretary, Young Communist International).
4. Against Provocateurs—Against Splitters. By Okano.

Materials from the Meeting of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.,
held on July 9th and 10th.

5. The Situation in Germany and the Work of the C.P.G.
By Richter.
 6. The Situation in Germany and Some Questions of the
United Front (conclusion). By O. Piatnitsky.
 7. Resolution of C.C. C.P.G.B. on the United Front against Fascism
and War.
-
-

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITED FRONT IN FRANCE

THE consistent struggle of the Communist Party of France for the united front and for the unity of action of the proletariat have recently led to the first palpable results, namely, on July 27th an agreement was signed between the C.C. of the Communist Party of France and the permanent administrative Commission of the Socialist Party to carry on joint activity against fascism, war and the special laws.

This agreement was not born in "empty space." The conclusion of this agreement was preceded by two years of stubborn work on the part of the French communists for the formation of a powerful anti-fascist and anti-war movement (the so-called Amsterdam-Pleyel movement). Despite the prohibition of the leading organs of the Socialist Party, tens of thousands of socialist workers, hundreds of local organisations and whole federations of socialists participated in this movement. The conclusion of the agreement was also preceded by actually bringing about the unity of action of the proletariat against fascism during the February events, when over a million workers, among whom were hundreds of thousands of socialists, responded to the call of the Communist Party and organised anti-fascist street demonstrations in reply to the attempt made to bring about a fascist putsch on February 6th. The ground for this agreement was also prepared by the powerful united action of the French working class in the shape of the general strike against fascism on February 12th, in which over four million workers took part.

The conclusion of this general agreement was also assisted by the agreement for joint action decided on between the communist organisations in the Paris district and the socialist federations of the Seine and Seine-Oise, and also by the successful joint actions undertaken against fascism and the exceptional laws. These agreements and joint actions led to concrete results which affected the material conditions of tens of thousands of workers and office workers in Paris.

It can therefore be stated without exaggeration that the success of the united front in France is a victory of no small importance for the Communist Party, which in practice led the movement for unity of millions of communist, socialist and non-party workers in France.

According to the agreement which has been made, "the Communist and Socialist Parties undertake to jointly organise a campaign throughout the country and to operate it, utilising all the means at their disposal (organisations, press, party functionaries, elected officers, etc.). The campaign has the aim of mobilising all the toiling population (a) against the fascist organisations and to

DISARM AND DISSOLVE THE LATTER; (b) defending democratic liberties, for the proportional system of electoral representation, and for the dissolution of parliament; (c) against the preparations for war; (d) against the exceptional laws; (e) against the fascist terror in Germany and Austria and for the liberation of Thaelman, Clara Zeits and all imprisoned anti-fascists."

The agreement provides for this campaign to be conducted by meetings, street demonstrations and anti-fascist counter-demonstrations. Such a method of activity is decided on by the contracting parties with a view to

"bringing about wide mass actions of struggle against the exceptional laws."

The members of the two organisations concluding the agreement must give help to each other in case of a conflict of the supporters of either of the organisations with the fascists, or with the armed forces of the bourgeoisie. During the joint activity, both parties will refrain from mutual criticism, but outside these joint actions maintain full independence in all spheres, both in agitation and propaganda and in the recruitment of new members, etc. A commission composed of an equal number of representatives of the central committees of the communist and socialist parties is set up to elaborate a plan of joint activity and to regulate possible conflicts and disputed questions. This is the essence of the agreement.

The Agreement.

Is this an ideal agreement? Does it completely satisfy the French communists? Of course it does not. Of course it is not what the communists would like, as supporters of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. The leaders of the French Socialist Party, moreover, considerably narrowed down the scope of the agreement. Taking into consideration the present intense situation in France it would undoubtedly be more advisable and more profitable for the interests of the proletariat to develop the joint actions on a wider scale, and to use more effective methods of struggle, which would undoubtedly give still bigger results. But our French comrades have not yet been able to bring this about. The socialist leaders had already broken off negotiations on one occasion, and it was only due to the pressure which the masses exerted on the Socialist Party, only due to the noticeable growth of the influence of the Communist Party, to the efforts and concessions made by our French comrades, concessions in the interests of the united front that, none the less, agreement has been reached. It is plain that the united front organised with the participation of the leaders of the Socialist Party

made concessions essential on the part of the Communists. But these concessions were not one-sided. The concessions made by the Socialist Party consisted in that the latter has agreed, at the present moment and on the given question, and under the pressure of the masses in the struggle against fascism, to adopt certain methods of the class struggle as provided for in the agreement reached. It is another question as to what were the motives which guided the leaders of the Socialist Party, whether they wanted to use the pact as a safety valve so as to avoid an outbreak of the mass movement, or whether they wanted to "frighten" the French bourgeoisie a little, so as to prepare for a renewal of class collaboration in conditions more favourable for their party. The concession of the Socialist Party further consisted in the fact that it gave up its original proposal ("non-aggression pact") and agreed to accept a new agreement for joint struggle against fascism, against the emergency decrees, and against war preparations. The concessions of the Communist Party, on the other hand, consisted in the fact that, in the interests of unity of action, it consented when carrying through joint actions with the Socialist Party, to limit itself merely to methods of struggle which are acceptable to the latter. As we see, these concessions are by no means of equal importance.

What concessions were made by the Communist Party of France in the interests of the united front ?

Firstly, our party agreed to refrain from criticism of the Socialist Party during the period of joint activity. This is a very serious concession on the part of the communists. The communists would willingly allow criticism of their actions by the Socialist Party, for they do not fear being criticised by the socialists, since on all basic questions (the economic crisis, war, fascism, etc.) the course of events has confirmed the correctness of the analysis made by the communists, and of their point of view, their tactics and their programme. But in the interest of unity of action the French communists agreed to refrain from mutual criticism. They went still further. They agreed not only to refrain from criticism on all urgent political questions during the period of the joint activity, but they also agreed to put aside the discussion of even theoretical differences. They agreed to this concession, even though the socialists previously put forward the proposal themselves to arrange joint theoretical discussions.

If, when conducting their general campaign on the question of the 20th anniversary of the imperialist war, certain communists understood this as meaning that the Party has to gloss over the role of the Second International and its sections during the war, it

would no longer be "abstention from criticism" but a distortion of historic facts.

Secondly, our French comrades proposed to include a point in the agreement on the necessity of developing mass activity right up to the point of strikes against the exceptional laws. But here again, they were forced to make still another concession, and instead of clearly and unequivocally posing the question of forms and methods of activity they agreed to include a fairly hazy formulation in the agreement, about "broad actions of struggle." In the country where the capitalist offensive is taking place against the working class and where there is no broad strike movement as yet directed against this offensive, such a restriction of the joint actions of the two parties is a serious concession to the socialists. This concession of the "communists to the Socialist Party" does not of course bind the independent activity of the Communist Party.

Thirdly, the French comrades at one time had proposed to include a point in the agreement stating that those who violated the agreement must be mercilessly exposed to the working class. Why was this point not included in the agreement? It was not the fault of the communists, who are vitally interested in the agreement being conscientiously carried out, and who have come forward un-animously for the united front of struggle of the working class against fascism, against the bourgeoisie. The communists are not scared by measures of struggle directed against those who violate the agreement, because they have never thought of violating it, and do not think of doing so now. In the agreement it merely says very vaguely that "each party undertakes to put a stop to all violations and shortcomings such as may arise inside their own organisations in regard to the common activities undertaken."

Instead of clear and definite language, we have here an indefinite undertaking to bring pressure to bear by "inner party" methods on those who sabotage the struggle against fascism. This, of course, is not what the communists would like.

BUT IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT THE AGREEMENT COST THE FRENCH COMMUNISTS VERY DEAR, IT IS NEVERTHELESS A POSITIVE FACT NOT ONLY FOR THE FRENCH PROLETARIAT BUT ALSO FOR THE ENTIRE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT.

Unity of Action Only.

It is plain that the conclusion of an agreement on unity of action between the communist and socialist parties does not by any means remove the differences of principle between these two parties. We are speaking of unity of action and not of the organisational unity of the two parties. Organisational unity is an entirely different thing. It presupposes not only a recognition of the class struggle, but also

unity in principle as to the aims and methods of this struggle, i.e., unity on the basis of the programme and tactics of the Comintern. But it is precisely on these basic questions that a fathomless gulf exists between the Communist and Socialist Parties of France. The Communists are for the dictatorship of the proletariat, while the Socialists are against the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communists are for the violent overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie, for the Soviets; the Socialists are for bourgeois democracy and against the Soviet power. The Communists are unhesitatingly for the U.S.S.R. as the first proletarian fatherland of the toilers of all countries, and consequently are for its defence; the Socialist Party on the contrary is for the "defence" of its bourgeois "fatherland," and carried on, until recently, a systematic campaign to discredit the U.S.S.R., etc.

Nevertheless, the Communist Party of France acted correctly when, while reserving the right to carry on propaganda for its complete unabridged programme, to carry on activity with a view to winning the workers over to Communism on the basis of this programme, it nevertheless made a number of very serious concessions in the interests of agreement. It acted correctly because the matter in question was the united front of struggle, and not organisational unity. It showed itself to be a genuine and loyal supporter of the unity of struggle of the working class, precisely by not putting forward the slogan of organisational unity, being well aware that to-day many of the socialist workers are not yet convinced of the correctness of the Communist programme and tactics, but that they are determinedly in favour of joint action with the Communists in the struggle against fascism, against emergency decrees, etc. Only political crooks and actual supporters of a split of the ranks of the working class such as Doriot can play with the slogan of organisational unity, so as thereby to hinder the unity of the struggle of the working class of France.

It is clear that when signing the agreement with the Socialist Party against fascism, war and the emergency laws, the C.P.F. by no means pledged itself to limit its activity only to the actions indicated in the agreements. While the leaders of the Socialist Party considered it necessary to limit in every way the operation of the agreement and the adoption of more effective methods of struggle, the Communists on the other hand, in the interests of the united front, agreed to this concession. This does not, however, do away with the fact, but even presupposes that the C.P.F. will carry on an open struggle for its programme, for Soviet power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and will bring forward ALL QUESTIONS of the class struggle independently and apart from the restrictions in the agreement; it will

explain to the masses its own position on all vital questions and will endeavour to ORGANISE INDEPENDENT MASS ACTIONS, and adopt the most VARIED FORMS OF STRUGGLE, INCLUDING STRIKES wherever conditions permit, against fascism, the emergency laws and war. The C.P.F. must supply the anti-fascist struggle with real contents, by developing the struggle for the immediate economic and political demands of the working class, the toiling peasants and the toiling strata of the urban petty-bourgeoisie.

The extension of the united front struggle of the proletariat and the transition to more effective revolutionary methods of struggle against fascism and the emergency laws will take place all the sooner in proportion as the masses of workers and toilers establish unity of action from below on the basis of concrete demands, which involve the most burning and the most vital questions of the present day. The agreement between the Socialist and Communist Parties is capable of unleashing this activity of the wide masses. In its turn, the new upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the masses in the factories, trade unions, etc., will assist in extending and revolutionising the united actions of the proletariat on an international scale.

The preservation of the independent political identity of the Communist Party, the resistance to all the attempts of the reformist leaders to disrupt the fighting agreement already arrived at, and to narrow down the united front, and what is more, to limit the independent role of the Communist Party, constitute a necessary condition for the achievement of further success in the struggle of the French proletariat against fascism.

Finally, in order to fulfil its historic task for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism, and for soviet power, and to have the necessary strength to rally the masses in the struggle for the united front, the C.P.F. cannot but pay the maximum of attention to questions of consolidating its ranks, to recruiting thousands of new fighters in the only revolutionary party, and to forming new and consolidating the already existing cells, etc.

The carrying out of this activity not only does not contradict the agreement, but is formally permitted by it.

The Real New Feature.

In the socialist press it is alleged that the agreement reached between the Communist Party of France and the Socialist Party signifies that the C.P. of France and the Comintern have adopted new tactics, namely, tactics of collaboration with the Socialist Parties. Is this true? No, it is not true. The Comintern and its sections have always stood for the united front struggle of the working class, stand

for it now, and will do so in the future. There is nothing new in this. The new feature is the turn which has taken place in the sentiments of the socialist workers. The new feature is the fact that during recent years the bourgeoisie have changed their attitude towards social-democracy in a number of countries. While the leaders of the socialist parties collaborated with the bourgeois governments or directly participated in them, they systematically and stubbornly rejected the proposals of the Communist Parties to establish the united front of struggle. Such was the case in Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Spain, etc. In places where the Socialists had not entered the bourgeois governments, they did not lose hopes of doing so, and therefore did not want to "compromise" themselves in the eyes of the bourgeoisie by making agreements with the Communists. The bloody experience of fascism in Germany and Austria, in which the bourgeoisie, in connection with its transition to open fascist dictatorship, threw social-democracy aside for a time, caused a turn in the sentiments of the socialist workers of the entire capitalist world, who became disillusioned with the famous "democratic path to socialism," and who began to turn from social-democracy toward Communism, towards joint revolutionary class struggle against fascism with the Communists. Nevertheless the leaders of Czecho-Slovakian social-democracy, who are members of the government, still reject the proposals of the Czech Communists regarding the united front of struggle. The Swiss social-democrats who have formed a bloc with their bourgeoisie have taken up a similar position. The British Labour Party have rejected the proposal for a united front. Therefore it should be emphasised that, however great the pressure of the working class, it is nevertheless not sufficient to compel the social-democratic leaders to abandon the policy of class collaboration. Hence, it is clear that the question of the united front on an international scale does not depend on the Comintern, but on the Second International and its sections, which continue in most countries to apply the tactics of splitting the working class with a view to establishing their unity with the bourgeoisie. And there is no need to have any illusions in this regard, because the bankruptcy of German fascism (since the events of June 30th), and of Austrian fascism (after the national-socialist putsch), a bankruptcy becoming ever more clear, and which fosters utopian hopes in the ranks of social-democracy to the effect that the fascist dictatorship will automatically collapse, may

again strengthen the political position of those social democratic elements who are dreaming of new possibilities for collaboration with the bourgeoisie; and it is no chance that Vandervelde has written an article in the Bulletin of the Second International against the formation of a united front of struggle against fascism in France.

All the genuine supporters of the united struggle of the working class, irrespective of whether they are Communists or Socialists, must now be on guard. It is true that at present only the first modest step has been taken towards bringing the Communist and Socialist workers nearer together in one single country on the basis of a joint struggle against fascism. But this step corresponds to the closest thoughts and sentiments of the working class. Anyone who tries to undermine the rapprochement which has been begun, risks a great deal, and above all his prestige in the eyes of the workers. However imperfect these first attempts of the French workers to establish a united front of struggle may be, however critical may be the remarks they have evoked, the task facing the supporters of unity is to widen and consolidate this unity of struggle in France. But to widen and consolidate this unity means to develop the maximum initiative of the lower organisations of both parties in the struggle against the fascist danger. This is now the crux of the whole question if the Communist and Socialist workers want to go forward, and not backwards, in the struggle for the unity of the working class. The further success of the united front struggle of the workers in France also depends on the real control by the lower organised and unorganised masses over the loyal fulfillment of the agreement reached. And the degree to which it will spread to other countries depends on the extent to which the united front of struggle is consolidated and extended in France. Good examples are contagious. Imitation which assumes a mass character will inevitably break the resistance of those who are against this elementary unity in the struggle of the proletariat. On the basis of the experience of the French Communist Party, the Communists of other capitalist countries must realise that the struggle for the working class united front consists not of periodically sending out "open letters" and registering refusals, but of everyday systematic work for unity, which convinces the masses that only the Communist Party is a genuine fighter for the militant unity of the working class, without which a proletarian revolution is impossible.

THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL STRIKE AND ITS LESSONS

By B. SHERMAN.

THE general strike in San Francisco and surrounding cities and the Pacific Coast maritime workers' struggle which led up to it, ensued in the midst of the second big wave of strike struggles sweeping the United States, continually rising in the level of militancy and displaying an ever more clearly-defined political character. The longshoremen's strike on the Pacific Coast broke out on May 9th around the demands for higher wages, the 30-hour week, union control of the hiring halls, and a United West Coast agreement with a uniform expiration date. The strike, from the first, was under the leadership of the militant rank and file in the A.F. of L. longshoremen's union, the I.L.A., and was called in spite of every effort of the district and national officials to prevent it. The strike rapidly spread to the seamen under the leadership of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, which forced the A.F. of L. seamen's union to call their members on strike as well. In a short time ten maritime unions were involved, with a total of 35,000 strikers, and all shipping activity on the Pacific Coast was completely tied up. In San Francisco, the strongest and most militant centre of the strike, a united strike committee of 50 was set up, with five representatives each from the ten different unions.

From the first the strike encountered the most violent attacks by the police, armed strike-breakers, and the National Guard against the mass picket lines, and in a number of pitched battles four strike pickets were killed and over 300 injured. At the same time the capitalist press launched a violent attack on the militant strike leadership, and tried to whip up an anti-Communist hysteria without success. The sympathy of the workers for the strikers expressed itself in the rapidly spreading sentiment for a general strike. Forty thousand workers attended the funeral of the two pickets killed, one of whom was a member of the Communist Party.

Movements for local general strikes had already taken place recently in many centres throughout the country, in support of the Toledo auto workers, Minneapolis truck drivers, Butte miners, Milwaukee carmen, and on the Pacific Coast. The workers in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and San Pedro were demanding a general strike in sympathy with the striking maritime workers and against the police and military terror of the government. Only in San Francisco, however, did the general strike materialise, because precisely in San

Francisco the leadership of the maritime strike was firmly in the hands of the militant rank and file strongly influenced by the Communist Party, and the whole strike assumed the character of a united front struggle against the employers and the government. The reason for our strength in San Francisco, as distinguished from other strike situations where the Party stood on the outside of the struggle, is because already in the middle of 1933, when the majority of the longshoremen showed their desire to belong to the A.F. of L., the Communists actively participated in the organisation of the longshoremen into the A.F. of L. local union. The A.F. of L. district, and national officials of the I.L.A. worked day and night to prevent the strike from taking place, and after it broke out, to send the men back to work, but every effort and every manoeuvre of theirs was defeated by the local strike leadership, which represented the sentiments of the rank and file; the firm stand of the strike leadership in San Francisco also helped to influence and strengthen the position of the strike in the other Pacific Coast centres, where, to a large extent, the rank and file was also able to gain control. The National Longshoremen's Arbitration Board appointed by Roosevelt made strenuous efforts to break the strike and submit the strikers' demands to arbitration, but neither they nor the A.F. of L. leaders succeeded in this. When the A.F. of L. leaders signed an arbitration agreement the strikers rejected it, and Ryan, the I.L.A. national president, received such a hostile reception at the strikers' meeting that he was unable to speak.

The Communist Party.

The policy of the Party was to spread the strike not only to all branches of the marine industry on the Pacific Coast, but to spread the strike to the Atlantic and Southern ports. However, our extremely weak position in the A.F. of L. unions in these other ports made it impossible to spread the strike into a national strike of longshoremen and seamen. Only in a few instances was our Marine Workers' Industrial Union able to call strikes of seamen on a few ships. In the face of the unyielding position of the employers, the question of developing a movement for a general strike in Pacific Coast ports in support of the maritime strikers, became an extremely urgent one. The influence of the Party among the strikers was so great that the San Francisco strike committee

DECIDED TO MAKE THE "WESTERN WORKER" (the Communist Party weekly organ on the Pacific Coast) THEIR OFFICIAL STRIKE ORGAN. The strike committee, after enlisting the support of the A.F. of L. and revolutionary unions in the marine industry, further extended its activities for the development of the general strike in San Francisco, the sentiment for which spread rapidly, and local union after local union voted in favour of the general strike. A mass meeting of 18,000 workers called by the Maritime Strike Committee cheered the slogan of "general strike." The A.F. of L. leaders of the San Francisco Central Labour Council moved heaven and earth to head off the movement, and even wired President Roosevelt to intervene to prevent a general strike. President William Green telegraphed to the Seattle Central Labour Council warning them that a general strike would violate the laws of the American Federation of Labour, and would be unauthorised. In San Francisco the local labour leaders set up a "Labour Strategy Committee" to hold off action and dissipate the movement. However, when the Maritime Strike Committee called a conference of the A.F. of L. unions to discuss a general strike, at which 26 local unions were represented, the local labour misleaders, fearing that the movement would go over their heads and slip out of their hands, changed their tactics and decided to head the movement in order to be better able to behead it. They called a special conference, attended by 115 local unions, where only three local unions voted against the general strike, and a general strike committee was set up, to which each local union was to appoint or elect five representatives. The Party mobilised for the election of representatives, while the A.F. of L. strove to get only officials appointed. The real power, however, was in the hands of an executive committee of 25, consisting of officials appointed by the labour bureaucrats, and included only one militant representative, the leader of the striking longshoremen. It should be noted that at the time the A.F. of L. leaders called the special conference, the momentum of the general strike movement had reached such a character that the economic life of San Francisco was already partially paralysed by strikes of teamsters, street-car men, butchers, etc., and other trades were preparing to walk out in the following day or two.

The General Strike.

The general strike began on July 16th in San Francisco, spreading on the following day to other nearby cities, Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda, until it involved about 125,000 workers in a metropolitan area whose population was 1,200,000. Everything was at a complete standstill, and the

only operations permitted were a few restaurants, truck deliveries to hospitals, etc., under strike committee permits. Every day, however, the misleaders heading the executive committee relaxed the tie-up by issuing more and more permits for business activity, preparing for the final sell-out.

Meanwhile the press opened a hysterical campaign against the Communists, and shrieked about "revolution" and "insurrection." The employers radioed an appeal to Roosevelt, on board a warship bound for Honolulu, to cancel his trip and come to San Francisco to settle the strike. Senator Wagner flew by plane to Portland, and succeeded at the last minute in averting the general strike which threatened there. General Hugh Johnson, head of the N.R.A., came to San Francisco and gave the keynote for the terror wave which followed, when in a provocative speech he called upon the A.F. of L. leaders to wipe the Communist influence out of the unions, and openly encouraged fascist gangs to take matters into their own hands. The Mayor and Governor made radio speeches that this was not a strike but a "Communist revolution," and 7,000 troops of the National Guard were moved into the San Francisco area. Secretary of Labour Perkins telegraphed that the government would co-operate by deporting all alien Communists. With the stage thus set, on the second and third day of the strike, raids began along the entire Pacific Coast by fascist gangs of "Vigilantes," followed by police, against the headquarters of the Communist Party, *Western Worker*, the maritime unions, and homes of workers, where everything was wrecked, workers beaten up and arrested. The printing plant which printed the *Western Worker* was destroyed by fire. About 500 arrests were made, some comrades were charged with criminal syndicalism, carrying heavy penalties, and fourteen workers were held for deportation.

It was not until this reign of terror was well under way that the labour misleaders in their turn took the offensive. On the third day of the strike the General Strike Committee voted 207 to 180 to call upon the maritime workers to submit their demands to arbitration, and on the following day the General Strike Committee voted 191 to 176 to call off the general strike. In spite of the terror wave the close vote in a committee packed with A.F. of L. officials shows how the sentiments of the workers really stood. The street-car men continued their strike for several days. Nevertheless the intimidation and the sell-out had some effect, and a week later the maritime workers, who had continued on strike, voted to submit their demands to arbitration, on condition that the unions of the seamen should be included in the settlement, and refused to go back to work until this was agreed to. This solidarity of the longshoremen with the sea-

men, and their repeated refusal to settle the strike unless all the strikers were included, was an outstanding feature of the strike, and especially significant because in the 1919 and 1921 strikes, due to the policy of the A.F. of L. leaders, the longshoremen and seamen did not support each other. The strike, therefore, ended, after more than three months of struggle, as an ORGANISED RETREAT, and the unions have forced the employers to negotiate with them on all disputed questions, which is in itself a significant concession in spite of the fact that the betrayal by the labour officials prevented the strike from ending in victory.

The Lessons.

What are the lessons and conclusions that can be drawn from the maritime strike and the San Francisco general strike?

Firstly, the working class, after a year and a half of the New Deal, has been aroused to an unprecedented fighting spirit, whereby the smallest actions for economic demands call forth solidarity strikes and protest actions in which the unorganised workers and the unemployed fully participate, and developing into general strike actions of a political character. This is evidence of the profound ferment and radicalisation rapidly developing among the masses as the illusions in the Roosevelt programme are evaporating. It is of the utmost importance that the Party utilise the experiences of the general strike, drawing the necessary conclusions and widely popularise its lessons among the broadest masses, paying special attention to consolidating and extending its influence among the workers and in the local trade union organisations in San Francisco and other centres of strike struggles. While the Party has correctly answered the cry of the capitalist press about "revolution," by pointing out that the general strike was not a revolution but a struggle in support of the immediate economic demands of the workers, it is also necessary for the Party to draw the necessary political conclusions, and point out the significance of the general strike in the present period in its relation to furthering the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat. The longshoremen's strike, as well as the general strike in San Francisco, has shown that through united front mass struggles, the workers can defeat the employers' moves for company unionism.

(2) The main stream of the strike movement for economic demands and against company unions continues to develop in the main THROUGH THE REFORMIST UNIONS, despite the feverish efforts of the A.F. of L. leaders to prevent the strikes, and if the leaders do not succeed in this they strive by all possible means to retain leadership of the struggle in their hands, and increasingly use the

S.P. and renegades (Trotskyites) to behead the strike movement.

(3) With the exception of San Francisco, to a lesser extent other Pacific Coast ports, and also Milwaukee, where the Party has shown good leadership, we have remained outside of many important strike struggles in the present big strike wave and DID NOT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE THE LEADERSHIP OF THESE STRIKES. One of the main reasons for the weak position of the Party in the present strike wave is because we did not see that the tremendous surge for organisation and struggle took place, in the main, through the American Federation of Labour. The already-mentioned features of the present strike struggles offer the most favourable opportunities for the Party in placing itself at the head of the strike movement, provided we place the main emphasis on the militant leadership of, and participation in, strike struggles through our activities inside the A.F. of L. unions and among the strikers following reformist leadership. The lessons of San Francisco are that, by placing the main emphasis on work within the A.F. of L. and at the same time skilfully organising the militant actions of the Red union, even though the union is in a weak position, and developing the united front with the A.F. of L. workers and the independent unions, etc., we can achieve important results in organising and leading strike struggles of the workers, despite the resistance of the A.F. of L. leadership.

(4) It is urgent that in the preparations for the coming A.F. of L. convention to be held in October in San Francisco, the scene of the general strike, an opposition programme be worked out dealing with the pressing issues raised by the strike movement, and it is essential that we work to have a substantial opposition delegation to the convention and to win positions in the local unions and the Central Labour Councils. At the same time the Party must foresee and be prepared for any new "left" manoeuvres of the A.F. of L. leadership at the coming convention, in the direction of giving a pretence of more democracy, recognition of the industrial union structure of the Federal Locals, etc. The experiences of the joint activities of the ten unions connected with the port of San Francisco show the value and need for continued collaboration and co-ordination of the activities of these unions following the strike, in order to preserve the gains of the strike and for further struggle. In view of the experiences of the joint strike committee of ten, the Party should advocate the advisability of unification of the existing crafts into one union.

(5) The Party, although functioning well under conditions of the terror, issuing the *Western Worker* and leaflets to the troops illegally, and the

leadership functioning intact in spite of the raids, underestimated the extent of the terror and was not prepared for it. Although issuing the slogan of organising mass self-defence corps, nowhere was any such mass self-defence organised effectively, and they did not organise working-class organisations for the defence of their headquarters. Even the wrecking of the union strike headquarters was carried through without resistance, although the employers openly spoke of the attacks in advance. In the centres of the terror wave especially, a broad united front movement for mass self-defence must be organised.

(6) A nation-wide protest movement against the terror must be carried on, drawing in especially A.F. of L. unions and Socialist Party locals in defence of workers' organisations. At the same time, it is necessary to utilise the Lundeen resolution introduced into Congress last May, demanding an investigation of the terror, which the Party has not utilised at all.

(7) The gains made by the Party during the strike must be now consolidated and further strengthened. It is necessary, first of all, to build the opposition and increase our influence in the I.L.A., and to organise opposition groups in every local of the A.F. of L., also with the aim of building up an opposition within the Central Trades and Labour Council. (2) To build up the Marine Workers' Industrial Union amongst the seamen, and to establish close united front connections with the reformist seamen's union and the building up of opposition groups there. On the basis of joint activities of the M.W.I.U., I.L.U., and reformist seamen's union, to advocate the forma-

tion of a local federated body of these unions. (3) To increase and consolidate the political influence gained by the Party during the strike it is necessary to increase the circulation of the *Western Worker* and establish it as a mass paper on the Western Coast. (4) To take the utmost advantage of the present favourable opportunities to build the Party in California into a mass Party by bold recruitment. It is most urgent to overcome the fluctuation of the Party there, which is expressed in the present alarming situation of a decline of membership in face of the large recruitment.

* * *

Finally, a campaign must be organised against the arbitration legislation, for the repeal of the Labour Disputes Act, and in support of the workers' demands now in the hands of the arbitration boards, backed up by the sending of workers' delegations and resolutions demanding the acceptance of the workers' demands.

The San Francisco general strike, and the movements for local general strikes in other centres throughout the country, bear eloquent testimony to the correctness of the estimation given by the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I., and particularly of the point indicating the inevitability of economic strikes more and more interweaving with the mass political strike. The historic significance of the San Francisco general strike will leave its imprint on the future development of still greater class battles during the approaching second round of revolutions and wars. The Party must see to it that these lessons are made the property of the whole working class.

(Continued from page 688)

of the objective situation. In consequence the methods of work of the Party, its agitation and propaganda, the ability to combine the everyday struggle with basic revolutionary leadership and building of the Party, the winning of wider numbers of workers to the Party, and of organised influence in all working-class organisations, the building up of organisation and of new cadres, all require to be enormously improved, sharpened, revolutionised, in order that the Party shall be adequate to its task.

The first task of the Party is to throw all its forces into the united front campaign. Through the united front campaign the Party should reach ever-wider numbers of workers, extend its revolutionary leadership and build up its organised strength.

SECOND, the Party should develop its leadership in the rising economic struggles, intensify its work in the reformist trade unions, overcome the twin evils of passivity and neglect in the trade union sphere or of a narrow non-political sectional approach to trade union work, learn to combine work in the trade

union and economic sphere with revolutionary political leadership and continuous building up of the strength of the Party.

THIRD, the Communist Party should give special attention to the winning of the leftward moving workers, both within the Independent Labour Party and in the Labour Party, as also among the opposition elements in the Socialist League, Labour College Movement, etc. The Guild of Youth has now adopted the line of sympathetic affiliation to the Young Communist International, the winning of the Independent Labour Party also to the line of sympathetic affiliation to the Communist International is of the greatest importance for the advance of Communism in Britain.

FOURTH, the Communist Party should concentrate attention on rapidly building up its membership under the present favourable conditions; for this purpose agitation and propaganda must be improved; the popular fighting political character of the DAILY WORKER must be strengthened; fuller use must be

(Continued on page 671)

WE ARE FOR THE UNITED FRONT

By V. CHEMODANOV (*Secretary of the Y.C.I.*).

AT the basis of the programme of the Young Communist International there is the task of RALLYING AND MOBILISING the broad masses of the toiling youth for the STRUGGLE for their own economic and political interests.

The Y.C.I. tries to unite the youth IN THE STRUGGLE for their interests, in the struggle for the VIOLENT OVERTHROW of the domination of the bourgeoisie, and for the establishment of the DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, because without this it is impossible to construct classless socialist society.

These principles of REVOLUTIONARY CLASS STRUGGLE are beginning to triumph more and more over the principles of the peaceful reformist transition from capitalism to socialism, and are winning an ever larger number of adherents among the working class and toiling youth.

The class struggle is more and more laying bare the IRRECONCILABLE contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

The question facing young workers, toilers and unemployed to-day with special intensity is: FOR bourgeois democracy and therefore for fascism as well, or FOR the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Soviet power, the power of the working class which carries out its dictatorship in alliance with the toiling peasants, and consequently for socialism as well.

Stern reality is compelling very many of those who used to argue about "democracy in general" and "dictatorship in general" to come down to earth from the cloudy heights of their above-class position.

And it seems strange, to say the least of it, that Frederick Adler at the Prague Congress ADVISES the socialist youth to find a middle path between democracy (i.e., bourgeois democracy, V.C.) and dictatorship (i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, V.C.).

For the youth the words of Lenin are becoming ever more clear that anyone who

"HAS NOT UNDERSTOOD FROM HIS READING OF MARK THAT IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY AT EVERY INTENSE MOMENT, AT EVERY SERIOUS CONFLICT OF CLASSES, WHAT IS POSSIBLE IS EITHER THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT OR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE, HAS UNDERSTOOD NOTHING OF THE TEACHINGS OF MARK IN THE SPHERE OF EITHER ECONOMICS OR POLITICS"

and such a person cannot give advice to the youth and be their organiser and leader in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Faced with the menace of the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie are striving to consolidate their shaken positions, are preparing for new imperialist wars and in an ever increasing number of countries

are passing to the establishment of open bloody fascist dictatorships. With brutal hatred they hurl themselves against the workers and the revolutionary organisations of youth, and by means of violence, terror and hunger drive the youth into forced labour camps, and into fascist and militarised organisations.

With the help of the entire state apparatus, schools, art, the press, the cinema, and radio, they are increasingly inflaming the more sordid chauvinist and nationalist sentiments among the youth.

THE CHIEF TASK facing every youth organisation which considers itself to be revolutionary is to ensure that the youth discards the chains of slavish bourgeoisie ideology, and unites in the struggle against exploitation and oppression.

At the present time when the word is "approaching closely to a new round of wars and revolutions," every youth organisation which is not reactionary must take up a definite position in the class struggle and give a clear, plain and unequivocal reply to the question of its attitude to the establishment of the united front of the toiling youth. The position of the Y.C.I. on this question is clear. However, to achieve greater clarity we are prepared to express our opinion on the united front of the youth once more. At the same time we want to put before the SOCIALIST youth the question as to WHAT BARRIERS separate them from the Communist youth and what prevents them struggling alongside the Communist youth and the communist organisations for the interests of the youth, against fascism and war, and for socialism.

We Are the Initiators in the Struggle for the United Front.

It is not difficult to prove this by facts taken from the struggle for the united front of the Young Communist Leagues in capitalist countries. It is not our fault that the socialist youth organisations in the past did not support our initiative in the way that they are beginning to do to-day. Neither is it our fault that our united front proposals have repeatedly been rejected on the most varied pretexts.

Some have stated that agreement could only be reached between "international organisations," and, if nothing more, ignored our attempts to establish the united front. Others barred themselves off in every way from the united front, under the pretext that our initiative and methods of struggle did not presuppose agreement but exclude any possibility of it. They alleged that we were "manoeuvring," "attacking," and putting forward "impossible" demands, and called us "splitters," etc.

We will try to examine these "accusations" calmly, in a business like manner, without mutual attacks. Before examining how true these "accusations" and "explanations" are, we must apparently speak of the basic principles of the Communist International which are not entirely clear to those who try to accuse us of all kinds of sins.

We have never concealed nor do we now conceal that we struggle by REVOLUTIONARY METHODS for the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, because the latter will not hand over power to the working class nor give up exploitation and oppression without a struggle. We struggle for the smallest economic, political, and cultural interests of the youth. We want to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet power. What follows from this? It follows that firstly there can be no question on our part of any kind of class collaboration, i.e., of any bloc with the bourgeoisie, and secondly we shall not agree to UNPRINCIPLED unity, for the sake of unity. This is clear. If this is clear, then it becomes plain that the task of establishing the united front of the youth in this struggle and in the name of this struggle arises precisely from our principles of the revolutionary class struggle. We know quite well that there are youth organisations which consider that it is possible to pass from capitalism to socialism without a violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, along some "middle path" between reformism and bolshevism, and which carry on all their work accordingly. Does this mean that we must refuse, even for a time, to carry on a joint struggle with these organisations, against reaction, for the interests of the youth? No. If that were the case we should not be practical politicians, but people floating about somewhere up in the clouds, people isolated from the masses.

Our differences in principle cannot serve as a hindrance to the establishment of the united front of the youth IN THE INTERESTS OF THE STRUGGLE for their everyday economic and political demands, for their rights, against the capitalist offensive no matter what form it takes, against fascism and war. Dozens of examples of the struggle of the Spanish, Polish, German, Czecho-Slovakian and other Young Communist Leagues, show that they are not only ready to establish a united front with the youth, both in the struggle for their everyday economic interests and in the struggle against fascism and war, but are the INITIATORS in this regard.

"But still you look on the united front as a manoeuvre," we are sometimes told. But when they say this, when they accuse us of not struggling for the united front, they forget to bring forward the facts to prove this. They forget to mention the time and place, the country, the town, the factory, the forced labour camp or university, where we

rejected a proposal for a united front, or where our cunning "manoeuvres" could be observed.

It is obvious for us that the decisive word in the oncoming class battles against fascism, and in the war for socialism, belongs to the proletariat and toiling masses and that reaction can only be resisted and victory achieved on the basis of their unity. It is also clear to us that the united front cannot be established by "manoeuvres." The united front can only be established and hammered out in the struggle against capitalism. We also know that when people talk about our "manoeuvres," they have in view primarily, our tactics of struggle for the united front FROM BELOW.

How Should We Understand the Tactics of the United Front From Below?

Some people are evidently not quite clear on this question. What lies at the basis of the tactics of the united front from below? At the base of it lies proletarian democracy and OUR PROFOUND FAITH IN THE POWERS OF THE WORKING CLASS, and the toiling youth.

The Y.C.I. develops on the basis of PROLETARIAN democracy, on the basis of the initiative and the active participation of all its adherents in the struggle of the working class. It is a law for every Communist Youth organisation not to wait for "special" instructions from above when it is a question of defending the economic and political interests of the youth, and when it is a question of establishing the united front in the struggle against reaction. It is necessary to act boldly and determinedly, firmly remembering that THE UNITED FRONT IS HAMMERED OUT, AND THE FATE OF CAPITALISM DECIDED NOT IN PARLIAMENTS, NOT IN THE OFFICES OF VARIOUS POLITICAL LEADERS, BUT IN THE FACTORIES, ON THE STREETS, IN THE BARRACKS, AT THE LABOUR EXCHANGES, IN THE VILLAGES, I.E., IN THE PLACES WHERE THE MASSES ARE TO BE FOUND. What is wrong about this? Where is splitting to be found here? It would be strange and ridiculous if the Y.C.I. were to put the question in any other way. That would mean that when some Communist organisation in Germany, China or Argentina, observes how the bourgeoisie doom the toilers to starvation and want, and sees how the fascist gangs try to destroy the best people of the working class and experiences it all, it would drop its hands and wait until instructions came "from above" as to the necessity of carrying on a struggle, and until permission arrived to unite the forces of the youth in this struggle. But this is not what happens. AND THEREIN LIES OUR STRENGTH and our ability to preserve and consolidate our organisations in conditions of the fiercest terror and oppression as in Germany, Japan and China. No objection can be made to this. But the "argument"

is advanced against us that in our struggle for the united front from below, we not only "attack" the leaders of various organisations with which we want to conduct a joint struggle, but that in general we do not even think it necessary to talk with these leaders. What is true and what is untrue in this statement?

Whom Do We Attack and Whom Do We Expose?

Our chief task is to expose the essence of fascist bourgeois ideology to the broad masses of the youth, to explain the danger of a new imperialist war, and to explain to the youth what are their interests and what are the tasks facing them. This task is organically linked up with the necessity of proving to the youth that only by establishing the united front and uniting their forces, only by struggle, can they fulfil their aims and the tasks facing them. It is here where we direct our fire, our forces and our energy. In this struggle we come into contact with very many organisations which, it may be, are not reactionary in essence, but which nevertheless weaken the powers of the working class owing to their policy, and consequently weaken the forces of the youth, hinder the establishment of the united front and thus assist the bourgeoisie. Should we expose them, should we expose the treacherous role of those who disrupt the united front of the youth, and should we prevent the youth from making false steps? As a political organisation, should we defend and explain the correctness of our principles and tasks, or not?

Let anyone show us a political organisation of the youth which does not do this, and which waits until God puts its views into the heart of the youth. As we know, neither the communist nor the socialist youth organisations rely on this. They carry on polemics between themselves, trying to convince each other of the correctness of their ideas and views, trying, each in his own way, to explain the causes of the split, the origin of difficulties in the path to the establishment of the united front. They try to expose those organisations and those leaders, who, in their opinion, hinder the establishment of the united front.

We are accused of untactfully and grossly attacking the socialist youth organisations and their leaders. Is this so? Cannot we say the same thing (taking at random any social-democratic paper and some speeches) of those who tell us about these attacks? Of course we can. But we say less about this, and not because we are better or worse in our "attacks," of course, but because polemics cannot be toothless, and what is most important, a polemic cannot be the CHIEF obstacle to the establishment of the united front of struggle against fascism and war, for the interests of the toiling youth. Compare the danger

of FASCISM, the danger of imperialist WAR, with a polemic. The mere comparison shows that those who really struggle for the united front, those who REALLY STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR will all the easier find a common language, and the question of polemics, of "attacks," will disappear by itself. Everyone who hinders or disrupts the united front will have to be most mercilessly exposed before the masses.

Are We Against Negotiations With the Leaders of the Socialist Youth Organisations?

We can say directly NO, we are not against. Then what negotiations do we oppose and what negotiations do we not desire to carry on? This is the question to which we must give a clear answer. We are against negotiations which try to put something in the place of the real struggle for the interests of the youth. We are for the united front in the struggle and not in the office. We consider it inadvisable to carry on negotiations for the sake of negotiations, for the sake of polemics and empty talk. We are for negotiations of which the basic masses are kept informed, which affect them, we are for negotiations which are begun not for the sake of manoeuvres but for the sake of getting things done and which help to remove the obstacles in the path towards the establishment of the united front. Have we shown initiative in this respect? Have the communist youth organisations called on the leaders of the socialist organisations to establish a united front? Yes, time after time! We take the liberty of quoting facts, and let no one be offended if these facts are not entirely to their taste. In the spring of 1933 the Executive Committee of the Y.C.I., in calling upon the toiling youth of the entire world to struggle against the fascist danger, and in defence of the German proletariat, recommended all Sections of the Y.C.I. to appeal to the LEADERS of the socialist youth organisations to set up a united front.

In its appeal, the E.C. of the Y.C.I. did not put forward unacceptable conditions, did not make any attacks, but put the question as follows:—

"In view of the conditions laid down by the Communist International as conditions which reflect the will of the working class, the E.C. Y.C.I. recommends the Sections to put the following points as the basis of their agreement:—

1. The Y.C.Lers and members of the social democratic youth organisations immediately begin to organise and operate the resistance of the youth to the attacks of fascism and reaction on the political, trade union, cultural, co-operative, sporting and other organisations of the workers and the working youth, on the revolutionary working class and youth press, on freedom of assembly, demonstrations and strikes, on the unfettered existence of the organisations of the working youth. They organise joint resistance to the armed attacks of the fascist gangs, by holding mass political strikes; they proceed to participate actively in the formation of committees of action in the factories, labour exchanges, working class areas, and to form workers' defence detachments.

2. The Y.C.L.ers and members of the social democratic youth organisations immediately proceed to organise the protest of the workers and the youth, by meetings, demonstrations and strikes against any reduction of wages, against the worsening of the conditions of labour, against attacks on social insurance, against reducing or depriving the unemployed of relief, for assistance and relief for the unemployed youth, against dismissals from the factories, against the closing of schools, against the exploitation, militarisation and fascisation of the youth in the forced labour camps, for the payment of the youth according to the wage scale and the expulsion of officers and fascist instructors from the camps, against any encroachment on the electoral or other political rights of the youth.

3. When accepting these conditions and carrying them into practice, the E.C. Y.C.I., following the Communist International, considers it possible to recommend the Y.C.L. organisations also to give up attacks on the social democratic mass organisations of the youth during the joint struggle against the offensive of capital and the fascists."

In accordance with this, the Sections of the Y.C.I. appealed to the leaders of the young socialist organisations. What was the reply? The socialist organisations either did not reply at all or simply prohibited the lower organisations of the socialist youth from entering into negotiations with the Y.C.L. Some organisations explained their action by stating that the communist organisations were weak, and therefore there was no point in talking to them about the united front; others referred to the decisions of the Prague Congress of Socialist Youth in which it states that the united front can only be reached by "international associations" coming to terms with each other.

I could mention countries where our proposals for the united front have been repeatedly rejected in this way, although agreement has been reached in many of the lower organisations. But the main point now is to give a clear reply to the basic question—DO THE CONDITIONS NOW EXIST FOR ESTABLISHING THE UNITED FRONT, OR DO THEY NOT?

The United Front Can and Must Be Established.

We shall give some facts which show more convincingly than words that THERE ARE NO UNSURMOUNTABLE BARRIERS TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED FRONT.

Last year the I.L.P. Guild of Youth in Great Britain sent a letter to the Executive Committee of the Y.C.I., proposing to begin negotiations on the possibility of reaching an agreement. As a result of these negotiations, the barriers which formerly appeared to be insurmountable, fell away, and close contacts have been established between the Guild of Youth and the Y.C.L. in Great Britain. Most of the Guild branches have declared that they are prepared to struggle together with the Y.C.L. as an organisation sympathising with the Y.C.I.

IN AUSTRIA in the conditions of the sharpening class struggle, the socialist and communist youth came still nearer together. As in Germany, it has

become perfectly clear there that no delay is permissible in the establishment of the united front. Over 2,500 members of the socialist youth joined the Y.C.L., in whole organisations, and came into its ranks to carry on a joint struggle against fascism.

Without making it a compulsory condition of the joint struggle that the young socialists should join the Y.C.L., the Central Committee of the Y.C.L. of Austria has made a special appeal to the revolutionary youth on the establishment of the united front.

The C.C. of the Y.C.L. of Austria proposed a JOINT struggle for:—

1. Joint resistance to attacks on our wages and on the law for the protection of the youth. The restoration of the independent apprentice youth sections on a revolutionary basis.

2. For the further development of military sport organisations as non-party military formations of the youth, apart from the *Schutzbund*, for the struggle against the White Terror.

3. The struggle for the payment of labour, and the payment of relief to all the unemployed youth.

4. Against any worsening of conditions, for the payment of wages in labour service camps according to collective agreements. For better treatment and food.

5. For the liberation of all proletarian political prisoners.

6. Against all military preparations and the propaganda of war and armaments. For the defence of the Soviet Union.

7. Against the fascist education of the proletarian youth and the fascisation of sport. For the legalisation of workers' sport and of all the other workers' organisations.

8. For the further development of the *Rote Falken* as a revolutionary non-party children's organisation, against chauvinist incitement in the schools.

9. For jointly celebrating 20th International Day of Youth (I.Y.D.) on September 1st, the traditional day of struggle against chauvinism and war."

Ernst Papenek, the leader of the revolutionary socialist youth of Austria, recently wrote directly to the E.C. of the Y.C.I. In his letter he said:—

"Almost everywhere the serious obstacles which have hitherto hindered the joint anti-fascist struggle of the social-democratic and Communist workers have disappeared. In no country with a fascist dictatorship can the proletariat adopt democratic means of struggle. The Marxist workers carry on their struggle by revolutionary means. They strive to overthrow fascism, to establish the revolutionary rule of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the final aim of which is the achievement of socialist democracy. In the struggle for this aim, for the overthrow of fascism, no one can divide us."

The Executive Committee of the Y.C.I. warmly responded to this letter and stated in its reply that:—

"We have always been ready to carry on a united front against the bourgeoisie together with you, as with all youth organisations. We were and still are ready undoubtedly to carry on negotiations with any youth organisation, including the Y.S.I., with a view to preparing for such joint actions, although we have not received such a proposal from the latter.

We consider the united front action by the working youth to be particularly necessary against fascism, and the preparations for imperialist war, against the attack of capital on the working class and especially on the working

youth, against militarisation and the forced labour of the youth."

The Executive Committee of the Y.C.I. further recommended Ernst Papenek to enter into direct negotiations with the C.C. of the Y.C.L. of Austria, whose proposals on the united front, it seems to us, are fully acceptable and do not contain any attacks.

In his reply Ernst Papenek writes :—

"We are overjoyed at your telegram of July 6th, which, it seems to us, opens the possibility before us of the conduct of joint action on the basis of a non-aggression pact.

We are confident that with mutual goodwill to serve the cause of the whole of the proletariat, a united militant front of struggle of the class-conscious working youth will very soon be established."

Yes, and we also express our complete confidence that the negotiations which have been started between the leaders of the Y.C.L. and the revolutionary socialist youth of Austria, will be crowned with success and the united front will be established. But the statement of Ernst Papenek to the effect that "in the struggle for this aim, for the overthrow of fascism, nothing will divide us"

will be consolidated by real work and a joint struggle.

In France, the Y.C.L.ers of Paris, according to "Avanguard" of July 19th, decided jointly with the young socialists of the Department of the Seine on the basis of the united front :—

"... to begin a big campaign in the Paris region on the basis of the following slogans:

1. The disarming and disbanding of the fascist leagues and the arrest of their leaders.

2. The repeal of the Emergency Decrees and the increase of wages for the youth.

3. Against the two-year term of military service, against military manoeuvres, and against any system of compulsory military training.

4. Unemployed youth to receive benefits from the unemployment fund immediately on leaving school, professional schools for the young unemployed to be opened up under the control of the trade unions. The abolition of all systems of compulsory labour. During these actions, the struggle will be increased to the maximum degree with a view to saving Thaelman and Paula Balish and also the arrested anti-fascists."

I could also give the examples of Spain, Poland and other countries. But these examples are sufficient to show that we not only talk about the united front but display every initiative in this matter and struggle to bring it about. Is not the enormous striving towards unity which can be observed among the toiling youth sufficient for us to say that the CONDITIONS for establishing the united front in the struggle against fascism and war, for the economic, political and cultural interests and demands of the youth, already exist ?

International Youth Day, as a Day of Unity.

About 20 years ago, at the height of the imperialist war, a conference of socialist youth organisations was held in the town of Berne. At this conference

one of the main questions was that of mobilising the youth of all countries to unite them in the struggle against the imperialist slaughter. Inspired by the best of desires, the Berne conference of the socialist youth sent out the call :—

"Comrades! Socialist Youth organisations of all countries! We call on you to display your unshaken will and to struggle tirelessly AGAINST MILITARISM, FOR SOCIALISM, by powerful demonstrations in all countries. We shall all demonstrate on the same day, October 3, 1915, at the same hour. Comrades in Copenhagen, Christiana, Stockholm, Paris, and Berlin must know that at the time while they are demonstrating for peace and socialism, their friends in Amsterdam, Vienna, Bucharest, Rome and other cities, are doing the same."

Since then, the revolutionary youth have organised The International Youth Day of struggle against fascism and its inevitable accompaniment—imperialist wars, every year.

This year will be the 20th Anniversary of the outbreak of the imperialist war in 1914. This year the revolutionary youth of all countries will celebrate International Youth Day on September 1st for the twentieth time.

The Executive Committee of the Y.C.I., in its appeal to all the working, unemployed, toiling and peasant youth, to students, soldiers and sailors, calls on them to carry on a joint struggle for the establishment of the united front.

The E.C. of the Y.C.I. says : Let us unite our forces, put a stop to all mutual attacks during this joint struggle, offer desperate resistance to bloody fascism and announce to the world that the present generation does not want to be and will not be cannon-fodder to save the interests of capital. Let us unite for the joint defence of Ernst Thaelmann, Paula Balish, and the other prisoners in the hands of capital. What can divide us in this struggle? What hinders us in establishing agreement ?

It is possible that for some of the youth organisations, all these conditions for a joint struggle will not be acceptable. It is possible that they will tell us that our demands are too general in character, that there are divergencies in principle between our methods of struggle against fascism and war, for socialism, and the methods of these organisations.

Well, what of it? In reply to this we propose that the Young Socialist International, the Y.S.I., like any other youth organisation, should state clearly and directly WHAT DEMANDS CORRESPONDING TO THE INTERESTS OF THE YOUTH IT IS READY TO FIGHT FOR JOINTLY WITH US. What other methods of joint struggle which correspond to the needs of the struggle against fascism and war and for socialism and which correspond to the defence of the interests of the toiling youth, can they propose to us.

As far as we are concerned, we can openly state that we are ready to support ANY demands and

methods of struggle of ANY organisation and to struggle jointly with it if these demands correspond to the interests of the working class and the toiling youth and can hasten the victory over the fascist-

inclined bourgeoisie who are frantically preparing for a new imperialist war.

Can we reach agreement on this basis? We can and we will fight for this.

AGAINST PROVOCATEURS—AGAINST SPLITTERS

By OKANO.

SINCE May this year the Japanese bourgeois press has been paying much attention to questions of the internal life of the C.P. of Japan. The hired servants of Japanese imperialism are particularly interested in the way in which the Communist Party of Japan combats provocation. The materials published in the Japanese bourgeois press about the activity of the C.P. of Japan are based mainly on police information. What kind of information do they provide as to the position in the Communist Party of Japan?

The bourgeois press states that the Japanese police were able to strike heavy blows at the C.P. of Japan at the end of 1932. At the beginning of 1933, it is alleged, Yamomoto Masami was sent from Moscow to Japan by the Comintern and in a short time he succeeded in restoring the party organisations and carrying on a large amount of Communist work both inside the country and at the front. The police were soon able to get track of this illegal activity and succeeded in arresting Yamomoto himself. After this, according to the statements of the police, discord is alleged to have arisen in the ranks of the C.P. of Japan and an internal struggle commenced. The C.C., which was formed after the arrest of Yamomoto, studied the circumstances under which the latest arrests had taken place, and came to the conclusion that they were to be mainly explained by the fact that provocateurs had succeeded in stretching their tentacles into the apparatus of the Party. In view of the tremendous harm done to the Party by provocation, the C.C. of the C.P. of Japan decided to begin a merciless struggle against it. With this object in view, great ideological activity was carried on in the Party. In addition, it is alleged that a special militant self-defence group was formed, attached to the C.C., whose special function was to discover provocateurs and to do away with them. The Japanese bourgeois papers, especially those most closely connected with the police, are filled with detailed descriptions of the activity of this party self-defence group. The statement is made that more than ten people were condemned to death by this group, that some of these have already been killed, while others have been only

able to save their lives thanks to the prompt interference of the police. As a result, it is alleged, suspicions have arisen inside the C.C. and even among the members of the defence group, to the effect that there are police agents-provocateurs in this small circle of Party activists and that they defend their companions—exposed provocateurs—whom they help to hide from revolutionary vengeance. After the first provocateurs had been murdered, the police proceeded to carry out mass arrests, and by May this year, arrested 736 persons allegedly in connection with the activity of the defence group. In connection with the arrests, as reported in the bourgeois papers, which base themselves on police materials, dissatisfaction is alleged to have begun to appear inside the C.P. of Japan with the activity of the self-defence group, and the C.C. which directs it.

On June 7th, 1934, an article was published in the newspaper *Tokyo Asahi* under the title "The Japanese Communist Party is approaching a Split." This article states that on May 25th a joint statement was published of a group of supporters of a conference of cells, signed on behalf of the Kansai district committee of the Party, of a conference and delegates of cells in the Moto district of Tokyo, of the fraction of the Koita district council of the Dzenkio,* of the fraction of the C.C. of the Dzeikai,† of the fraction in Niahon, Soranmei Kumiai Remei,‡ and of a group of organisers of the Tiugokow district. In this statement, if we are to believe the press, information is given regarding the formation of an organisational committee for the calling of an all-Japanese delegate party conference. The newspaper *Tokyo Asahi* explains the formation of this organisational committee as an expression of the lack of faith of the lower party organisations in the C.C. because these lower organisations allegedly consider that the C.C. is in the hands of the provocateurs. The organisational committee, according to the *Tokyo Asahi*, allegedly sets itself the task of winning the C.C. away from the provocateurs. The newspaper

* Revolutionary Trades Unions.

† Peasant Unions.

‡ Reformist Federation of Trade Unions.

continues that the C.C., on its part, accuses the organisation committee of being a tool in the hands of the police, who are in every way trying to hinder and nullify the merciless struggle against provocateurs begun by the C.C.

Police Phantasy.

All these flights of fancy of the Japanese police are being distributed all over the country in millions of copies. They are being read by the masses of the workers, peasants and toilers in town and village. They are being read by members of the C.P. of Japan, who, in underground conditions, have no direct connections with the C.C. of the Party, and who are being led astray thus by incorrect information regarding the position in the C.C. What is the matter, and what does the Japanese bourgeois press wish to achieve by handing out police information regarding the position in the C.P. of Japan? These questions must be very carefully examined. This information is undoubtedly of no chance character. The Japanese Government systematically and intentionally gives detailed information to the bourgeois press regarding the situation in the Communist Party of Japan, and tries to depict the activity of the Communists in such a manner as to frighten away the workers and peasants. By publishing such information regarding the situation in the C.P. of Japan, the police are pursuing their usual aims of (1) causing confusion in the Party, and among the working and peasant masses, by giving false information about the C.P. of Japan; (2) through false information, disorganising the work of the Party and discrediting the Party in the eyes of the masses. This is the first thing which must be borne in mind by all toilers in Japan and other countries when they read the information in the Japanese press regarding the situation in the C.P. of Japan.

Do the Japanese police make use of provocation? There is no need to prove this. Without a doubt they use provocation just as the police do in other capitalist States. It may be stated that provocation is the usual weapon used by the Japanese police in its struggle against the Japanese Communist Party. The C.C. of the C.P. of Japan published a manifesto to all Party members and to all the workers and peasants of Japan, in which it concretely and in detail exposed the provocatory methods used by the Japanese police. In this manifesto, for example, attention is drawn to the following methods of police provocation:

(1) It makes use of fractional struggle by inflaming existing disagreements, and participates in anti-party factional groups. The manifesto says: "Be vigilant! Study the decisions of the party collectively, and ensure iron party discipline by carrying out party decisions without question." (2) The police egg on the party organisations and individual activists to take the path of adventurism, e.g., the robbery of a bank in Omori, etc.; (3) through

provocateurs who penetrate into the party, the police are able to remove the best activists and at the same time do everything possible to hinder the carrying out of party decisions, as was the case in 1932 when provocateurs succeeded in penetrating into the finance department of the C.C. of the party, and into the circulation department of the newspaper *Sekki*; (4) provocateurs often come forward as those who "defend" the correct line of the Comintern against deviations in the work of the C.C., and "owing to their boldness and impudence they are able to deceive some comrades. Sometimes provocateurs are found who have real political talent"; (5) the police often do not react to the reports made by provocateurs for a time, so as to make it possible in this way for the latter to worm themselves into the confidence of the party better and to prepare for the more serious destruction of the party organisations."

Correct Proposals.

In mentioning all these types of work of the provocateurs, the C.C. calls on the Party members and on all workers and peasants,—

"in case of arrests, to make a most consistent study of their causes, and at the same time to keep a vigilant watch on suspicious elements who have penetrated into the party with the help of the political police. Check up most carefully on those who return to the organisation after the police have released them, learn to observe people, and carefully check up those whom you appoint to various posts. It is not a matter of getting rid of one or two provocateurs, but of developing an energetic struggle against the system of provocation. Organise the struggle against provocation as a component part of the general revolutionary class struggle for the overthrow of the monarchy."

The analysis made is a correct one, and the proposals, on the whole, are also quite correct. But this does not by any means imply that, having issued a manifesto and exposed therein the types and methods of work used by provocateurs, that the Party has thus protected its organisations, including the central bodies, against the penetration of provocateurs. The manifesto of the C.C. of the C.P. of Japan justly points out that no complete guarantee against provocation can be created. The police obtain their provocateurs by the most varied means—by bribery, terrorisation, torture, and by sending paid agents into the Party, who play the rôle of loyal Communists, etc. The harm done by provocateurs to the Communist Party is very great, but it should be borne in mind that owing to their special position, owing to the fact that they have to work under the orders of the police, and at the same time give systematic proof to the Party of their good revolutionary work, the provocateurs in some cases do harm to the bourgeoisie. Examples of this kind are provided by the provocation carried on in various Communist Parties and particularly by the history of the Russian provocateur, Malinovsky.* Malinovsky succeeded in making his way into the central apparatus of the Bolshevik Party. Documentary evidence now exists to prove how great was the harm done to the Bolshevik Party by

* See *The Agent-Provocateur in the Labour Movement*.

Malinovsky. He betrayed a number of important activists, and informed the police upon the inner work of the illegal Bolshevik leading committees, etc. But at the same time there is documentary evidence to prove that in order to keep his post as provocateur, Malinovsky was compelled to carry out various tasks assigned to him by the Party, such as speeches in the State Duma, the collection of money for the illegal Party press, speeches at workers' meetings as a revolutionary social democrat, etc.

In general, history knows no case where provocateurs have been able to stop the revolutionary movement of the masses who are rising to the struggle. This is completely confirmed by the example of the C.P. of Japan. In spite of all cases of provocation in the recent period, the Party is successfully continuing its heroic struggle. The exposure of a police provocateur whose reports have caused the arrest of revolutionaries and their torture in the police dungeons, has always roused great indignation in the ranks of the Party and among the masses of the working class. History knows many cases when provocateurs were killed by the indignant workers. But it should be borne in mind, on the basis of existing revolutionary experience, that the creation of special groups to deal with provocateurs as methods of dealing with provocation, etc., may bring elements of disintegration into the Party. Before the seizure of power and before conditions exist for open civil war and for the struggle for power, the Party organisations must as a rule quietly remove Party workers who are suspected of being provocateurs from Party activity.

The entire experience of the revolutionary movement, especially the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks, shows how correct the latter were during the Tsarist régime, when they sharply condemned individual terror as a method of struggle against the class enemy. The C.C. of the C.P. of Japan has correctly pointed out in its manifesto that it is not a question of removing one or two provocateurs from the list of the living. It is only possible to finally put an end to provocateurs by the victory of the proletarian revolution which will establish the Soviet régime and place the keys to all police secrets into the hands of the victorious working class. The vengeance wreaked on two exposed provocateurs which took place in Japan was promptly used by the Japanese police, who tremendously exaggerated these facts, and tried in every possible way to prove that the Japanese Communist Party had entirely adopted the path of mass individual terror in respect to all Party members suspected of provocation. At the same time the police began to arrest hundreds of workers and

peasants right and left who were alleged to have had something to do with the "lynching" of the provocateurs, and each of these prisoners was brought to court on "legal" grounds and punished according to the severest clauses of the criminal and military laws.

No Split.

In the organisation committee formed by a number of the lower Party organisations with a view to calling a Party conference, the alleged aim of which is to free the C.C. from provocateurs, there was clearly to be felt the influence of the campaign of the bourgeois press against the C.P. of Japan. The slogan that a Party conference be called of representatives of the lower Party organisations who have not yet fallen under the disintegrating influence of the provocateurs, with a view to establishing at this conference a new C.C. of honest Party members, is, of course, easily understandable in such circumstances, although not entirely correct, because the question of the C.C. in an illegal party is by no means such a simple one. The activists in the C.P. of Japan must realise that if there is only a core of good Bolsheviks in the C.C. of the Party, who, despite police difficulties, rally the Party and the working class for the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and against war, the police are very deeply interested in discrediting such a C.C. in the eyes of the Party. On the other hand, the police, who evidently have agents in the lower Party organisations, will also try to worm themselves into the preparations for the Party conference. With this object in view they will try to get their people into the organisation committee and through them to learn what is being done at the conference, about everything that is being done in the Party, and will also try to penetrate into the C.C., which will be elected at this conference. All this should be foreseen. On the basis of all existing international experience of the struggle against provocation, we should consider that the comrades in the C.C. are right in thinking that the political police will try, through their agents, to penetrate into the organisation committee for calling the Party conference, at the same time the comrades in the lower organisations are right when they raise the question of a further struggle against provocation in the central bodies of the Party. It must be stated outright, without any concealment, that the C.P. of Japan is now threatened with a split and the disorganisation of all its Party work, a position to which it is being egged on by the agents of the police, who are artfully utilising the situation inside the Party. The Party must beat off this police attack at all costs. How can this be done?

What Is To Be Done?

Firstly, those comrades who help to sharpen the struggle between the C.C. and the organisation committee are objectively playing into the hands of the police, whether they like it or not, and are driving the Party towards a split. All honest Communists, supporters of the C.C. and supporters of the organisation committee, must come out in a most decided manner against such a sharpening of inner Party relationships.

Secondly, a small commission should be appointed from among the members of the C.C. and the organisation committee, and consisting of thoroughly tested comrades who do not arouse suspicion among the supporters of either side. The work of the commission will be to gather all existing materials which accuse individual workers of the C.P. of Japan of provocation, and on the basis of a careful study of all this material, to take the necessary organisational steps, which would put an end to these mutual accusations and would ensure the harmonious work of the Party in the future. As for the Party conference, it would be useful to call it, but only when, as a result of the measures adopted by the committee, mutual attacks have been stopped and conditions for normal Party work have been established. Naturally, an all-Japanese Party conference requires careful preparations, and the ENTIRE PARTY must participate in this important matter. The place where it is to meet, the manner of electing the delegates, the agenda of the conference, etc., are extremely important questions in underground conditions and cannot be solved without serious preparations.

Thirdly, a wide campaign must be carried on against the police-inspired slander in the bourgeois press, which claims that the C.C. has introduced the system of lynching provocateurs into the Party.

The real position of the Party in the struggle against provocation, as set out in the above-mentioned manifesto of the C.C. to the Party, the workers and the peasants, must be widely popularised. It must be clearly stated that the C.P. of Japan repudiates individual terror as a method of struggle against provocateurs and, on the contrary, regards the struggle against provocation as a component part of the general revolutionary struggle.

Fourthly, in the immediate future the organisational work of the Party must be decentralised to the greatest possible degree—maximum initiative being allowed to the local and district Party committees. All efforts must be directed towards organising the regular issue of the *Sekki* and other central Party literature, which gives information about the Party line, about its central fighting slogans, and which explains how the slogans should be carried out. Extensive district and factory Party literature must be published by all means, to supplement the activity of the central Party press.

Fifthly, the use of legal and semi-legal possibilities must be continued and extended, and work in all the legal and semi-legal workers' organisations must be intensified, especially in the trade unions (Red, reformist, etc.). By a correct combination of illegal methods of Party work with legal and semi-legal methods, the blows of the police terror should be paralysed, contacts with the masses should be strengthened, the Party activists should be put under the defence of the masses in the factories, in the mass organisations, and in the organs of the united front of struggle (strike committees, etc.). These are the most reliable methods of protecting the Party activists against police terror, while simultaneously consolidating the influence of the Party among the masses.

(Continued from page 662)

made of all available literature and of the organs of the Party press; the work of winning and training new members must be continually combined with every form of everyday work. Instead of being relegated to an occasional recruiting appeal far more attention than in the past must be given to the new members. The most careful assistance, training and encouragement of initiative and responsibility, drawing into active work and comradeship without overloading, so as to build up stable and growing forces of the Party and continually draw new cadres into active leadership.

FIFTH, the entire work of the Party is directed towards development of revolutionary leadership

and mass organisation in preparation for the decisive revolutionary issues which we know to be in front. For this reason all the work of the Party, both great and small, must be imbued with this understanding and perspective, with awakening the workers to the necessity of the revolutionary path as the sole solution of the crisis, the PATH OF THE WORKING-CLASS REVOLUTION AND SOVIET POWER. The united front, which is the necessary next stage in the advance of the working-class struggle in Britain, is itself only a stage to the further mass advance to the overthrow of capitalism in Britain. To this developing battle, leading to the final victory of Socialism, the Communist Party calls the working class.

WHY HITLER IN GERMANY? (Fritz Heckert)	2d.
HITLER AND THE TRADE UNIONS	1d.
FOUR WEEKS IN THE HANDS OF HITLER'S HELL-HOUNDS (Hans Beimler) ...	3d.

THE SITUATION IN GERMANY AND THE WORK OF THE C.P.G.

By RICHTER.*

COMRADES, 18 months have passed since the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, and we can say once again that the Hitler government has not succeeded in solving a single one of the burning problems facing it. On the contrary, it is just during the last few months that we have been witnessing a further growth of the difficulties facing the fascist dictatorship, a further sharpening of the situation, a further deepening of the contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and a still further narrowing down of the mass basis of fascism.

All the attempts of fascism to win over the broad strata of the working class to its side have proved in vain. Fascism was unable to give the workers anything materially, but on the contrary made claims on them. Work was given to the unemployed at the expense of the employed, but not only was there no rise in wages, but in some cases the total amount of wages paid fell. Public works, operated within the framework of the "battle against unemployment" were carried out with some help from the charitable organisations. These works are now being considerably reduced, as all the funds for carrying them on have been exhausted. What remains is unpaid forced labour in the country districts, to which especially the youth from the big cities up to the age of 25 are now doomed. Such is the result of Hitler's dictatorship for the workers, who clearly and plainly showed what they wanted during the elections of the factory "representatives."

But the Hitler government could not give anything to the middle classes either. In connection with the fall in the purchasing power of the masses, the conditions of the handicraftsmen, small traders and members of the liberal professions, have grown considerably worse during the last few months. The number of bankruptcies is increasing and debts are mounting higher and higher.

The masses of the small and middle peasants, like the urban petty-bourgeoisie, are rapidly growing disillusioned and exasperated. The peasant is forced to give up his produce to the State at ridiculously low prices, and he is prohibited by law from selling produce on the market. Taxes have not been reduced, and debts have not been annulled. The court officials act more callously than ever before. The "peasant farm" inheritance law, the

compulsory establishment of farms, and the new law on grain deliveries to the State (Getreidegrundrecht) have still further intensified the position in the villages.

The majority of the peasants are turning away from Hitler.

What is the attitude of the capitalists to the rulers whom they appointed? Some groups of capitalists are not at all satisfied with them, and not only because Hitler did not succeed in uprooting Communism. In spite of the help given to his party by the National Socialist factory organisations, the so-called "labour front," the latter have not been able to bring "quiet and order" into the factories. The workers' resistance is growing. It is therefore not astonishing that Hitler has so far not dared to carry out the main points of the labour law of January 20th, and has twice been forced to postpone its operation. The majority of the wage agreements are still in force, but the employers want to bring about wage-cuts more rapidly and to worsen the conditions of labour. This is further supplemented by the fact that owing to its foreign policy, the Hitler government is in a catastrophic condition. Germany is isolated. Since January the unfavourable trade balance has continued to increase. The gold and currency reserve of the Reichsbank has almost completely melted away. The stoppage of the payment of interest on foreign loans, even the Young and Dawes loans, still further complicates the situation.

The tremendous discontent with Hitler's fascist dictatorship takes the most varied forms. Among the workers it is shown in growing hatred and in increasing resistance; among the middle classes and the storm troop detachments it is shown by the so-called "grousing" and cursing; it found expression in the church conflict and in Papen's Marburg speech.

And it was in such circumstances that, on June 30th, the shots rang out which sent Roehm, Heines, Ernst, Schleicher, Klaussner and others to their graves, an event which marks the beginning of the crisis of fascism.

1. The Development of Class Forces in Germany Since the XIII Plenum (Dec., 1933.)

The recent events in Germany show that the fascist dictatorship is passing through the beginning of its crisis. It should not be forgotten what the XIII. Plenum indicated in this connection, namely, that a sudden development of events in

* Abbreviated stenogram of a report made by Comrade Richter at a meeting of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. held on July 9 and 10, 1934.

Germany was not only possible but was very probable. This is to be explained not only by the very essence of German fascism, but also by the special position, by the difficulties and the profound crisis of German capitalism. The latest events were prepared for by the development of class forces during the year and a half of the rule of the fascist dictatorship. Fascism did not succeed either in smashing or isolating our Party from the masses, which was the basic aim of the fascist dictatorship. On the contrary, the authority of our Party among the masses of workers and the middle class has increased. From every part of the country we are informed that wherever the *Rote Fahne* appears it is enthusiastically received by the working masses, and in most cases leads to the unification of the workers and to increased revolutionary activity. Our Party did not allow fascism to win over the decisive part of the working class.

The social democratic workers are coming to us, though, it is true, slowly and hesitatingly. Hesitation is to be observed also among the middle strata who, until recently, were the basis of the fascist dictatorship. This found clear expression during the elections of the office workers' representatives.

In the October resolution of the Polit-Bureau of the C.P.G., as in the decisions of the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I., we spoke of the beginning of a new revolutionary upsurge. What effect did it have at that time? We must establish this to-day in order to understand the development of events during the last half-year.

While we were drawing our conclusions, some of the workers were under the influence of the seeming stability of the fascist dictatorship. Our conclusions were sceptically received by some of the workers and even by some members of the Party. In connection with this I remind you of the attacks of the social-democrats and renegade groups, the Trotskyites, etc. To-day we see that the fact of the new revolutionary upsurge is accepted and recognised by the broad masses of the working class.

At the 13th Plenum we spoke of the concealed hatred among the masses. At that time it was very correctly remarked that the indignation in Germany expressed itself differently than in other countries.

During the executions in Germany hundreds and thousands of workers participated in the funerals of the victims, despite the fact that the police made mass arrests in this connection. But there were also demonstrations against the executions and murders. During the funeral of the murdered leader of the trade union movement in Duisburg thousands of workers wore black ties. The Nazis tried to make mass arrests, but did not succeed in this owing to the mass resistance.

Take May 1st. What characterises May 1st this year as compared with last year? The workers acted more openly. We can note mass abstention from participation in fascist demonstrations in spite of compulsion. The workers openly carried on discussions, and Hitler's speech in the Tempelhof merely gave the workers an excuse for sarcasm. The increased propaganda of our Party in connection with May 1st was of great significance. Throughout the whole country, district newspapers were issued for May 1st, and we could state that the number of factory papers had increased. I will restrict myself to two examples: In one district in Berlin 4,500 copies of newspapers, 9,000 copies of proclamations and 8,000 to 10,000 leaflets were distributed for May 1st. This, of course, was not the position in every district, but these figures probably do not very much exceed the average. Take another example — in Hamburg, which suffered so greatly from mass arrests and the terror, the total circulation of the Party press in Hamburg in April reached 13,700 copies; in addition, we issued 205,000 copies of proclamations and about 10,000 leaflets.

Such great activity on the part of our Party for May 1st compelled the enemy to show his real face more openly. During the last few days of April and on the eve of May 1st, a more severe check was kept over passenger trains, while raids and searches were made. All the Storm Troopers and Guards' detachments were mobilised.

The mass indignation took the form of strikes and other forms of resistance, e.g., a whole number of strikes. In one of the big departments of the Opel factory in Frankfort-am-Main a strike took place for the second time. At the "Achter and Ebbels" textile factory in Gladbach the workers conducted a stay-in strike for four days against the two-loom system. At the Simpson factory in Zuhl a strike was held against wage-cuts. At the Kuben factory in Hagen a National Socialist library was to have been opened, the expenses of which were to be borne by the workers. The workers prevented the establishment of the library. At the Elbe rubber plant in Harburg a strike was held against the reduction of piece-work rates, in which the National Socialist factory organisations also took part. A stay-in strike against a 10 per cent. wage-cut also took place at the "Continental" plant in Hanover.

A wage-cut announced at an aviation plant in Gotha was prevented by the resistance of the workers.

At the shoe factories in Erfurt the employer demanded a 33 per cent. reduction of wages. The Labour Trustee proposed 20 per cent. The workers opposed both proposals. At the Mitchel factory the workers struck work for two hours against a

wage-cut. At the Hans Union factory in Baden the workers discussed the question of the high membership dues and left the fascist trade unions.

At the Vieting factory a worker wrote out leaflets against an 8 per cent. wage-cut and put them by the machines. Later the directors withdrew the notice about it.

In Cologne a meeting of forced labour inspectors took place composed entirely of old members of the Storm Troopers and Guard detachments. After the statement that the inspectors were henceforth not government employees and that their wages of 32 marks, plus an allowance for children, were reduced by 70 pfennigs an hour, these government officials broke up the meeting. Two later meetings were also disrupted, and a written confirmation of the new conditions was rejected.

At the A.A.W. factory in Nippes, a movement against a wage-cut was developed in which 140 Storm Troopers participated. The workers refused in an organised way to collect money for Germans abroad. The workers of the Roleman and Meyer factory held a four-hour strike against a wage-cut of from 8 to 14 marks a week. The wages were reduced, but the directors did not dare to dismiss the members of the former Red factory committee.

In Achen 50 building workers, engaged on forced labour, came out on strike because they were refused 3 marks in money in place of the dinner provided. Similar resistance was shown by workers engaged on other building jobs in the Achen district. The workers engaged on public works in Amendorf (Thuringia) stopped work owing to a refusal to pay them wages.

The district leaders of the National Socialist Party warned a member of the N.S.B.O. (Nazi Factory Organisation) who collected signatures at a small factory against a wage-cut.

The political importance of these strikes and acts of protest is very frequently not taken account of. I will give a typical example. The leader of the local party group in Meintz spoke of the two strikes in the Opel factory as though they were nothing exceptional, that they should not be exaggerated, and that they were the work of the N.S.B.O., which, just as the social democrats did formerly, organise a strike from time to time to deceive the workers. These strikes were furthermore not organised by our Party leaders or cells, but broke out at the initiative of individual revolutionary workers.

As the result of this protest movement against wage-cuts the Hitler government was deprived of the possibility of bringing about wage reductions on the scale intended. Although wages were partially reduced from 20 to 30 per cent., nevertheless the proposed cut was prevented in a large number of factories.

I will give still another characteristic example of the sentiments existing in the factories. I will speak of the sentiments in the Berlin Transport Union, which is of great importance. This union has been repeatedly "purged," thousands of revolutionary-minded workers, not to mention worker-Communists, being driven out of it, and its ranks being reinforced by supporters of the National Socialists, but in spite of all this, mass indignation reigns in the Berlin Transport Workers' Union against the Nazis, due to their failure to carry out the promises they made to the workers before they came to power.

Take another example, from the unemployed movement. At the 13th Plenum Comrade Pieck justly criticised this weak aspect of our work. We may now point to successes in this sphere. We can point to a series of mass actions of the unemployed at the labour exchanges. In Berlin hundreds of the unemployed, in one case even 2,000 of them, marched to the Town Hall to protest against a reduction of unemployment benefits.

Every day the wives of "village auxiliary workers" (unemployed who have been sent into the country districts) demand an increase of relief for themselves and their children. They demand a week's vacation for their husbands and the payment of their travelling expenses. They maintain their rights in fierce every-day struggle against the charitable societies.

Our great weakness is the absence of unemployed committees, these united front organs which unite the Communists, social democrats and non-Party unemployed.

I will give another example showing the change in the situation since the 13th Plenum. I refer to the elections of the factory representatives. Recently Schacht stated in a newspaper interview that the government was very seriously concerned at the result of the elections. The elections of the factory representatives were a defeat for the Hitler government and reflected the feelings in the factories and the attitude of the workers towards the fascist dictatorship.

What were the basic forms of resistance of the workers during the elections of the factory representatives? Firstly, boycott of the elections. It is well known that in the big factories two-thirds of the workers, and sometimes more, did not participate in the elections. Secondly, the tactics of voting against the candidate proposed, or else not for the chief candidates, but for those whose names were at the bottom of the list. In order to demonstrate the "unity of the people," the employers, together with the Nazis, frequently placed the names of people least eligible as far as they were concerned at the very end of the list. Scores of examples could be quoted in which Nazis who

were specially well known at particular factories received very few votes (5-10 per cent. of all votes cast) in spite of the fact that their names were at the head of the list. A third method was also used which we did not advocate sufficiently, namely, the struggle for OUR OWN councils of representatives. There are few such examples. We know of cases of struggle for our councils of representatives at one of the mines in Upper Silesia and at the Krupp plants. In my opinion, the results of the elections for the councils of representatives (I cannot here deal with them in detail) were a great success for our Party.

The campaign against "grumblers" carried out by the Nazis was intended to strike a heavy blow at the discontented elements, ESPECIALLY THE WORKERS. But instead of the stoppage of discussion which the National Socialists expected, this campaign led to still more discussion. Meetings against the "grumblers" took place without any display of enthusiasm. It is noteworthy that the campaign was conducted in general only at open meetings. In places where attempts were made to carry it into the factories, the result was a failure. At the Schering-Kalbaum factory in Berlin, a meeting against the "grumblers" was to have been held. But only 30 came to the meeting, although 700 tickets were distributed. At the Agfa-Treptov factory only 150 persons came to the meeting, although 1,100 are employed there.

What activity has been carried on by the Party among the masses who are under fascist influence and among whom great dissatisfaction reigns? It should be stated that our Party has succeeded in establishing quite good contacts with discontented elements in the ranks of the Fascist party and among the storm troops. Frequently contacts with these elements are in better shape than with the social democratic workers. Our groups are often well informed of the situation in the fascist organisations. The situation is not as it was a year ago when no discussions were conducted with the Nazis. In small local groups, where communists are well known to every worker, the storm troopers frequently appeal to them to discuss various questions. There is one place in Germany (I will not mention its name) where five storm troop leaders are on our side. This, of course, does not mean that the whole storm detachment sympathises with us, but it shows that the leader of the detachment distributes our material among people he knows.

In the introductory part I have already spoken of the rôle of the middle classes. It is well known that before the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany the middle strata were against the workers' strikes. This has now changed. They often welcome resistance and strikes. I will give only one example showing the unrest among the

middle strata. Out of 25 meetings of milk dealers in Cologne, 23 were disrupted by the dealers themselves. Among the middle strata there is a saying: "Russland ist ein Sovietland, Deutschland ist ein Gebjettland" (Russia is a soviet country, but Germany is a country of collections).

It cannot be said that they are with us, or that we have already obtained allies in their person, but a turn to our side is already to be noticed. Many of them already give financial assistance to political prisoners through the I.L.D. This was not the case last year. On the contrary, they often used to inform the police of our comrades.

Such is THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS FORCES in Germany. Summing up, I think that we can say that a big step forward has been made since the 13th Plenum.

II. Hitler is Leading Germany to Catastrophe

In the decisions of the C.P.G. and also in the decisions of the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. we said, "Hitler is leading Germany to catastrophe." What is the economic situation in Germany and what are the economic measures being operated by Hitler's government?

Firstly, the campaign to provide work which was started with such pomp at the end of March this year fell to pieces after a month and a half. To-day no one speaks of providing work. On the contrary, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour state officially in the press that there are no additional funds for providing work.

How is unemployment being "removed" in Germany at the present time? Here are two examples—Goering's plan in Berlin and the ORDER of the President of the Coblenz district. In the order it states that those who refuse to carry out agricultural labour will be deprived of unemployment benefit. Engel has now issued a decree in Berlin that all employed workers under the age of 25 are to leave the factories to make way for the adult unemployed. This signifies the utter breakdown of the plans for providing work.

Secondly, the bankruptcy of the policy of autarchy. The situation in Germany just now is the same as it was during the war, when it was necessary to restrict consumption (potato shortage, clothing, etc.).

Thirdly, the complete bankruptcy of exports. A law has been passed giving powers to the Minister of National Economy requiring him to carry out all the measures which he thinks necessary in the interests of the national economy. I may recall the disagreements on the question of transfers with the U.S.A., Great Britain, Switzerland and other countries.

Fourthly, the population, even in Berlin itself, fearing inflation, are buying up food, etc., in

masses. As a result of the measures adopted by the government, the exchange rate of the mark inside the country is being maintained at one level (although its purchasing power has FALLEN), while it has fallen very much abroad.

To this should be added the isolation of Germany in foreign policy. All this confirms the fact that we were a thousand times right when we claimed that Hitler was leading Germany to catastrophe.

III. Our Struggle for the Social-Democratic Workers.

The social democratic masses have come nearer to us, firstly on the question of dictatorship or democracy, secondly in the estimate of the rôle of the State, and thirdly in condemning the wrong policy pursued by the social democratic party. I will deal here with these three matters of principle. Here we may observe the dialectic influence of the fascist dictatorship, which, on the one hand, hinders our struggle, and on the other hand destroys the illusions of the German working class, especially the social democratic workers. The social democratic party is broken up organisationally.

It may be said that in Germany there are left social democratic groups, real and pretended. But the outstanding thing is that the pseudo "left" groups, who can only be given the title of "left" in quotation marks, are losing their influence.

In the eyes of the social democratic workers there is only one enemy—FASCISM—while before the fascist dictatorship many of the social democrats thought that there were really two enemies—capitalism and communism. Now their views have changed, and this is of decisive importance for the further development of the revolutionary struggle in Germany.

In the struggle for the overthrow of fascism the Party must bring about the unity of the working class. The revolutionary prospects of the Party require that the social democratic workers be brought in to participate in the struggle for everyday demands, for the formation of independent unions, for mass self-defence, for the development of mass and cultural organisations, and for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. It is clear that we have had to advance such demands as will unite all the workers in the struggle, demands which strike at the common enemy—fascism. These tactics, of course, do not change our line of struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Up to the present we have not sufficiently fought to establish this unity of the working class in Germany. We are still to some extent isolated from the social democratic workers. We must study our shortcomings. We must carry on this struggle for the social democratic workers on the basis of the

changes which have taken place in the surrounding conditions.

There is no doubt that as regards the winning of the social democratic workers we may point to a series of favourable results. We can quote examples where half the members of a local group of the Communist Party are former social democratic workers. But, unfortunately, we can only give a few dozens of such examples, while the fact that it is not a general feature shows that something is not right in our work. In the town of "X," 80 social democratic workers came over to us, including the former chairman of the social democratic party organisation. With his help we have been able to set up a cell in a big factory. In "Y," seven cells have been established by social democratic workers and young socialists. In one town in Thuringia alone, out of the 200 party members, 100 are former members of the social democratic party. In one Bavarian town we had contacts with social democratic representatives who in turn were connected with 500 workers. In one district, 200 social democratic workers joined the party. Thus, seven local groups were established in places where we had no organisation in legal times. I could give still more such examples. What do they prove? They prove that in those places where the party carries on a struggle to win over the social democratic workers we obtain real success. But I want to mention one example which shows how our Party sometimes approaches the question of winning over the social democratic workers. I have before me the illegal paper of the Wedding district which addresses the social democratic workers. Its heading is "As in 1918." I will quote the first paragraph:

"There are workers who smile when the Communists tell them that social democracy is STILL an organisation which 'sacrifices itself' for the benefit of capitalism and its Hitler. These workers again and again suggest that we should throw aside party squabbles and at all costs unite to overthrow the Hitlerite dictatorship. Others, it may be, point to a few copies of the social democratic paper *Socialist Action*, published in Prague, in which, as always, the reproach of sabotaging the united front is thrown at the Communist Party.

"The task of this sheet is to help all workers to understand the REAL CHARACTER OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY."

Thus the paper reduces the question to explaining the "real character of social democracy" instead of explaining to the S.D. workers that the C.P.G. always was for the unity of the working class in the struggle against fascism, and welcomes the increasing strivings of the masses towards unity in the struggle against the Hitlerite dictatorship and then giving concrete slogans of struggle for the united front. I gave this example simply because it is typical and is repeated in many cases, but only in other forms.

What are the basic methods of struggle for win-

ning over the social democratic workers? The formation of groups to sell illegal publications, groups of sympathisers, of readers, of listeners-in to the Moscow radio broadcasts. One of the chief methods is the joint struggle in the factories and in the fascist organisations where our comrades come to an arrangement with the social democrats and form oppositional groups. Another method is joint work in the I.L.D. organisations and support for political prisoners.

Up to the present time these methods are the chief ones. The use of them has brought us nearer to the social democratic workers. Our weak point is that we have not yet sufficiently drawn the social democratic workers into strong enough organs of the united front, and especially that we have not succeeded in bringing about firm contacts and unity with the social democratic workers at the decisive sectors of the class struggle, namely, the factories and labour exchanges.

The Party must energetically STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS. What does this mean concretely for the Party? Firstly, to set up united front bodies in the factories and at the labour exchanges; secondly, to really bring the masses of the workers into the revolutionary mass organisations; thirdly, we have decided to re-establish the free trade unions so as to achieve unity with the social democratic workers through them; fourthly, we have to develop the united front of struggle for the Saar district which plays a big part in our struggle for the overthrow of the Hitlerite dictatorship, and is also of tremendous international importance; fifthly, we must extend the united front in the struggle for the liberation of Thaelmann.

IV. From the Activity of the C.P. of Germany.

The Party has obtained success in the sphere of mass work. However, I consider that the work done is utterly insufficient.

Our work in the fascist mass organisations must also be regarded as absolutely insufficient. What has prevented us up to the present obtaining success in our work in the fascist mass organisations?

It is the view which still exists in our Party that the best defence against terror is to restrict the circle of our acquaintances. This view is covered by "left" sectarianism, and is in reality "right" opportunist capitulation.

Our activity in the factories is the weakest part of all our activity, in spite of the fact that it has improved somewhat in the course of the last three months, especially since we gave up the old system of instructors, and made a general alteration in the character of the work of instructors. We are establishing factory instructors. The Party leadership has set itself the task of preparing 100 factory

instructors in the next two months. The insufficient attention being devoted to the work in the factories is undoubtedly to be explained by the wrong system of instructors. I do not want thereby to say that our system of instructors is of no use at all. In the first period of the fascist dictatorship, when the Party had to resist the specially strong onslaught of fascism, when it required great efforts to preserve the Party, to maintain contacts, etc., our instructors were of great use for the Party. But now, in the present conditions, this system of instructors of the first period is still insufficient. We must set up a new type of instructor, and concentrate our forces in the factories.

Besides this there still exists an underestimation of the need for work in the factories. A check-up in our district leading organs shows that there are very few factory workers in the leadership of the Party organisations. We must exert every effort to bring about a real concentration of our work in the decisive sectors of our struggle—in the factories.

The factory cells raise questions of the struggle against the worsening of the conditions of labour. This is of great significance. In some factories we have succeeded in getting a number of factory representatives on to our side. It should not be forgotten that the storm troopers and the members of the N.S.B.O. are under the influence of the feelings which dominate the factories. I want to give several other examples of how, as a result of our work, revolutionary sentiments are created in the factories, which determine the conduct of the National Socialists. At one factory in Berlin the workers presented their demands to the "representative." The employer rejected them, but the workers continued to insist on them. The council of representatives took up the matter. During this campaign the chairman of the council, an old Nazi, was sent off to a concentration camp.

At a margarine factory the workers demanded that the council of representatives should satisfy their demand for the payment of additional wages to those with children. The employer refused to satisfy the demand. The matter was passed on to the labour trustee, who took the side of the workers. But Schmidt, the Minister of Economy, rejected the demands. The labour trustee was discredited. This caused great dissatisfaction in the factory, and even the old Nazis said that they had imagined things quite differently.

Six hundred workers are employed at a margarine factory in Lichtenburg and work in the most difficult conditions. Under the pressure of the workers the factory committee was compelled to put forward demands for the improvement for conditions of labour. The employer declared that he did not require either the council of representatives or a factory meeting to change the conditions

of labour because "we alone decide the questions of labour conditions . . ." The newly-elected representatives of labour stated that they had no desire whatever to work under such conditions, and immediately resigned.

Organisation.

I wish to mention a few organisational questions. Fluctuations in the leadership make our work very difficult. Frequently big districts have been compelled to change their leadership seven or eight times. It must not be thought that the terror has grown weaker; on the contrary it has grown stronger. But the masses do not fear it as much as previously.

The question of new cadres assumes decisive importance for the development of events in Germany in the near future. We must on no account calculate on a weakening of the terror (the assassination of the storm troopers is a proof that the Nazis will be no less merciless towards us). But we shall not form new cadres unless, firstly, we promote people and supply all the leading bodies with men; secondly, unless the main weight is transferred to the lower committees, the local and group leaderships, and finally and thirdly, unless we promptly and correctly arrange the exchanging of Party forces. It is clear that the question of the exchange of Party forces will remain merely theory unless we are able to bring about the real training of cadres. A secretary who has worked for a year in one district must be transferred without fail to another district. But a proper exchange of comrades is only possible if systematic work is carried on among the cadres.

The question of cadres plays a decisive rôle. In Germany we note a great weakening of cadres. We must send our cadres to the most important points.

What conclusions can we draw from the situa-

tion in Germany? What do the events of June 30th signify?

1. The narrowing down of the mass basis of the fascist dictatorship.

2. The events of June 30th, the shootings and murders of the leaders of National Socialism, testify to the beginning of the crisis of the fascist dictatorship.

3. The belief in the stability of the fascist dictatorship, which helped the Hitlerites so much in Germany, has now been shaken.

4. The growth of the exploitation of the toilers and the impossibility of using social demagogy on the previous scale.

5. The increase of mass actions, strikes, the growth of resistance, and mutinies in the storm detachments. Of course, the mutinies in the ranks of the storm detachments should be estimated differently than the mutinies in the N.S.B.O., because they include the most active groups who win the victory of fascism.

6. The events of June 30th show that in carrying out the cleansing of the storm detachments the fascist dictatorship in Germany will rely primarily on the Reichswehr and the police.

The social democratic theory that the fascist dictatorship should be allowed "to play the master" is just as incorrect as it was previously, and has become particularly dangerous since the events of June 30th. Reliance on spontaneity has not yet been eliminated. It is obvious that a decisive struggle must be conducted against the social democratic theory to the effect that the fascist dictatorship will fall by itself owing to the contradictions and the friction in the camp of the bourgeoisie. We must overcome the view that it will be possible in Germany to bring about big and successful mass battles without the leading and organising rôle of the Communist Party.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL IN DISSOLUTION (Bela Kun)	6d.
SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY — STEPPING-STONE TO FASCISM (Reply to Otto Bauer. Manuilsky)	2d.
THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS (O. Piatnitsky)	9d.
THE PRESENT SITUATION IN GERMANY (O. Piatnitsky)	3d.
THE FAR EAST ABLAZE (G. Safarov)	2d.
THE TOILERS AGAINST WAR (Klara Zetkin)	1/-
"NATASHA"—A BOLSHEVIK WOMAN ORGANISER	6d.
CIVIL WAR IN AUSTRIA (Reply to Otto Bauer)	3d.

THE SITUATION IN GERMANY AND SOME QUESTIONS OF THE UNITED FRONT

By O. PIATNITSKY.

When Communists Can Successfully Conduct the United Front.

(Conclusion.)

I WISH to touch on only one question here—the question as to what change has taken place in the operation of the united front. What has changed is this: that wherever the communist parties have extended their work among the masses to even a slight degree, they have secured certain successes in operating the united front. Those communists who have increased their influence over the working masses, have thereby exerted pressure on the social-democratic organisations, and helped to bring about the united front even when the leaders of the social-democratic parties have been against the united front of struggle with the communists, and hindered its establishment. This has taken place due to the fact that in broadening their influence, the communists have established contacts with those strata of the working class on which the social-democratic party have relied hitherto. It is these very strata of workers which have exerted pressure on the social-democratic organisations with a view to establishing the united front of struggle, along with the communists. I wish to confirm this assertion by quoting instances from the experiences of a few parties.

Take France, where the successes of the communists in operating the united front have been particularly great. Take the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933. At that time a campaign against war was being carried on in France. The Communist Party of France carried on extensive agitation in favour of affiliation to the Amsterdam anti-war movement, into which large numbers of workers, including members of the Socialist party in France, and even whole organisations of this party, were drawn in. The social-democratic party offered to commence united front negotiations with the C.P. of France, having in view one aim, namely, to stop this movement. And the C.P.F. took the line which the socialists most desired, namely, the line of endless talk about unity and about methods of calling discussion meetings and similar questions, instead of raising the question of the concrete methods to be adopted in carrying out the united front of struggle against the capitalist offensive. By its actions, the communist party only helped to stop the process of the passage to the communist party of those social-democratic workers who were dissatisfied with the repression directed by the social-democratic leaders towards those who participated in the anti-war movement.

At the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933, the Second International started to talk about a “non-aggression pact” between the communists and the social-democrats, but no concrete proposals regarding joint struggle were made either by the Second International or the parties belonging to it. The social democratic parties thought of the “non-aggression pact” in the following way: the communist parties (who were at that very moment beginning to extend their influence over the masses, should join the united front with all the existing workers’ organisations (trade union, co-operative, sports, etc.) and parties, and as they were in a minority, they could be browbeaten. The communist parties, according to this view, would moreover be compelled to conform to the decisions of the majority and would have to give up all criticism of social-democracy. And when on March 5th, 1933, the Comintern made the concrete proposal to them to begin a joint struggle against fascism and the worsening of the conditions of the workers in each separate country (this just coincided with the coup d’état in Germany, when the fascists showed their real faces), and the Second International in fact rejected this proposal, while all the parties of the Second International, including the French party, repudiated the united front with the communist parties, the masses (even in France) did not react to this event. The masses did not react to the rejection of the united front by the social-democratic parties because they did not see a really wide struggle being carried on by the communists, and the results which could be obtained by the joint action of the communists and social-democratic workers.

France.

But take the events in France which took place at the same time as those in Austria, when the C.P. of France succeeded on February 9th, 1934, in carrying the majority of the French proletariat with it during the demonstrations which it organised; and when, by joining in the general strike called by the reformists on February 12th, 1934, it converted this strike from the “folded arms” strike desired by the reformists into an active general strike, accompanied by mass demonstrations. And it only needed the communist party to show the masses that it was able to fight, and that it was capable of starting this struggle in time, for an immediate

change to be observed in the attitude of the social-democratic workers towards it. The united front was established even before formal negotiations were begun between the communists and the socialists. This took place because the C.P. of France repeatedly warned the French workers that the French bourgeoisie were organising fascist gangs and that although the social-democratic party was aware of this, it not only concealed it from the workers, but even reassured them with assertions that fascism was impossible in democratic France. On February 6th, however, the fascists not only came out on to the streets, but overthrew the Daladier government. The majority of the workers in France, including the working class members of the social democratic party, responded to the call of the communist party for street demonstrations on February 9th, in spite of the fact that the reformist trade unions called on the workers not to participate in these demonstrations. This compelled the social democratic organisations, which felt the pressure from below, to abandon their former sabotage of the united front, even when the C.C. of their party rejected the united front. The social-democratic party manoeuvred. The congress of the social-democratic party proposed to establish a united front with the communists only on one definite question, and for a short period of time. By this means the socialists wanted to soothe their party members somewhat, and to convince them that they were agreed to and would consent to establish the united front with the communists. However, such large social-democratic organisations as that functioning in the Department of the Seine, as well as a number of others, established the united front with the communists against the will of their C.C. And thereby they exerted pressure on their C.C.

What does this show? It proves that the communists were able to bring about the united front in France only after they had demonstrated in practice that they were able to struggle and are capable of starting this struggle in time. It was only after this that the call of the C.P.F. met with a wide response. In a short time the communists made up for all that had been allowed to slip, all their losses since 1920. I do not mean to say by this (and let our French comrades not think so) that the communists will be able to consolidate their influence without further active work. There are enormous possibilities not only of extending the united front, but of consolidating it, which have not as yet been used.

Germany.

Take Germany before the fascists seized power. Here we have the opposite state of affairs. During the Prussian elections the social-democrats, in order to get votes for their candidate, declared that they

would oppose wage cuts in those industries where the collective agreements terminated at that time. A small manifesto was prepared together with the help of the German comrades, in which an appeal was made to all organisations capable of offering resistance to form a united front of struggle against wage cuts. The leaders of the Communist Party of Germany kept this document hidden away until the end of the Prussian elections, on the ridiculous grounds that its publication during the elections might influence the masses to think that "this is only a communist manoeuvre, while this document was of a serious character." This was a great mistake. What did the publication of this document show? Firstly, the workers in the mills and factories began to discuss this Communist Party document in detail. This was the first document for a number of years in which the party proposed the organisation of a united front to all working class organisations desirous of struggling against wage cuts when new collective agreements were being made in certain branches of industry. And if the document did not lead to the desired results, it was only because it was late in being published.

Let us see what were the tactics of the C.P. of Germany on July 20th, 1932. When the Communist Party called on the social-democratic party and the reformist trade unions to undertake joint action to the point of a general strike when Papen dissolved the social-democratic government of Prussia, it made a bold and correct step. We know that the reformists refused to undertake this struggle. The inability of the communists to begin this struggle themselves on July 20th, 1932, and to draw even part of the proletariat into it and thereby show that the communists were really able to fight and that they could rally the workers to this struggle, had a depressing effect on the workers. The proposal made by the C.P. of Germany to the social-democratic party and the reformist trade unions on January 30th, 1933—to act in a united front against the fascist dictatorship which had only just seized power, was, of course important for the further struggle of the C.P. The fact, however, that after the call to mass strike action on July 20th and January 30th, the C.P. of Germany was unable to rouse the masses, determined the attitude of the workers to the proposal made by the C.P. of Germany in March, 1933, to the leaders of the social-democratic party and the reformist trade unions to undertake joint action against the fascists, a proposal to which the reformists did not reply, and to which the workers did not react at all.

The reason why the C.P. of Germany was unable to rouse the workers to the strike on July 20th, 1932, January 30th, 1933, and March 5th, 1933, is well known. The great mistake made by the communists

was that they carried on insufficiently energetic mass work, work in the trade unions and in the factories. The one thing is connected with the other. The poor mass work of the Communist Party of Germany made it impossible for the party to carry the masses with it despite the reformists, and this helped towards the fact that the call of the C.P.G. on January 30th and March 5th, 1933, at the decisive moment in the struggle against fascism, met with an insignificant response.

Austria.

And now take Austria. The Communist Party of Austria was a small magnitude as compared with the giant which the social-democratic party was. The social-democrats mocked at the Austrian communists when the latter proposed the united front. But the conduct of the communists during the February events, when, without agreeing with the methods of struggle of the social democrats, they fought side by side with the *Schutzbund*, was of decisive importance for the future of the C.P. of Austria. The Austrian communists who, when the fight was on were able to point out the correct line of struggle for soviets and for the dictatorship of the proletariat, at the very moment when social-democracy displayed its complete bankruptcy, were thus able to attract the revolutionary elements of Austrian social-democracy to the work of the C.P. of Austria. In this way the communists caused such a ferment among the social-democratic functionaries that the majority of them have broken with the official social-democratic party of Austria and are finally coming over to the communists. Austrian social-democracy no longer sneers at the C.P. of Austria as previously. The C.P. of Austria is now the centre around which the entire revolutionary movement of Austria will revolve. If the communists had not fought side by side with the *Schutzbund*, I think that they could not have achieved the success they have done.

Great Britain.

The C.P. of Great Britain is not going ahead as much as is possible and desirable. This is true, of course, but the yardstick for the C.P. of Great Britain must be a different one from that used for other Communist parties. The position of the Communist Party of Great Britain in 1934 cannot be compared with the situation in 1933. The C.P. of Great Britain has obtained successes. How did it secure joint activity with the I.L.P.? Only by successfully leading the struggle of the unemployed after the government had cut the wages of workers, office employees and civil servants and had reduced the unemployment "dole" by 10 per cent. This movement was a big one, a tremendous one, and was directed by the unemployed organisation which is under the influence of the C.P. of Great Britain.

There have not been such big demonstrations in England since the days of the Chartists. This is why there has been a swing over in a number of trade unions in favour of the Communist Party of Great Britain and this is what compelled the I.L.P. to join with the C.P. of Great Britain in the organisation of the united front, and what caused a ferment in the ranks of the I.L.P. If this activity had not taken place, if there had not been these demonstrations, organised by the unemployed organisations which are close to the C.P. of Great Britain, the latter would not have achieved these successes. A wide road has opened up before the Communist Party of Great Britain. A number of trade unions (railwaymen, engineers) have passed resolutions in the spirit of the Communist Party. The C.P. of Great Britain is winning different trade union branches and various elected positions. It is already competing against the reformists in the elections for union posts. In some cases it has received only one or two thousand votes less than the reformists (our candidate received 40,000 votes against 42,000 for the reformists). This is undoubtedly a step forward. The C.P. of Great Britain has only secured these successes by showing, even if only by the example of the unemployed struggle, that it is able to fight.

Belgium.

Take the little Belgian Communist Party. The Labour Party of Belgium never took it seriously. But now, after the Communist Party took an active part in the miners' strike, it has become a definite force, and see how politely the social-democratic party replied to the proposal of the C.P. of Belgium regarding the united front. In its reply to the C.P. of Belgium, this big party (the Belgian L.P.) says that the little Belgian Communist Party makes attacks on it in the "Drapeau Rouge" which comes out once a week! Why did the Belgian Labour Party reply to the C.P. of Belgium, and moreover so tearfully? Because the Belgian communists have shown that they lead strikes or help strikes, and give correct slogans, and so the workers gather around them.

Conclusions.

What are the conclusions to be drawn? In order to successfully carry on the united front, the communist parties must work, they must go to the masses, must extend their influence, and in this way they will exert pressure on those strata of the workers who still follow the other parties. And the comrades must not imagine that it is sufficient to write an appeal, even if formulated in the most correct way possible, for the united front to be established. This is of course insufficient. They must work, carry on mass work, and be able to extend their influence and thus extend the united front. And what does the

establishment of the united front mean for the Communist Parties? It means a great deal. I think that very many comrades underestimate the importance of this question. Firstly, it has been possible to bring about the joint struggle of the communists and the social-democrats, a thing which had not been done for a period of fourteen years, despite all our attempts to do so; and now the Communists and the social-democrats who opposed each other, and railed at each other, are carrying on a joint struggle, and this joint struggle is meeting with great success. Do you think that any social-democratic party is powerful enough to hold the masses back and to prevent the possibility of further joint struggle? They will not be able to do it. And if the social-democrats are against this struggle, if they do not permit the organisation of the united front, while we nevertheless bring it about over their heads with their local organisations, this will make it possible for us to liberate the masses from the influence of the reformists, and to come closer to those revolutionary elements who agree to the joint struggle. You cannot stop them now! This is of tremendous importance. The Austrian revolutionary social-democrats wrote a letter to the Second International in which they proposed that a united front of struggle, of social-democrats and Communists be established if only in fascist countries. I think that in establishing the united front in the fascist countries, we will be able to do without the Second International. Things are not so bad in Austria. The Communists and the revolutionary socialists are carrying on a joint struggle against the fascists. In Germany (although Stampfer wrote that the social-democratic party of Germany was already dead but that after the events of June 30th it will rise again) we should not sit and wait to see whether it will rise or not. We must do everything in our power so that the social-democratic party of Germany, as such, should no longer be able to exist. And this depends to a great degree on the energetic and correct work of the Communist Party of Germany, from top to bottom. Comrade Knorin has said that if the Communists in Germany have not achieved such successes in attracting the social-democratic workers to their side as the C.P. of Austria, this must be attributed to the insufficient work of the Party. He is absolutely right. It should be emphasised still more firmly that if the local organisations of the C.P. of Germany do not change their tactics towards the social-democratic groups which are working in Germany itself—and although they are not formally connected with one another they nevertheless meet, carry on discussions, etc. (former members of the reformist trade unions do the same)—there is the danger that if other times arrive in Germany and the lefts appear

(real and pseudo), they will be able to bring the German social-democratic party back to life, even though not in its previous form. I do not want to be a prophet. It would be better if I prove to be wrong. But this may happen. Therefore there must be a 90° change in the tactics of our Party in relation to the social-democratic workers and the existing social-democratic groups in Germany itself. Social-democrats who have come into our party, are by the condescension of the "pure" communists, transformed into third-grade party members. They are not allowed to come right into the party, they are not drawn into the Party's work, and efforts are not made through them to influence other social-democratic workers who are not so near to us. This is a crime. The C.C. of the Communist Party of Germany is struggling against such things. We give it our fullest support. This practice must be radically changed. Communists must propose the establishment of the united front in the struggle against fascism to the existing social-democratic groups which publish illegal literature and carry on a struggle against fascism.

I will now say a few words about Comrade Losovsky's speech. I do not think we should follow his advice, that if Communists call meetings jointly with the socialists, at which the broad masses are present, we should advocate our whole programme at once there, although the united front of struggle was established only against the fascists. Comrade Losovsky advises us to state at these meetings that fascism can be destroyed only when the dictatorship of the proletariat is set up. At such meetings which are called for the struggle against fascism, it is inadvisable to do this, because this is only true when we speak of fascism in general, and not of fascism in those countries where the fascists are still fighting for power. The united front in such countries can prevent them coming to power. In countries like France and Great Britain, we demand a joint struggle against fascism immediately, so as not to let it get into power. This struggle, of course, must help towards the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The proposal made by Comrade Losovsky resembles the old methods. And, to show how not to approach the question of negotiations regarding the united front, I will use the example of the proposal made by the American C.P. to the Socialist Party of America. What conditions were put forward there? One of the conditions for the united front was the liberation of the negroes. I am not against the liberation of the negroes, as you all know, but the socialists are very much against it. To begin with, the liberation of the negroes means to know in advance that nothing will come of the united front. But there are points which could at least unite those

workers who follow the socialists, such as to strike together with the trade unions affiliated to the A.F.L. This question is extremely urgent in America, because there is no country where there are such strikes, and nowhere do they pass off with such torments as in America, when the entire apparatus of the police, the entire apparatus of the employers' thugs are directed against the strikers, when there is not a single strike where there are no killed and wounded. And if only we could get a united front on this question, it would have a terrific effect. And once the workers saw the result, then we could raise the question of

the liberation of the negroes, and other similar questions as well.

The social-democratic party of America will find it difficult to reject the proposal for a united front in the strike struggle, against terror in this struggle, for the workers are spontaneously in revolt against these methods. If the social-democratic party were to reject such a united front, it would discredit itself in the eyes of the workers. If, however, it refused to carry on a joint struggle for the liberation of the negroes, this would pass unnoticed by the overwhelming majority of the American workers.

RESOLUTION OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P. OF GREAT BRITAIN ON THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

THE Central Committee of the Communist Party, having reviewed the present situation, declares that the most important immediate task confronting the working class in Britain to-day is the realisation of the widest mass united front against fascism and war.

International Situation.

The situation, both in Britain and internationally, raises these issues in the sharpest form.

Never since August, 1914, has the imminent danger of a new world war been so acute. Every day and every hour events are hurrying us nearer to war. Europe in very truth has become a powder magazine liable to explode at any moment.

At the same time in the FAR EAST, the Japanese Government intensifies its provocative acts against the Soviet Union in its efforts to organise a war against the Workers' Fatherland.

All the hopes and expectations of the capitalists and of the labour leaders of a gradual peaceful "recovery" from the crisis, based on the limited upward economic movement 1933-4 and return to "stabilisation," are being proved false. On the contrary, the desperate measures adopted by monopolist capital to overcome the crisis, by shifting the burdens on to the workers, colonial peoples and weaker capitalist groups—the measures of tariff wars, currency war, veiled inflation, subsidies, governmental intervention and regulation, artificial restriction to force up prices, etc.—only increase the total disorganisation of world capitalism, intensify the struggle between the classes in each country, and the struggle of the imperialist states amongst themselves.

In consequence, the phase of "depression" which normally follows the lowest point of an economic crisis is to-day enormously complicated by the continuing general crisis, and results in a unique situation, not comparable to the process of previous economic crises in "normal" capitalism.

The analysis adopted by the Thirteenth Plenum of the Communist International, last December, which described the present situation as one of the "still further disintegration of capitalist economy," and consequent "accelerated maturing of a revolutionary crisis," leading to the expectation of "a turn at any moment which will signify the transformation of the economic crisis into a revolutionary crisis," has been overwhelmingly justified by the events of the half-year succeeding the Plenum.

The seven months since the Plenum have seen the armed struggle in Austria, the mass conflicts of the February days and after in France, the open fighting in Amsterdam, the rising revolutionary crisis leading to the June 30th events in Germany, revealing the growing instability of the Nazi regime, the assassination of Dollfuss, and the internal crisis in Austria, and the rising strike movement and open fighting in the United States.

Further, they have seen the open breakdown of the so-called "disarmament" negotiations, the rapid advance of military alliances and counter-alliances, and the full launching of a feverish armaments race of all the imperialist Powers.

The International situation following on the attempted Nazi coup in Austria, directly inspired by the desperate Nazi regime in Germany, and arousing the strongest antagonism of Fascist Italy,

has laid bare the tensivity of all present imperialist antagonisms, sharpened and increased by Fascism, and revealed to all how narrow is the margin between the present situation and world war.

Therefore, more than ever, the working class needs to be prepared for the "turn at any moment which will signify the transformation of the economic crisis into a revolutionary crisis."

Situation of British Capitalism.

The boasts of "recovery" by the British capitalist class and propagandists of the National Government are, in fact, a bare-faced attempt to conceal the real situation confronting the hungry and harassed masses in Britain, and to stave off discontent by illusory hopes of a return to prosperity.

It needs to be burned into the minds of the whole working class, that the merciless slashing of wages, speed up in the factories, cutting down of unemployment benefits, social services, and brutal imposition of the Means Test, involving a terrific lowering of working-class standards of living, have been the chief means through which the National Government has attempted to defeat its trade rivals.

The "trade recovery" about which it boasts has been gained on the stomachs of the workers, and the increased death-rate of working-class mothers and children.

By a series of aggressive measures against the workers, against the subject colonies, and against their trade rivals, they have succeeded in cutting down the unfavourable balance of trade (mainly through diminution of imports), extorting a budget surplus, increasing production and employment in certain branches of industry and raising the total of profits.

On the other hand, unemployment remains over two millions; foreign trade, indispensable to any recovery of British capitalism, remains heavily depressed and with no sign of improvement. Despite the Ottawa Agreements, the total of exports to Empire countries remains only a fraction of what it was prior to 1929. No solution has been found for the so-called "derelict areas" or for the basic coal and textile industries. The desperate measures adopted to win temporary gains—sterling depreciation, tariffs, subsidies and the trade war—bring no stability, but only increase enormously the world disorganisation for relatively minute gains, and are of necessity temporary in their effects.

It becomes increasingly recognised by the leaders of the capitalist class that the alleged "recovery" can only be extremely limited and unstable, that it is doubtful whether it can even reach the level of 1929, which was already heavily below the level of 1913, and that it represents at best an attempted adaptation to conditions of chronic depression.

The necessity for the revolutionary socialist solution of the crisis by the working-class conquest of power, which can alone basically reorganise British industry and agriculture, giving the working class the means of securing bread, work and peace, stands out ever more sharply, the more the results of the policy of the National Government are examined.

The Policy of the National Government.

In this situation the policy of the National Government becomes more and more openly based, not on a perspective of stabilisation and successful conquest of the economic crisis, but on a perspective of rapidly increasing imperialist antagonisms and sharpening class struggle at home.

In the field of foreign policy, the break with America over the debts, the military conversations with France for an eventual alliance of war, the support of German rearmaments, and the encouragement of Japanese aggression in the Far East against the Soviet Union, are now followed by the open advance to the full armaments race, as shown in increased armaments expenditure, new enlarged naval demands for the Naval Conference next year, and the new air-building programme for 42 additional squadrons.

Not only in Britain but in the Empire the National Government's war preparations directed against the Soviet Union are going forward, as for example the rapid mechanisation of the Indian Army, the development of the air bases in Irak, the survey of the Soviet frontiers under the guise of scientific expeditions.

In internal policy the increasing drive towards preparatory measures of a fascist type against the workers is seen in the UNEMPLOYMENT ACT and POLICE ACT already carried, in the SEDITION BILL, in the new legislation under preparation for the police control of meetings, in the numerous prosecutions of militants, as well as in the direct assistance and protection given in practice to the open fascist movement of Mosley.

At the same time the National Government presses forward its economic policy of tightening of the grip of monopolist capital under direct State leadership in all branches of economy, by promoting the formation of State-aided cartels and price-fixing combines, by subsidies to industry, and by quota systems and artificial price-raising in agriculture for the benefit of the landlords and big farmers. All these policies are directed to increase the domination and profits of the ruling bourgeoisie at the expense of the workers and petty bourgeoisie. These economic policies are at the same time closely linked with the advance to fascism and the strategic preparations for war.

The War Danger.

The urgency of the war danger is now visible to all. The growing boom in the war industries, the continual rise in the price of armaments shares, the new plans for a bigger Air Force and Navy, the speeches of Cabinet Ministers emphasising the necessity for extending the armed forces, are all unmistakable signs of the direction of policy. No less unmistakable are the similar signs from all the imperialist countries and the ever more active secret diplomacy and spinning of alliances.

The only obstacles which still hold back the imperialists from immediately plunging into war as the solution of the crisis are: the extreme uncertainty and fluctuation of existing imperialist alliances and combinations; the fear of the working-class revolution and rising mass opposition to war and the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union, in close alliance with the growing opposition to war of the masses of the population in all the imperialist countries, has proved itself one of the major factors in hindering and delaying the advance to imperialist war. The Soviet Union, by its disarmament proposals and non-aggression pacts, has succeeded to win the support and sympathy of wide strata of the population in all imperialist countries, including the border countries which imperialism desires to use for the attack on the Soviet Union. Further, the success of the recent diplomacy of the Soviet Union, in utilising the contradictions among the Imperialist Powers to break up the war designs and attempted common war front against the Soviet Union, in utilising the question of Soviet membership of the League of Nations as an instrument further to hinder the war designs and promote its peace policy, and in putting forward the project of an Eastern Pact of mutual guarantee against aggression, has served to lay bare the open war designs of those Powers unwilling to accept the Soviet peace policy, to throw embarrassment and confusion into the war designs of all the imperialist Powers, and to increase the possibilities for the mass of the population in all the imperialist countries to develop their pressure and action against war.

On the other hand, the growing intensity of the contradictions arising from the crisis, the desperate problems of the internal situation in Germany, Japan and Central Europe, the sharpening conflict between Britain and the United States of America, lends to the possibility of the sudden outbreak of large scale war at any moment, and at any point of the world situation.

At this moment of close war danger, the leaders of the LABOUR PARTY and of the TRADES UNION CONGRESS have come forward with a NEW PROGRAMME, which is nothing other than a programme of open

preparation of imperialist war. This programme explicitly repudiates the previous unanimously adopted decisions to resist all imperialist war with the whole force of the Labour Movement, including by general strike action, and calls instead for support of war by British imperialism, if it is carried out against an "aggressor" country in accordance with the rulings of the imperialist diplomatic machinery of the League of Nations. This line is the line of open Jingoism already before the outbreak of war, and has received the universal applause of the bourgeois press.

Against this line of betrayal, and for its defeat, the entire force of the working-class movement must be mobilised, and the strongest opposition fight must be conducted at the forthcoming Weymouth Trades Union Congress and Southport Labour Party Conference.

The building up of a powerful mass REVOLUTIONARY ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT is the only way to defeat the war-plans of imperialism. But this task is linked up with the fight against fascism and the building up of a mass united front against the closely interlocked menace of fascism and war.

The Menace of Fascism in Britain.

Since the events at Olympia the whole working-class movement, as well as wide strata of the petty bourgeoisie, have awakened to the menace of fascism in Britain, of which in the initial stages only the Communist Party gave warning.

There is still, however, widespread confusion on the issue of fascism in Britain. On the one hand there is a tendency to see the issue of fascism as only the issue of Mosley and the Blackshirts, and not to see the main weight of the fascist offensive which is being directly conducted by the National Government.

On the other hand, there is the tendency to emphasise solely the fascist offensive of the National Government, and to treat the Blackshirt Movement as a politically negligible factor. Both tendencies are incorrect. Finance-capital at present backs the National Government as its main weapon for fascisation, like Bruening in Germany; but at the same time gives Mosley lavish support, and utilises his gangs as a subsidiary weapon, which will be rapidly brought to the front, in proportion, as the National Government proves insufficient and if the workers' upward movement continues. The NATIONAL GOVERNMENT OFFENSIVE and the MOSLEY OFFENSIVE supplement each other; the Blackshirts can only operate under the protection of the police, but at the same time can be used, and subsequently disavowed, where it would be inconvenient to use the police. It is essential to make clear to the workers this twofold character of the fascist offensive, at once through the official State machine and through

the open fascist forces, the effective division of labour and interplay of both. The understanding of this necessarily destroys the "democratic" illusion, the illusion of the possibility of legal bourgeois-democratic opposition to fascism.

There is, further, still confusion in many quarters on the role of SOCIAL-FASCISM. It is not yet sufficiently understood that the reformist Labour leaders, who verbally denounce fascism, do not merely fail to organise any opposition to fascism, but in practice directly assist the advance of fascism. Not only that, but the whole present positive policy of reformism in practice prepares the way for fascism. The policy of alliance with monopolist capital, the support of new forms of State capitalist organisation (exemplified in the London Passenger Transport Board, proposed Cotton Control Board, etc.) as representing an "advance towards socialism," when in fact these represent the intensified dictatorship of monopolist capital and mass dismissals and worsened conditions for the workers, in ever closer linking up of the Labour Party with official imperialist war policy and the ever closer tying up of the trade unions with the State machine, all help to prepare, ideologically and organisationally, the way for the fascist State, which aims at the suppression of all independent working-class organisations.

At the same time the Labour leaders disrupt the workers' ranks by opposing the united front, by calling for "freedom" for Mosley and opposing counter-demonstrations against him, by co-operating with the National Government in preparing police measures against the workers, by co-operating with monopolist capital in new forms of capitalist organisations at the expense of the workers, by strike breaking and opposing strikes even in principle (Lansbury), by violating trade union democracy, by concentrating their offensive against all militants and Communists, etc. All these are essential elements of the fascist offensive.

Finally, there is still confusion as to the methods of the fight against fascism. It is not yet widely enough realised that the line of passivity, of trust in legal defences, of trust in the capitalist State as preached by the Labour leaders and as was preached by German social-democracy, is fatal and can only lead to the victory of fascism; and that only active mass opposition can defeat fascism, already in the early stages, before it is strong. But it is no less important for it to be understood that this ACTIVE MASS ANTI-FASCIST MOVEMENT must be a political movement, not merely a specialised defence force, but a political mass movement and campaign, exposing the claims of the fascists, enlightening opinion as to their true character, at the same time as resisting and defeating their violence.

The immediate demands and slogans of the fight

against fascism at the present stage must be: Dis-solution of the Blackshirt army! No toleration for Blackshirt hooligan gangs! No extended police powers over meetings and demonstrations! With-draw the Sedition Bill!

The Question of a Third Labour Government.

The increase of Labour votes at recent by-elections shows that considerable sections of the workers who voted for the National Government in 1931 are now returning to support of the Labour Party. This movement is not yet of a sweeping character; it has not yet reached the level of 1929; existing indications point to a balance of forces rather than a clear Labour majority as the most probable result of a general election in the next eighteen months, although new events may change this situation.

The reformist Labour Party and trade union leaders are endeavouring to divert the whole rising movement of the workers into the channels of voting for the Labour Party and looking for the hypothetical return of a Labour parliamentary majority and third Labour government as the solution of all problems. Fantastic hopes and promises of rapid advances to socialism are being built up around this perspective by the Left Labourists, in particular by the leaders of the Socialist League.

The Communist Party warns the workers that this illusion of solving all problems through voting Labour at the next general election and through a third Labour government is the most dangerous illusion confronting the British working class to-day, and the strongest weapon of capitalism against the workers. Despite its working-class membership and support, the official Labour Party is to-day, by its whole policy, programme and leadership, the second party of the capitalists. A future Labour government, whether with or without a Labour majority, will only govern for capitalism against the workers. Henderson and Clynes are no different in essentials from MacDonald and Thomas. A third Labour government will only repeat in new forms the deadly experiences of the first and second on a still more disastrous scale. The illusory hopes raised on this perspective only serve to divert attention from the real struggle against capitalism to-day.

The recent programme statement of the Labour Party, issued under the deceitful title "For Socialism and Peace," lays bare that the programme and policy of capitalism, "Peace, Freedom and Justice," "Equality of Opportunity," "Standards of life and Employment," "A planned National Economy," "Social Provision," "Adjustment of Taxation"—these are the threadbare catchwords of Liberalism which are put forward as "Labour's Aims," to replace the class struggle of the workers for the ending of capitalist class rule, the taking over of the means of

production by the workers and building up of socialism.

Just as the vague and hypocritical promises of the previous programme "Labour and the Nation" preceded the capitalist practice of the second Labour government of MacDonald, so the closely similar vague and hypocritical promises of the present programme "For Socialism and Peace" are calculated to precede the CAPITALIST PRACTICE OF A THIRD LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

There could be no greater danger confronting the working class than to listen to the pleas to "give Labour another chance," etc. The fatal line of trusting to German social-democracy, pursued by the majority of the German workers despite the repeated betrayals, led straight to the victory of fascism in Germany; the same happened in Austria; the workers learnt the error of this path too late, and have now to struggle under heavy and difficult conditions. The same process now threatens in Britain. Already disillusionment, consequent on the second Labour Government, led to the disastrous swing to the National Government at the 1931 elections—the warning signal of the approach of fascism. The far greater disillusionment which would follow on the experience of a third Labour Government would give rise to the most critical danger of a far more widespread swing to open fascism. Against this menace the only safeguard is the present strengthening beforehand of the Communist Party and of the militant mass opposition, the exposure of the social-fascist programme of the Labour Party, and the development of the united front of active struggle against capitalism.

The Workers' Rising Resistance.

The success of the Olympia counter-demonstration, the enforced withdrawal of the charges against Pollitt and Mann, the enforced abandonment of the Black-shirt White City demonstration, the postponement and even hesitation of the Government over the Sedition Bill, all bear witness to the rising wave of resistance of the working class against the offensive of fascism and the National Government. This rising wave of resistance has been directly led by the Communist Party.

Of particular importance at the present time is the RISING WAVE OF STRUGGLE IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD. The rising militancy and outbreak of strikes in all directions bear witness to the development of a new temper, advancing towards the offensive in the working class. The recent Trade Union Conferences, notably of the railwaymen, of the engineers and of the miners, have revealed the same picture. Two million organised workers of all industries are now demanding wage increases. Of particular importance in this developing movement is the fight of the RAILWAYMEN, expressed in the emphatic decisions of the conferences of all three railwaymen's unions

to press forward their wage demands, and leading to the perspective of a strike on the railways in the coming period, and the parallel movement of the engineers. These are the key points of the developing fight on which all militant forces must be concentrated.

But all this advance is being conducted in a fully sectional and sporadic fashion, without common leadership or strategy, without any attempt at leadership by the reformist trade union machine and its General Council.

Unity of forces and a common strategy is essential for victory. This can only be achieved along the path of the UNITED FRONT, and through the activity of the militant trade unionists of the rank and file trade union movements. The development of the RANK AND FILE TRADE UNION MOVEMENTS in every industry is now more than ever important.

This situation makes it absolutely imperative that the Communist Party devotes the greatest possible attention to the effective preparation for economic struggles by careful agitation in the factories, by choosing the correct time for the launching of the struggle, by mobilising all possible working class support for the strikers.

In connection with those industries where wage demands have been presented to the employers, the workers must be won for the policy of insisting that a time limit must be given to the employers to concede the demands of the workers, failing which strike action will be taken.

At the same time the militants must raise with the workers the necessity of demanding that the trade unions now asking for wage increases, be prepared to take action at the same time, thus bringing the maximum pressure on the employers and the Government.

In this question of preparing for economic struggles both in the organised and unorganised industries, special attention should be given to inducing the local trades councils to turn to the factories and to play a greater rôle in the preparation of successful economic struggles.

The strike struggles must be co-ordinated with a powerful movement of the unemployed this winter, aiming at:

1. Forcing the local authorities to undertake a definite and comprehensive plan of work, schemes of social utility at trade union rates and
2. The granting of increased winter relief to all unemployed, and
3. The mobilisation of all employed and unemployed workers against Governments' slave labour camps.

The Burning Need of the United Front.

The real struggle against capitalism to-day, both in the economic and in the political field, against the offensive of fascism and war, requires, not passive hopes in future ecortelal victories, but the mass

united front of all the workers for present struggle.

This is the central question confronting the British working class to-day.

The example of FRANCE has shown that the overwhelming pressure of all militant workers, social-democratic and Communist alike, for the united front can overcome and destroy the resistance of the social-democratic leadership and compel the formation of an all-in united front of action. The example of the French working class is a model to the workers of the world.

The British working class must repeat the glorious example of the French working class. This is the way to fight fascism. This is the way to fight war. Now that German and Austrian social-democracy have passed out of the picture as effective parties, and the German and Austrian social-democratic workers are fighting in a united front with the Communist workers, now that the French Socialist Party has been compelled to enter into a united front with the French Communist Party, the British Labour Party remains as the only leading party of the old Second International which still maintains the old reactionary policy and prevents the united front of the working class. The resistance of the reformist Labour leadership must be and can be overcome by the pressure of the entire working class. The united front must be achieved in Britain. The entire future of the British working-class struggle hangs on this.

The NEW APPEAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY to the Labour Party and to the Trades Union Congress, and to all working-class organisations for the united front against fascism and war, initiates the most important campaign of the present period. All forces must be thrown into this campaign, into tireless all-pervading agitation for this demand, especially to bring mass pressure to bear on the coming annual conferences of the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party, which must be led to victory by the universal pressure of the working class.

The seriousness of the Communist appeal for the united front, the readiness to make every possible concession for the sake of its achievement, the urgency of its need as involving the whole future existence of the working-class movement, the lessons of Germany and Austria, must be made clear to every worker. The achievement of the united front in Britain will open a new era in the international situation and in the international working-class movement.

The Anti-Fascist Front.

The critical character of the present situation, the offensive of fascism and war, requires the formation of an all-embracing mass front of opposition to fascism and war. The aim of the united front

campaign must be, not merely the holding of joint demonstrations and agitation, but the building of a MIGHTY ALL-EMBRACING MASS ORGANISATION capable of fighting the offensive of fascism and war. This mass front against fascism and war must embrace, not only the working-class organisations as the central core, but all unorganised workers, and all elements of the petty bourgeoisie, employees, small traders, technicians, professionals, intellectuals, students and even bourgeoisie liberal elements that are prepared to enter into the common fight against fascism and war under the leadership of the working-class.

The present political situation, the widespread indignation and anger of all strata against the menace of fascism, following the events at Olympia and June 30th, as well as the widespread alarm at the menace of a new war, offers the present moment as the urgent most favourable moment for the formation of such a wide all-embracing mass front. The existing wave of feeling must not be allowed to ebb away, but must be utilised to lead to lasting organisation.

The most favourable form for such organisation at the present moment, taking into consideration existing popular feeling, is a wide ANTI-FASCIST FRONT. The demand for this is now widespread on all sides. The anti-fascist front should be built up at a wide all-embracing ANTI-FASCIST CONGRESS, uniting the political working-class parties, the trade unions, the co-operatives, the unemployed organisations, progressive women's organisations, students' organisations, professional groupings, Jewish anti-Hitler groupings, previous existing anti-fascist and anti-war organisations, progressive anti-fascist organisations, etc. The core of the anti-fascist front should be built up in the localities, in the factories and in the streets.

The task of the anti-fascist front should be to unite and lead the mass struggle against fascism and war, in unity with the already existing INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR, and to develop all appropriate forms of organisation for this struggle.

The Tasks of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party, by its correct warning and leadership on the issues of fascism and war from the outset, and by its active leadership and organisation of the mass struggle at Olympia and elsewhere, as well as in the rising strike movement, has raised its prestige and political influence in the working class, increasing numbers of whom are coming to recognise the correctness of its line. But the growth of its organisation, membership, press and strength in the trade unions does not yet correspond to the growth of its political influence, still less to the rapid advance

(Continued on page 662)

This smaller sheet I found inserted (loose) in the middle of the copy of The Communist International Number 17 that I obtained.

---marty Nov. 2023

FACTS *against* **FASCISM**

- FASCISM. R. P. DUTT. Only Complete Study 5/-
- BLACKSHIRT BRUTALITY. IVOR MONTAGU. Story of Olympia 1d.
- FASCIST WAR ON WOMEN. Facts from Italian Gaols 3d.
- ERNST THAELMANN. What he stands for 1d.
- MURDER IN CAMP HOHENSTEIN. Stories from Germany 1/-
- A SOVIET WRITER LOOKS AT VIENNA. I. EHRENBURG. Epic story of Austrian workers 6d.
- FOUR WEEKS IN THE HANDS OF HITLER HELL HOUNDS. Inside a Nazi Murder Camp 3d.
- CIVIL WAR IN AUSTRIA. The full facts 3d.

WORKERS' BOOKSHOP

16, KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

Wholesale: 38, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1

London Agents

1 Salway Road, Angel Lane,
Stratford, E.15.

157 Seven Sisters Road, Holloway,
N.7.

249 King Street, Hammersmith.

387b High Road, Wood Green, N.22
31 Dudden Hill Lane, Willesden,
N.W.10.

156 Whitechapel Road, E.1.

649 High Road, Tottenham.