

# INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 13 No. 33

28th July 1933

## CONTENTS

<b>Politics</b>		<b>Keller: The Work Provision Plans of the Austrian Trade Unions</b>	733
Tom Bell: The Foreign Policy of the British Labour Party	725	<b>First of August</b>	
J. B.: The Tokyo Negotiations	726	Marcel Cachin: For August 1st of United Front and Action	734
A. G. Bossé: The Morgan Investigation (conclusion)	727	<b>Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union</b>	
<b>Germany</b>		L. F. Boross: The Way of the Soviet Village to Socialism and Prosperity	735
Hitler's Decisive Turn	728	The Greatest Machine Building Works in the World Opened	736
The New Wave of Terror in Germany	729	<b>The White Terror</b>	
Fritz Heckert: "Brothers in Distress"	729	N.: New Terrorist Laws against the Working Population in Latvia	736
<b>Great Britain</b>		<b>Organisational Questions</b>	
J. R. Campbell: New Opportunist Arguments against the Communist International	730	D. P.: After the Congress of the National Unemployed Movement	737
<b>In the Camp of Social Democracy</b>			
J. Berlioz: The Congress of the French Socialist Party	731		
V. Olsen: The Norwegian Labour Party	732		

## Block and Gallows in the "Third Reich"

**Machiavelli:** Only armed prophets are successful.

**An Old Commentator:** The significance must be laid on the word "prophets," men who have grasped the necessities of their age and who go to work to create a new society with fiery enthusiasm must use violence to shorten the birth pangs of the new society, because the representatives of the old order will not voluntarily abandon their positions. On the other hand, that which has already gone rotten cannot be maintained indefinitely even with violence, no matter how many false prophets may declare the contrary. "Only armed prophets are successful," but not armed charlatans.

The bandits in brown uniform and black robes have celebrated the "end" of the National Revolution with orgies of blood. There were never more persons "shot whilst attempting to escape," never more "suicides" in the prison cells, never more death sentences against Communist workers than in the days which followed July 15th. Naturally, the gentlemen in red robes, the judges of the German Supreme Court in Leipzig, could not absent themselves from this Communist hunt, so they refused permission to the foreign lawyers to defend Torgler, Dimitrov, Tanev and Popov, and announced that the trial would begin at the beginning of September, or, in other words, that these completely innocent men would be handed over to the fascist hangman.

The aim of the business was perfectly clear. The bloody spectacle was intended to draw the attention of the petty-bourgeois and proletarian supporters of National Socialism away from the too flagrant treachery that their leaders, Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Frick and whatever they are called, had committed against them by rejecting with a contemptuous wave of the hand all the social demands of the national socialist programme: the abolition of interest slavery, the creation of peasant settlements, the letting out of the department stores to small traders, the socialisation of the banks and trusts, limitations on profit-making, etc., and by handing over the control of the economic system completely into the hands of the industrialists and the East Elbian Junkers for their untrammelled rule.

But this time the disappointment was too great for the supporters of the Nazis to be content with a "flung-down bone." Dissatisfaction became general, and in the ranks of the Storm and Special Detachments there were even thorough-going rebellions. The Nazi leaders were compelled to act. Hitler delivered his speech: the revolution has now ended. But it has not ended, and in order to deal with it and give Hitler's words force the headsman's block and the gallows are being set up all over Germany and new prisons are being equipped. But these preparations are not exclusively directed against the Communists, against those workers who are not prepared to be slaughtered by the Nazi Storm Detachments without showing fight, who distribute pamph-

lets and leaflets amongst the betrayed population in order to develop a mass oppositional movement against fascism; not only these, but also against the rebel supporters of Hitler and against those who want to form a new party. Gallows and imprisonment are their lot. The mass murders are to be carried out legally; not in excitement; not in struggle, not in the fight, but cold-bloodedly and with forethought. That is what Goering calls showing a firm hand; it is in fact the consolidation of the rule of Stinnes and Gloeckner, of Solmsensen and Stauss, of Oldenburg-Januschau and Oskar Hindenburg.

The working masses of the whole world have learned with indignation and bitterness of these new bestialities of the Nazi leaders, bestialities which put everything done previously into the shade. The working masses know well that the Nazi leaders are thoroughly capable of putting these and any other atrocities into execution and increasing the ranks of the murdered victims of fascism from hundreds to thousands. As far as the victims of this new reign of terror are concerned there is no room for optimism. But the Nazi leaders themselves also have no reason to be optimistic. Quite apart from the fact that such mass slaughter will cry for immediate vengeance—that is to say, it will not be allowed to pass with impunity—the fascists will not and cannot achieve their aim, the holding down of mass discontent with terror. Even further, it can be said that they will not even be able to carry out the terror on this mass scale.

In order to carry out this mass terror the Nazis must have tens of thousands, millions of helpers, who help them to carry out their measures. There has been no mass movement which has cultivated the idea of bloody terror and the use of violence like the National Socialist movement. Blood-thirstiness was raised to the level of a dogma. There would therefore be sufficient Nazis prepared to do the work. When we regard the matter purely pathologically we must come to this conclusion, but the situation becomes different immediately we regard the social basis of the Nazi theory of violence. How was it that the phrase: "Put them against the Wall!" could be so popular with great masses of the people? Only because embittered, hungry and betrayed men were compelled to look on whilst profiteers and speculators enriched themselves at the cost of their neighbours. There were no means of legal redress against such blackguards; even if they were brought before the courts and charged, they were able by means of unending legal tricks to drag out the proceedings indefinitely and cost the general public enormous sums for costs; for instance, the Sklarek process. "Put them Against the Wall!" Such vile criminals deserve no other fate. But that was not all the masses wanted; they did not want to shoot merely for the sake of shooting; they envisaged a new society cleaned once and for all of such parasitic types, a society in which every honest man would be able to earn a decent living. In other words, for the masses, violence, terror, bloodshed, were nothing but a means to an end, an accelerated means to a higher end. However, the deep hatred of the Nazis for the Communists has also its social basis. They felt that the constant cry of the Communists who declared that Hitler was betraying the masses, and doing the work of the capitalists and junkers, was a deep insult to them; they regarded the Communists and the Communist successes as nothing but a lengthening of their own period of sufferings, because the Communists were responsible for the fact that Hitler was still unable to "clear up thoroughly." For Hitler's supporters the threat of violence was not the be all and end all of their wishes; their idea was that Hitler, once in power, would save them and put things right.

But why should the millions who supported Hitler, the millions of petty-bourgeois and proletarian elements, now oppose the Communists and use violence against them now that Hitler has so obviously betrayed the high hopes set in him? The Communists were obviously right in all they said. Hitler has seized power in order to prevent the overthrow of the capitalist and junker rule. The old system beat the masses of the workers, peasants and petty-bourgeois with whips, but Hitler is now beating them with scorpions. And now the masses who supported the Nazis are to turn on the Communists, to denounce them, to terrorise them? Unemployed national socialists whose eyes have been opened are now being treated like Communists, murdered and imprisoned. Are they not companions in misfortune who

must stand together? A fierce hatred of the profiteers, the speculators, and other capitalist riff-raff has been engendered in the rank and file of the Nazi supporters. "Put them against the Wall!" was their slogan. And what is the situation to-day? Everywhere the masses can observe that new scoundrels have taken the place of the old; that a tremendous horde of job-hunters and money-grabbers much worse than their predecessors are now seizing all jobs; they are job-hunters in a hurry to enrich themselves as quickly as possible because they are themselves not quite sure about the permanence of their stay. When the Nazi rank and file observe these satisfied locusts they must involuntarily think of their old slogan: "Put them against the Wall!" The murderers of Erzberger and Rathenau are being glorified, but does not this encourage the disappointed to pay off their score in blood? Violence loses its omnipotence when it loses its social basis, or it turns itself against those who continue to use it in their own interests in defiance of the changed circumstances.

The Nazi leaders are prepared to see one side of the matter only. They were able to utilise excellently the consequences of the general crisis of capitalism and the consequences of the world crisis for their ends. They have tremendous power because they promised to abolish these consequences, but if they were really serious in their desire to abolish the consequences they would have to abolish the cause; or, in other words, capitalism. However, they see their whole justification in their attempts to maintain the source of the whole evil, capitalism. Naturally, the consequences will go on as long as the cause exists, and they will be followed continuously by the desire and the effort to abolish them. But, blind to the change which has taken place in the situation in the meantime, the Nazi leaders are using the power they have obtained in order to crush this desire and effort. But the millions who supported the national socialists cannot lend themselves to this. On the contrary, the disappointed millions will turn into bitter enemies of the national socialists, and the wonder that a demagogic party in "opposition" to capitalism can gather millions around its banner will turn into the exact opposite; it will be just the weakness of the national socialists who have abandoned their "opposition" to capitalism and left their followers utterly in the lurch.

Now that they have been compelled to abandon their social demagogy piece by piece, the national socialists will now play on their nationalistic demagogy all the more. But a burned child avoids the fire and people who have been deceived grow wary. The supporters of the Nazis will realise that no previous government has made the Versailles powers so many concessions as the Hitler government, and the more the internal situation sharpens, the greater concessions Hitler will be compelled to make. So that even on the field of nationalism the Hitlerites will disappoint their followers and meet with powerful opposition. And should the Hitler government try to save its face by foreign political adventures, then that will be once and for all the end of it.

A careful and exhaustive consideration of the situation shows us therefore that the barbarous brutalities of Goering cannot lead to the desired success. However, as has already been said, this does not mean that he will not slaughter thousands of revolutionary workers first. The Communist Party of Germany will not permit itself to be intimidated by Goering; it will work with the utmost care, but also with the utmost determination to develop the already existing oppositional movement into a powerful mass movement in order that millions of toilers can stay the arm of the fascist hangman.

The international proletariat must also come to the assistance of the German working class. The events in Germany offer the basis for a tremendous anti-fascist movement not only amongst the workers, but also amongst the petty-bourgeoisie and the peasants. The disappointment with the national socialists is general. Even Hitler and Goering would be compelled to give heed to such a mass movement. And if the international working class can launch such a mass movement it will be easy for it to hold all the leaders of the Nazi regime in Germany personally responsible for the bloodshed, just as the latter hold the relatives of their opponents, the wives and children, responsible.

The international working class must do this, not in order to increase the bloodshed, but to prevent it.

## Politics

### The Foreign Policy of the British Labour Party

By Tom Bell (London)

The collapse of the World Economic Conference, and the new currency conflict marks another stage towards imperialist war. All the capitalist governments are feverishly hastening their preparations. In Great Britain and throughout the British Empire no attempt is now made to conceal the growth of armaments. Everywhere, and on all fronts, the greatest activity prevails. In the Army, the Navy, the Air Force; recruiting and training of territorials, military displays and pageantry; increased activity in all auxiliary forces, women, youth and children—all the resources of imperialism are being exerted without stint of energy or expenditure.

These circumstances lend a special significance to a statement just published by the British Labour Party on "Labour's Foreign Policy." The "Daily Herald" describes it as "Mr. Henderson's Peace Plan," and in a special leader speaks of it as "a State paper" of the highest importance, since it lays down the general lines upon which the "next government" of this country will conduct its foreign policy.

The manufactured optimism and inflated cheerfulness with which the Labour leaders and writers speak of "the next government" is touching. But what if there should be no next Labour government? That question doesn't appear to enter into their discussions of the future. Yet, if we are to take stock of world realities, this question is worth consideration, especially by those honest workers who still pin their faith to Labour and social democracy.

It is not enough to point to Labour's six million votes. The German social democrats had many more millions of voters (the Communist Party of Germany had nearly six million votes). To-day there is no question of a next socialist government in Germany. So long as the social democrats were necessary to maintain capitalism and foster illusions amongst its millions of followers regarding the parliamentary democracy as a means of solving the problems of labour, they were encouraged and tolerated as a kind of necessary evil.

But in this period of decaying capitalism—caught in the grip of permanent economic crisis, with its death struggle to maintain its very existence before the menace of proletarian revolution—capitalism has other means at its disposal. Fascism is not an accidental phenomenon. It is the capitalist method of solving its crisis in a period when it is faced with the question: "Either open dictatorship or proletarian revolution." And Great Britain, with all its traditions of "parliament" and "democracy" will prove no exception to the rule.

The British bourgeoisie already have all the means at their disposal to introduce fascism. Their professional military clique is a caste in itself. The police system is being reorganised on the basis of the graduates of the universities who are faced with the problem of what to do with the sons of the bourgeoisie. The bureaucracy within the State apparatus is increasing.

There is another aspect of this "next Labour government" fetish, and that is the circumstances of 1932-33 compared with 1924 and 1929. The first Labour government came in on the tide of decades of labour and socialist propaganda, and the post-war crisis of capitalism in Europe. Its "sane," capitalist policy of "continuity" was screened by the claim: "It was only a minority government." 1929 revealed the complete abandonment of socialist policy and the full-blooded capitalist character of the Labour Party.

Since 1929 the working class, in the teeth of sabotage and resistance from the Labour and Trade Union bureaucracy, have fought back heroically the increased attacks upon their standards. Millions of workers to-day are no longer under any illusions as to the Labour Party's capitalist policy. Moreover, the capitalist crisis is so acute, the economic resources are so strained, the ties of Empire, particularly of India, so attenuated, that only the firm and open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie provides for the ruling class sufficient guarantees for its own safety.

What is there then in "Labour's Foreign Policy" likely to rouse enthusiasm amongst those workers who still follow the

Labour Party, and, particularly, its six million voters? Henderson declares as the fundamental conception of its policy "the establishment of international institutions, the strengthening of international law, the practice of international co-operation and freedom for the peaceful development of every nation."

Immediately on reading this paragraph one's mind leaps to the Dawes Plan, with its enormous burden of reparations passed on to the backs of the German working class. The Dawes Plan succeeded by the Young Plan, and the Hague Conference, when the "iron chancellor" Snowden secured another two and a half million pounds on the British allocation, showed how Labour carried out its international co-operation. By the "persistence and grit" of Snowden, the Labour Under-Secretary for War, Earl de la Warr, was able to say: "England counts in the Council of Europe." . . . "We are once again a nation."

Again, one remembers the arrogant attitude of Henderson towards the U.S.S.R., which he was compelled to abandon only with the storm of protest from the working class. "Freedom for the peaceful development of every nation," that means freedom for Hitler to carry through his policy of murder and imprisonment of socialist, trade union and Communist workers. That means freedom for Pilsudsky, Mussolini, the Japanese cut-throats in Manchuria and the white terror governments of the Balkans and elsewhere to carry on their bloodthirsty policy of extermination of the Marxian and proletarian socialist movement. Intelligent workers will not fail to draw their conclusions.

"The Party has never wavered in its loyalty to the policy of the League of Nations." Quite! If "Labour's Foreign Policy" is the recognition of the Versailles Treaty, with its redistributed territory and property; the co-operation with the robber governments of Europe, there could be no better instrument for such co-operation than the League.

But when one recalls the many little "incidents" since the League was established—Corfu, theft of Vilna, wars in Morocco, Syria, South American States, Palestine, India, Nigeria, and remembers that the League, far from protesting, actually screened such things—it will be seen that there will be no difference between Henderson at the Councils of the League and Sir John Simon.

On the question of armaments Henderson declares the next government will work for a "drastic reduction of national armaments by international agreement." It is hard to believe such an astute party manager could commit his party to such a banal objective. For nearly two years now we have had a disarmament conference. This conference is compelled to adjourn to save its face. What has been the crux of its dilemma? Why, the very fact that no international agreement was possible. And this for the simple reason, each imperialist group dares not relax its armament activity lest its rival gains an advantage. Moreover, the longer the discussions go on, each takes advantage of the breathing spell to perfect its murder machinery. The sharper grows the crisis the keener grows the military preparations.

No one is in a better position to know all this than Henderson. He has been chairman of the disarmament conference throughout its proceedings. He has held council with all the governments of the world. He has met and seen the "experts" at their work. As a peripatetic diplomat he has been fluttering from London to Paris, from Berlin to Rome, and back to Geneva in a futile effort to prove his policy of "international co-operation."

In the meantime the governments make no pretence of concealing their war preparations. Armaments of all kinds are on the increase. Against these feverish preparations for war, millions of workers are coming together in a real international of co-operation to fight it and resist it. This is the **International Anti-War Committee**, founded in Amsterdam last August.

It is only a week or two ago since the Labour Party and the General Council of the T.U.C., which takes its politics from the Labour Party, black-listed the Anti-War Committee as a Communist organisation and warned the Labour supporters against it.

The publication of "Labour's Foreign Policy" at this moment is opportune. It means that Henderson is preparing for a new treachery in the coming war. Nothing is clearer than the declaration that "the government . . . should never mobilise its armed forces, or take any war-like action of any kind except for the purpose of repelling actual aggression." This is our old friend "National Defence," to aid which Henderson, Clynes, Barnes, and the rest of the Labour leaders became recruiting sergeants during the last war. For where and when does actual aggression begin?

and who is to determine who is the aggressor? These questions are only answered by the barking of guns.

The publication of "Labour's Foreign Policy" is opportune, for it will not fail to open the eyes of tens of thousands of workers who support the Labour Party. It will lead them to ask if there is no other policy to which they can turn for a way out of the crisis of capitalism. They will be driven to see that there is another policy: the revolutionary policy of the Communist International.

As part of that policy they will turn to the great United Front Anti War Movement. For here are being marshalled into a mighty force against imperialist war millions of workers disillusioned with Labour treachery and its capitalist diplomacy, determined to resist the imperialists who are preparing a new world war.

## The Tokyo Negotiations

By J. B. (Moscow)

In spite of the absurdity of the exceedingly low sum (50 million Yen) proposed by the Manchurian delegation at the Conference in Tokyo as the purchase-price of the Chinese Eastern Railway, and in spite of the untenability of the arguments with which they vainly endeavour to dispute the perfectly clear and undeniable statements contained in the Soviet Memorandum, it is necessary to examine these arguments and to show, on the basis of facts and documents, that they do not accord with reality.

It is not worth wasting time on a continuation of the discussion raised by the Manchurian delegation on the ownership rights of the Soviet Union in the Chinese Eastern Railway. The Soviet delegation have in their declarations already brought forward exhaustive proof of the complete juridical and actual untenability of the arguments employed by the Manchurian delegation in defence of the attempt to question the Soviet Union's ownership rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway. It is sufficient here merely to call to mind the statements of one of the most prominent Japanese politicians, Matsudari, the present Japanese Ambassador in London, who not so long ago was at the head of the Japanese delegation of the League of Nations, at the Washington Conference in 1922.

This authoritative representative of Japan plainly and emphatically declared to the Chinese delegate at the Washington Conference that there could be no talk of the railway not being Russian property. This categorical declaration by Matsudari is a complete refutation of the vague assertions of the Manchurian delegation.

The question of the ownership rights of the Soviet Union in the Chinese Eastern Railway is absolutely indisputable, and a discussion of this question only impedes the progress of negotiations in Tokyo.

The Manchurian delegation questions the sum mentioned in the memorandum of the Soviet delegation representing the amount expended on the construction of the Chinese Eastern Railway, namely, 411,019,089.07 gold roubles, by asserting that the sum expended on the construction of the Chinese Eastern Railway amounted to only 226,908,508.05 roubles.

Whilst the sum named by the Soviet delegation as representing the expenditure on the construction of the Chinese Eastern Railway is shown by documents to be absolutely correct and is cited in the official calculations and the balance-sheet of the railway, the Manchurian delegation do not bring forward anything in substantiation of their figures; the Soviet delegation is perfectly right when it demands documents in support of these figures.

The same thing applies also to the calculation of the value of the affiliated undertakings, which are estimated by the Soviet delegation at 40 million gold roubles and by the Manchurian delegation at 9 million Yen.

In their efforts to reduce the purchase price of the Chinese Eastern Railway, the Manchurian delegation have gone so far as to maintain that the whole of the property belonging to the railway, amounting in value to many millions, which at various times was forcibly seized by the old Mukden authorities, must not be included in the purchase. This property includes the land belonging to the railway, the steamboats, and the telephone station in Harbin. The Soviet delegation proved on the basis of documents the legal ownership by the Chinese Eastern Railway of 115,000 hectares of land, the value of which is estimated at about 200,000 gold roubles, which was confiscated by the local Chinese authorities in the year

1923, and against which confiscation the Soviet Government categorically protested.

By similar unlawful actions the fleet of the Chinese Eastern Railway was seized by Chang-Tso-lin in 1926.

In spite of the indisputable correctness of the schedule setting forth the particulars of this property belonging to the Chinese Eastern Railway, the Manchurian delegation are endeavouring to justify the predatory actions of the former Chinese authorities and at the same time consider the Manchukuo government as the legal successor to this property which has been stolen from the Chinese Eastern Railway.

The Manchurian delegation, in their endeavours to justify these predatory actions of the old Manchurian authorities, point to the example of the nationalisation of the Egersched dock, at Vladivostok, which was used by the Chinese Eastern Railway, by the Soviet government. As a matter of fact, Egersched was the property of the Soviet Union, and was only temporarily used by the Chinese Eastern Railway and was handed back to the lawful owner.

In order to prove the low value of the railway, the Manchurian delegation made numerous statements regarding the decline of the economic importance of the railway, mainly as a result of the contemplated construction of new railways in Manchuria, while at the same time they question the data cited by the Soviet delegation regarding the big yield of the Chinese Eastern Railway and declare that the figures quoted are exaggerated.

According to the official data and calculations of the Chinese Eastern Railway covering a period of seven years, i.e., from 1924 to 1930, which were submitted by the Soviet delegation to the conference, the revenue of the railway exceeded the running expenses by 143,440,526 gold roubles, which means an average of 20 million gold roubles a year. Even in the year 1932 the Chinese Eastern Railway achieved a surplus of revenue over expenditure amounting to 11 million gold roubles.

According to the opinion of the Manchurian delegation, the railway must grant credits to the troops guarding the railway as well as to the Chinese government institutions, maintain the police, convey military passengers and goods free, render innumerable and costly services to the troops and place money at their disposal.

The cost of granting credits to the troops guarding the railway amounted up to January 1, 1932, to 40,646,000.69 roubles, whilst the total indebtedness of the Chinese, and now the Manchurian, government to the Chinese Eastern Railway amounts to 53,885,682.25 gold roubles. It is perfectly obvious that no commercial undertaking could assume such heavy liabilities.

There exist no agreements or treaties under which the Chinese Eastern Railway is pledged to such expenditure, on the contrary, such an assumption is directly contrary to the agreements of Peking and Mukden. Therefore, to point to the low yielding capacity of the Chinese Eastern Railway now, when the lion's share of its income is swallowed up by expenditure which has no relation to the undertaking and the commercial activity of the railway, means to deceive oneself.

All the references by the Manchurian delegation to the railway being worn out, to its weak economic position, to the unprofitability of its subsidiary undertakings, to the possibility of a new railway being constructed more cheaply, etc., are completely refuted by the statements regarding the actual state of affairs. The Chinese Eastern Railway is far more firmly and substantially built than any of the existing railways or any of the railways being constructed in Manchuria. It can, without any difficulty, increase its traffic to 19 trains per day, in both directions. Thanks to the constant expenditure on improving and modernising the railway, its tracks and rolling stock are in such good condition that the average speed of the slow trains is 40 miles an hour, whilst the "new" railways, such as the Chuchai Railway, the Supingai Taonan Railway and others, which are so highly praised by the Manchurian delegation, do not attain a speed of more than 12 to 20 kilometres an hour.

Such are the irrefutable facts brought forward by the Soviet delegation.

## Election Success of Communists in Iceland

Oslo, July 24.

A report received here states that at the re-election to the Allting (parliament) on July 18th the Communists have gained votes while the Social Democrats have lost. The Right Independence Party has won two seats from the governing Progressive Party, one of these seats being that of the minister of agriculture.

## The Morgan Investigations

(Conclusion)

By A. G. Bosse (New York)

The "Daily Worker" carried a chart showing corporations in the Morgan-Bonbright-First National Bank group, which usually works together. It listed 50 non-financial corporations with assets of over 100,000,000 dollars each, 11 of them with over 1,000,000,000 dollars each. Their combined assets total over 50,000,000,000 dollars. These are included because they link up with this Morgan group by cross directorships, by keeping large deposits with Morgan, by having him float their security issues, or because their executives are on Morgan's preferred lists. This is, of course, an arbitrary selection, excluding, as it does, financial companies and a great many others known to be Morgan companies (United Corporation Standard Brands, Alleghany Corporation, Johns-Manesville and others, the stocks of which were distributed through the preferred lists). (These corporations have a sixth of the total corporate wealth of the country, with a powerful influence in other companies with assets of another 50,000,000,000 dollars.) The group includes 6 Mellon coal, oil, steel and aluminium companies 22 Rockefeller oil companies, a number of Dupont companies, 27 railroads, 27 public utilities and communications companies, 10 copper companies, 2 steel (U.S. Steel and Bethlehem), 4 rubber, 4 coal, 6 oil, 2 food companies, and Cosach, Cuba Co., Mexican National Railways, Shell Union Oil, etc.

Other connections of the Morgan empire are shown by the following facts: Morgan gives 32 other stock exchange companies business. Twenty-five leading bankers still have unpaid loans with his company. Sixty-three bank executives, mostly of banks he controls, borrowed from him. Mitchell, ex-president of the National City Bank, still owes Morgan 6,000,000 dollars of a 10,000,000 dollars loan, and the bank's collateral is now insufficient. This gave Morgan greatly increased influence in the N.C.B. Morgan loaned money to Richard Whitney (head of the N.Y. Stock Exchange and brother of a Morgan partner), and gave his firm much business. In return for this the Morgan firm was not required to file with the Exchange a statement of its condition, as are other members. Whitney was also on Morgan's preferred lists.

Twenty-seven of the largest public banks carry Morgan deposits while a great number of corporations carry accounts in Morgan banks. Among the latter is Rockefeller's Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. Together with Rockefeller Morgan controls, in New York City, for example, the subways, gas and electric companies, and much of the bus, street car, and taxi systems. If we take 8 New York banks, of which 6 are Morgan-controlled, we find that they continued their dividends in 1933 at the 1929 rate, and some even increased their profits. By cutting wages and salaries, reducing other expenses, and using their preferred position, they were able to increase profits. In 1932 Morgan claimed a loss of 25,000,000 dollars and therefore refused to pay any income tax, this being one reason for the investigation. Yet while the hearings were in process Roosevelt cut the pay of postal workers millions of dollars—to make up for Morgan's cheating.

Morgan's is not an ordinary partnership. He fought like the devil to prevent publication of the firm's partnership agreement, but much of it was finally made public. It showed that some of the "partners" were simply salaried employees, getting a salary of 100,000 dollars, with a certain interest in the profits. Morgan's word is final in all matters, he may discharge any partner and fix the amount due him. Half the profits are divided, but Morgan decides the disposition of the other 50 per cent. He may dissolve the firm at any time if partners representing the majority interest so decide; while it was not disclosed what interest he and his sons have, it is probably the majority.

Yet this financial giant, Mr. J. P. Morgan, presented a sorry spectacle at the investigation. He couldn't remember the names of his partners and the addresses of his branches. He lied and contradicted himself repeatedly, and was continually turning to his partners and lawyers for advice. Even a sports writer for the Hearst press could characterise him as "helpless," "all damp with perspiration," "the great Morgan frankly admits that he does not know a whole lot about the details of his business.

S. Parker Gilbert, reparations expert, was made a Morgan partner of January 2, 1931, two days after the close of the taxable year, in order to permit a revaluation of their assets on a cost basis and show a loss of 21,000,000 dollars for the two days. Such manipu-

lation of revaluation occurs when a new partner enters or leaves the firm.) This "loss" was charged against profits for the next year and no income tax paid. In 1930 and 1931 Morgan profits on selling securities and underwritings totalled 10,000,000 dollars (more than in 1929, when they paid 11,000,000 dollars income tax, plus hundreds of millions on other business. Yet for these two years they paid only 48,000 dollars in income taxes, and the government accepted the returns "without explanation." The law, made by Wall Street lawyers and enacted by its politicians, conveniently allows deductions of capital losses from profits. In England this is not the case and there Morgan paid taxes each year.

The Morgan partners resorted to every possible subterfuge to avoid paying taxes to their government, while so nobly urging workers to contribute 25 cents weekly for unemployment relief. Two partners "sold" their stock to their wives and a third to minor children to create losses and avoid payment. They sold short, created fake trust accounts, etc.

At the end of 1930 the Morgan firm was worth 704,000,000 dollars, and two years later claimed assets of 338,000,000 dollars in cash plus 240,000,000 dollars in government securities. (They very literally owned part of the government.) Incidentally it might be mentioned that there is now outstanding 32,000,000,000 dollars in tax-exempt government securities, practically all of it in the hands of the wealthy. It was proposed in Congress to tax this enormous riches, upon which the government pays annually nearly 700,000,000 dollars in interest. This proposal was quickly scotched, however, and, instead, the tax on small incomes and on the consumption goods of the masses raised. The budget deficits created by the refusal of the rich to pay taxes and by the enormous expenditures on war preparations are being made up out of the hides of federal employees, war veterans, the unemployed, etc. The R.F.C. has given the great railroads and banks "loans" of over 2,500,000,000 dollars, but has given the states for relief purposes less than an eighth of this sum. Income tax refunds continue to be made to the great corporations, the total during the past years amounting to 4,047,000,000 dollars. Morgan's U.S. Steel Corporation alone has received 120,000,000 dollars in refunds.

The money sharks continued to make profits even during the worst days of the crisis, and at a moment when they were "sacrificing" themselves for the common weal. Morgan, Rockefeller, etc., organised a pool to save the market on October 24, 1929, buying 138,000,000 dollars worth of stocks. It so happened that most of the stocks they supported were of Morgan companies and those controlled by the other members of the pool. With stocks going steadily down the pool still made a profit of over a million dollars before ceasing operations. The investigation brought out that Morgan was careful to liquidate his holdings of common stocks before the crash. At the end of 1928 his firm had 68,500,000 dollars of such stocks, but one year later only 7,000,000 dollars worth. His gang boosted stock prices, especially those of the holding companies he organised (three were started at the peak of the boom), and when they collapsed the small investors were left with their pieces of paper and the financiers with the money.

In closing let us take a look at the Sir Galahad of this filthy crew, Roosevelt. A millionaire, previously bond peddler and salesman of German marks, he thundered nobly in his inaugural address against the money-changers, threatening to drive them out of the temple. But when the scandals of the investigation broke, Roosevelt became as silent as a dummy. His son, however, spoke what he could not say: "It isn't Morgan who is to blame. It is the laws that are to blame." Chicago's Wall Street reported that if an uncensored "preferred" list of Kuhn-Loeb were made public Roosevelt's name would be found upon it.

With Morgan controlling directly about half the public utilities of the country, and indirectly a great part of the remainder, Roosevelt obligingly continued the 3 per cent. tax on electricity. He put through the banking measures Wall Street desires, under cover of the banking moratorium, wiping out a vast number of small competing banks and consolidating financial power still more firmly in the hands of the financial oligarchy. Since Morgan is a large owner of railroads, Roosevelt had Congress pass a new railroad law, cancelling 300,000 dollars of their indebtedness to the government, and even turning over to them 10,000,000 dollars in the government's vaults. Of the three and a third billion dollars voted under the so-called Industrial Recovery Act, the bulk of what has so far been spent has gone for war purposes, largely to the navy. Morgan's steel and armament companies get these bounties.

## Germany

# Hitler's Decisive Turn

The German capitalist class is joyfully proclaiming that Hitler has now at last made a "decisive turn." "The German revolution is concluded." The German bourgeoisie was haunted by the fear of the anti-capitalist tendencies among the masses of Hitler's supporters, and that these strong anti-capitalist forces, nourished daily by the unbounded demagoguery of the Nazi leaders, might finally get beyond the control of Hitler, Göring and Göbbels and lead to a real attack against the foundation of German capitalism.

It is perfectly obvious that had it been at all possible, the Nazi leaders would like to have postponed this open turn to a policy of capitalist consolidation. They were no longer able to do this. The development of events—the development which rendered the situation of capitalist economy in Germany dangerously acute—compelled them to act quickly. For weeks a fierce struggle went on behind the scenes among the chief leaders of the national socialist party. Right up to the last few days the wing which has gathered round Göbbels advocated the continuation of the revolution, the "second revolution," the "revolution which knows no compromise." At the same time, however, there were such open declarations as that made by Dr. Ley in the "Völkische Beobachter" of June 10:—

"The leadership in the factory. Therefore the building up of the corporative State will, as a first thing, restore to the natural leader of an enterprise, i.e., to the employer, the complete management and thereby also the responsibility. The factory council of a works consists of workers, employees and employers. Nevertheless, it has only an advisory vote. The decision rests with the employer alone."

This standpoint was perfectly clear: the employer is to be again master in his house. This was an absolutely plain capitalist characterisation of Hitler's policy.

Hugenberg's resignation accelerated the decision. The new Minister for Economy, Schmitt, of the "Allianz" Insurance Company, and one of the leaders of German finance-capital, took office only on condition that a plain capitalist policy should be laid down. The circle connected with the national socialist "Reichs Commissioner of Economy," Dr. Wagener, who intrigued against Schmitt, has been destroyed by the arrest of four of his collaborators, who have been interned in a concentration camp. Wagener himself was arrested for a short time, but was released and only deprived of his offices. Hitler himself sharply opposed the "purely formal decisions," the "Economic Commission's organisations, constructions and theories" of Wagener and his circle, and the Nazi papers learned to reject to-day as nonsense that which they yesterday represented as the highest national-socialistic wisdom. This disavowal of Wagener naturally means the surrender of an essential part of Hitler's programme. But Hitler simply passed over this fact with a wave of the hand, as it were, by declaring that the ideas of his programme do not bind them to act like fools, thereby excellently characterising his whole programme.

The essential meaning of Hitler's speeches in Reichenhall (to the leaders of the Storm Troops, the Special Detachments and the Stahlhelm) and to the "Reichs-Stadtholders" in Berlin, has been bluntly interpreted by his bureaucrat Frick:—

"In his recent speeches to the Storm Troops and Reichs-Stadtholders, the Reichs Chancellor plainly declared that the German revolution is completed."

Anybody who now talks "of a continuation of the revolution or of a second revolution," "opposes the leaders," or is guilty of sabotage, must be severely dealt with and "at least placed under preventative arrest." The Prussian Minister for Justice, Kerl, promptly issued a decree in which he demanded that class justice should impose the most drastic punishment in the case of any form of sabotage. The decree states that:

"anybody who acts against the orders of the national government, or calls upon others to oppose government orders, must expect severe fines and imprisonment and, under circumstances specified in the Decree for the Defence of the People and the State, will be liable to the death penalty or imprisonment with hard labour and confiscation of his property."

This gallows-decree is, of course, directed in the first place against the Communists and the revolutionary workers. But at

the same time it aims at stifling the ferment, which has been growing so rapidly in the last few weeks, among the masses of the supporters of Hitler's party.

The millions of supporters and members of the Hitler Party among the working population expected of Hitler that he would fulfil his promises and realise their own anti-capitalist wishes. They attached to the words "German revolution" a meaning corresponding to their own feelings and wishes: emancipation from capitalism and its misery. It is necessary to call to mind the monstrously fraudulent game Hitler and the Nazi leaders have carried on with this word "revolution." It was mentioned a hundred times in every one of their speeches. With this phrase, "German revolution," Hitler and his consorts attempted to deceive the people regarding the counter-revolutionary character of their dictatorship, and unfortunately it is true that they succeeded to a very great extent in this. Now, however, this Babylonian Tower of fraud and deceit is collapsing.

Ever since April the ferment among the working masses of the Hitler party has increased; at first slowly, and then with ever-growing rapidity. The Nazi bureaucrats sought to counteract this ferment by saying: "Wait a bit until Hugenberg has been thrown overboard; then the second revolution, the real revolution against capitalism will begin." But Hugenberg has now been thrown out of the government, and at the same time Hitler declares that the revolution is concluded! Hugenberg's successor at the Ministry for Agriculture, the 'peasant leader,' Darré, who promised that interest on money borrowed by the peasants would be reduced to 2 per cent., who fulminated against Hugenberg's law relating to the agricultural debts because it fixed interest at 4½ per cent., has now declared that Hugenberg's law will be observed! Hugenberg's successor at the Ministry of Economy, Schmitt, welcomed the un-fettering of the initiative of the employers and declared to the capitalists: "Now you can again work in safety." The new Secretary of State at the Ministry of Economy, Herr Feder, has disavowed the entire programme of the national socialist party drawn up by him, including "the breaking of the chains of interest slavery," "abolition of unearned income," "nationalisation of the trusts," etc., and proclaimed as the supreme law: "economy needs peace." All these declarations, and above all Hitler's speeches and what followed them, have meant a rude awakening for Hitler's supporters among the working population.

The same people who in March and April were ready to lynch any Communist on the spot who said to them "Hitler is deceiving you," now see how absolutely right the Communists were. For weeks and months they have been realising with increasing clearness that Hitler's "German revolution" has not brought about any real change. The employers are the masters and the workers remain the slaves.

Hitler has completely exposed himself to the working masses of Germany as the lackey of the exploiting capitalist class, as the agent of finance-capital, as the executioner of the working class. He stands exposed as the most mean and contemptible deceiver of the people, as a deceiver who, it is true, still possesses enough weapons against those who oppose this deceit.

The conflict between Hitler's capitalist policy and the anti-capitalist wishes of the masses of the working people has now openly broken out in the sharpest form. This is certainly a decisive turn, but in another sense than that of which the bourgeoisie dreams. And this conflict will increase in acuteness, for a fresh attack will be made shortly on wages and unemployment benefit. The general attack against the working class has commenced.

We must not underestimate the path which the national socialist workers and unemployed, small traders and peasants have to traverse before their present disillusionment will develop into a movement of open resistance. We know, however, that this development depends to a very great extent upon the role of the Communist Party, upon its activity in the factories and at the Labour Exchanges, upon its initiative, upon the boldness and determination of its functionaries and members. We know that the fight against Hitler has now entered a new stage, which offers us enormous possibilities. We will carry forward the banner of socialist action for freedom.

## "Brothers in Distress"

By Fritz Heckert

"The National Chancellor, Adolf Hitler, was the first to give 1,000 marks out of his own pocket for the 'Brothers in Distress.' The President, too, has given a considerable sum for the same purpose." (Daily paper.)

The "Third Reich," which was to relieve the great masses of the people from all their troubles, has now existed for six months. Millions of petty-bourgeois, millions of the middle class, driven by their longing for better and brighter lives, turned to Hitler, who promised them national emancipation and socialism, work and bread for all. Hopeful fools, they did not see that their passage was from the frying pan to the fire, from purgatory to hell.

They had not the courage to fight for social revolution side by side with the revolutionary proletariat, to drive away the exploiters and oppressors, and to build up socialism for themselves. They awaited the Messiah who was to free them. And they thought they were on the right path when they gave their adherence to the most impudent of adventurers.

Gregor Strasser, when still organisational leader of the National Socialist Party last autumn, stated that 95 per cent. of the population of Germany had anti-capitalist longings, and were opposed to the capitalist rule. This fact was seized upon by Hitler, Göbbels, Göring, Frick, and the rest of these shady elements calling themselves the leaders of the "Third Reich." Socialism and national emancipation were pushed forward as the slogans by which the national socialists set out to catch the masses. Now that they have power, Terror is their only means of "consolidating" what they have gained by lies and deception.

The capitalist backers of the Third Reich were very well aware that it was no good advancing a capitalist programme in the Germany of to-day, if the decaying system was to be saved from speedy bankruptcy. The experiment with Papen had shown that an openly capitalist programme was bound to be defeated. Hence they resorted to a roundabout way of reaching their goal. The Stock Exchange wolves, the industrial hyenas, the East Elbe brigands, found in the national socialist charlatans and adventurers precisely the unprincipled elements which they needed, ready for every lie, every shameful deed, every act of violence.

The last capitalist governments had plunged the country into distress enough, but the present government has plunged it into even profounder depths in the six months of its rule. At the beginning of Hitler's government the future of the country was nebulous, but now it is openly on the verge of a catastrophe. The national socialist catchwords of socialism and national emancipation were mere baits thrown out to lure the masses, enabling their fighting organisations to be shattered and robbery made easier for the capitalist sharks.

In these six months not a single large landowner has lost his land to the peasants, but tens of thousands of peasants have been sold up. Not one Stock Exchange shark has been deprived of a penny, but the national socialist robbers have stolen the last property of tens of thousands of workers. No factory has been taken away from the industrial magnates, but the workers' wages have been reduced and new hundreds of thousands condemned to unemployment. The deficit of the "Third Reich" has increased to 6 milliards. Those who have been robbed are robbed again, and those who fight for liberty are thrown into prison and brutally murdered. This is Hitler's socialism.

National emancipation has gone the same path. The liberators kow-tow to all capitalist Powers. Like the mercenaries of the Middle Ages, they offer themselves on all markets, ready to protect the imperialist interests of other Powers. Göbbels, Göring, and Rosenberg travel from one capital to another, offering the services of the "Third Reich" for the fight against the Soviet Union. Not gratuitously of course; they want a share of the spoils. That their offers have not yet been accepted is solely due to the present political conditions. Germany, tied down by the Versailles treaty, has fallen deeper into isolation and contempt through the policy of the Hitler bandits. This shameless policy is what they call national emancipation. And the whole swindle is designated as the national socialist revolution.

But the growing poverty and terror have already opened the eyes of hundreds of thousands of one-time adherents of Hitler. They no longer shout: "Hail Hitler!" The words on their lips are: "Accursed be the 'Third Reich' and its apostles." However loudly

Hitler may declare that the whole people are backing him, the fact remains that open mutiny has broken out in his own ranks in the Storm Troops. The deceived members of his own party demand that socialism be fought for. Hitler knows that the best days of his "Third Reich" are over. With the waters rising to his neck, he grasps at a savage drive against the Soviet Union as a last hope of saving himself. Perhaps the imperialist lords will let him fight with them against the Soviet Union, as paid mercenary; perhaps he can avoid the threatening Communist danger by throwing mud at the proletarian state!

So he has re-discovered the "Brothers in Distress," an idea originally conceived with some cleverness by the Roman Catholic, Brüning, who discovered that was the mission of re-awakened Germany to liberate the Germans in the Soviet Union from Soviet rule. Brüning's agents mobilised at that time the scum of the kulak and priestly elements in the German towns and villages of the Soviet Union, inducing these to use their influence to turn the peasants against the Soviet Power, and promising the emigrants a warm reception in Germany, with land and help and all their hearts' desires. But once in Germany, these peasants were left to rot in the concentration camps, or sent to work for the junkers of the East Elbe, if they did not prefer to emigrate to Brazil or Canada where they perished miserably.

Hitler is trying to dish up this old scheme again. He declares that it is not the German peasants and workers who are in distress, but the Germans in the Soviet Union. It does not matter that the German peasant is deprived of his last goat, the German worker driven to suicide or simply murdered. All this is no distress, but the happiness of the "Third Reich."

Who can still be foolish as to believe the promises of the national socialist tricksters any longer? Every sincere toiler must now recognise that there is only one sacred duty facing him—that of doing his utmost to accelerate the end of the "Third Reich." And the task of our brothers in the Soviet Union is to place one stone upon another, building up socialism, encouraging the toilers in Germany to fight tenaciously in the revolutionary struggle which is undermining that structure of fascist lies now only held together by the cement of Terror.

Hitler has told us revolutionary workers that he is preparing Sodom and Gomorra for us. And there will be Sodom and Gomorra in the "Third Reich." But pitch and sulphur will not rain from the sky. From the earth the revolutionary workers and peasants will rise, and will make of these so-called "brothers in distress" brothers in liberty.

## The New Wave of Terror In Germany

Berlin, July 18, 1933.

The new wave of fascist terror, which we expected and predicted, has set in. "Shootings while attempting to escape," "suicides" in the prisons and concentration camps are the order of the day. The savage actions of the Storm Troops have greatly increased, as have also the raids, house searches and wholesale arrests by the police. Fascist class justice is feverishly active and is increasing its savage sentences. The broad public hears of only an insignificant part of the dreadful happenings, for the news of that which takes place in the provinces, and especially in the open country, does not reach beyond a narrow circle.

The motive for this new wave of terror is perfectly obvious. The fascist rulers are becoming increasingly uncertain of their own position. They observe the great ferment among the masses; they see the advance of Communist influence and seek to stifle this development by means of the most bloody terror.

Hitler's open self-exposure has had a great effect among the followers of the national socialists, especially among the Storm Troops. The Nazi leaders foresaw this and, simultaneously with Hitler's "turn," launched a new terrorist offensive.

The leaders of the Hitler party realised from the outset that the open proclamation: "The German Revolution is ended," would give the Communists further great possibilities of increasing and extending their agitation and propaganda among the masses. They wished to counteract this. They hoped that the reorganisation of the political police, the "Secret State Police," would be so far advanced that it would be possible to carry out a drastic action against the Communist Party. The big actions in Pomerania and in the coastal districts were preceded by weeks of observation and spying. But taken as a whole the result is very unsatisfactory for

the "Secret Police." All the fiercer therefore is the new wave of terror.

The fascist leaders are aware how dangerous the criticism of the Communists has become for them at the present time. They are seeking to counteract it with terrorist laws and increase of terrorist sentences. Anybody who is active in another party than the national socialist party commits "high treason" and is to be severely punished accordingly. Anybody who acts against the orders of the government or calls upon others to do so, as is done in every Communist handbill and leaflet or any illegal newspaper, according to the decree of the Prussian Minister of Justice, has to expect imprisonment or capital punishment. Anybody who organises resistance of the working people, runs the risk of the gallows. These new terrorist laws show most clearly the rapid sharpening of the inner political situation in Germany.

Especially noteworthy, however, at the present time is the fact that this fascist terror is directed not only against the Communists and the anti-fascist front, but also, and to an increasing extent, against their own followers, who are becoming more discontented and rebellious. The reports which come to us from all parts of Germany leave no doubt that the ferment among the Storm Troops is leading to numerous open symptoms of disintegration: mutinies, open fights among the Storm Troops, dissolution of sections of Storm Troops, arrest of Storm Troopers. When foreign newspaper correspondents already announce a split in the Hitler party, they are greatly underestimating the enormous pressure which the Hitler party exercises on all its members, and especially on the Storm Troops. Nobody hardly ventures to leave the party, for this involves severe retributive measures, house search, arrest, concentration camp. Withdrawal from the Storm Troops means immediate arrest, and in certain cases murder. Consequently, nobody ventures to come forward openly against the leaders, and the disintegration is therefore for the time being going on below the surface.

How great the ferment among the members of the national socialist party is is best proved by the document which all members of the Hitler party are now compelled to sign, and which reads as follows:—

"I am aware that I must refrain from any criticism of the measures of the government, the party and the leading men. I know that otherwise I shall be brought not before a party court but before a penal court. Signed . . . . . (name)."

A party leadership can submit such a document to its members only when it is convinced that discontent is general and has assumed great proportions. If, however, this is the case, such a document cannot have a very great effect. Up to the present we have only a few reports to hand regarding the effect this document has had. According to these reports, this document has evoked an exceedingly fierce discussion and very sharp criticism of the Hitler government. The shortcomings and failures of the government have been debated for hours. But even if the leaders of the Hitler party should succeed for the time being in checking this ferment, it will not be able to stifle it, for, as a result of a thousand objective causes, this ferment is daily produced anew and increased.

The new wave of terror, therefore, differs from the former waves of terror in that it has to be directed against a much broader front of discontent, against broad strata of the national socialist followers. This will not reduce the brutality of the terror against the revolutionary workers, but it will increase the possibilities of anti-fascist resistance.

#### Death Penalty for Any Anti-Fascist Action

Berlin, July 23.

The conference of all Prussian Storm Troop leaders and heads of the police, called by Goering to meet the special emergency, has resolved upon fresh measures for combating the anti-fascist front, of a nature sharper than anything ever imposed by any anti-fascist government.

Goering, when proposing these measures, gave as reason that Communism is raising its head once more, and that "Communist attacks on Storm Troops and Guard Corps" are increasing. He ignored, however, the fact that the actual great increase of the anti-fascist activities of the workers under Communist leadership has been accompanied, since Hitler's declaration on the "close of the revolution" in the first days of June, by a perfect avalanche of mutinies in the Storm Divisions, so that—in view of the increased Communist activities—fascist rule is seriously threatened.

## Great Britain

### New Opportunist Arguments Against the Communist International

By J. R. Campbell (London)

The situation in the Independent Labour Party since the publication of the Communist International Letter is not easy to gauge, as the only public expressions of opinion with regard to the letter of the Communist International have been those of the section of the I.L.P. leaders. The rank and file have not spoken yet, and are only in the process, in many districts, of exchanging opinions with the Communist Party members as to the meaning of that letter.

In a number of districts, however, the co-operation between the rank and file of the Communist Party and that of the Independent Labour Party has notably increased during recent months. Whereas in the first days of the united front, co-operation between the C.P. and the I.L.P. was largely confined to public meetings, there has taken place recently a number of **common united front actions** in which the rank and file of both parties have co-operated—such as the **Scots Hunger March**, the **Unemployed March to Wakefield**, the **Lancashire March to Preston**.

In the Wakefield march, particularly, great progress was made to building up the united front of the workers by the drawing into this march all Labour Party Unemployed Associations, and by the co-operation of Labour Councillors and ex-M.P.s, including Sir Ben Turner, in the meetings in connection with this march. The co-operation of these gentlemen was, of course, the result of the powerful pressure of the Labour Party rank and file.

It is significant that this widening of the basis of the united front by the bringing in of Labour Party workers, and local organisations, is taking place at a moment when Divisional Councils of the Independent Labour Party are complaining that association with the Communist Party is narrowing the possibilities of a wide united front of the working class being created. The Wakefield march shows, on the contrary, that wherever a united front policy is vigorously applied it has the effect of bringing in the Labour Party organisations into the struggle and in widening the front.

Nevertheless, attempts have been made in the ranks of the I.L.P. workers to show that the Communist International letter means the narrowing of the united-front appeal to the revolutionary sections of the working class.

However, there is going on in the ranks of the I.L.P. a heavy attack by a section of the I.L.P. leadership on the Communist International on the double ground that the Communist International is equally responsible with the Second International for the victory of Hitler in Germany, and, secondly, that the Communist International is preventing the development of the fight by pursuing an opportunist policy now.

In the meeting called by the London District of the Communist Party to discuss the letter of the C.I., Fenner Brockway stressed two main reasons why the Communist Party in Germany had helped to prepare the way for Hitler. He argued that the form of criticism of the social democrats indulged in by the Communist Party of Germany has been such as to drive the social-democratic rank and file closer behind the social-democratic leaders. He particularly objected to the use of the term "social-fascism" as describing the social-democratic organisations.

Yet in the same speech he admitted that the Social Democratic Party had worked to strengthen the German State machine against the working class, that they had weakened the working class by pursuing the policy of the lesser evil, that they had refused to co-operate with the Communist Party on July 20th and January 30th when the Communist Party called for strike action against Hitlerism, that they had offered to Hitler the co-operation of the German trade unions.

To admit facts like these, and yet to object to the name "social-fascist" which actually describes these facts, shows the hollowness of Brockway's argument.

The other charge brought by Brockway against the German C.P. was that it had pursued the policy of systematically splitting the trade unions. Here he was forced to resort to a rather curious argument. On the one hand he practically admits that the split in the socialist movement was due to the war policy of the social-democratic leaders and their coalition policy after the war; just



as in Britain he argues that the split of the I.L.P. from the Labour Party was due to the treacherous policy of the Labour leaders. But, having proved that the split in the political parties was due to the reformists, Brockway tries to compensate for this by suggesting that the split of the trade unions was due to the policy of the revolutionaries. No facts were brought forward to prove this in relation to Germany, and with regard to Britain it was decisively disproved both by the history of such union splits as have taken place, notably in the Scottish mining industry, and by the present policy, of the T.U. bureaucracy, who are further attacking the militants inside the trade unions.

Those were the two main arguments brought forward by Brockway, and it is obvious that as the details of the situation of the German working class, prior to the coming to power of Hitler, become better known, it is becoming more and more difficult for the leaders of the I.L.P., without showing themselves to be open Right wing opportunists, to find any real concrete arguments against the policy pursued by the Communist Party and in support of the lying thesis that the Communist Party was equally responsible with the social democrats for the triumph of Hitler.

With regard to the role that has been played by the Soviet Union, since the coming to power of Hitler, it is clear that here the discussion has forced Brockway to recast his original arguments. The original arguments were to the effect that the Soviet Union had made an agreement with Hitler at the very moment when Hitler was in a critical situation in Germany. Many of the I.L.P. rank and file even believed for a time that the Soviet agreement was made by Germany in the days immediately following Hitler coming to power. When the actual date of the signing of the Soviet-Germany agreement is seen to be May 7th, at a moment when Hitler's position was consolidated for the time being and the signing of this agreement is seen to be a reply to the attempts of Italy and Britain to isolate the Soviet Union, then there has been a big change in the opinion of the rank and file I.L.P.ers, who at first sight imagined that there was something in what Brockway was saying.

However, it is clear that Brockway has abandoned the boycott, in the exact meaning of the words, and now argues as follows: We cannot advocate the refusal to buy German goods, as this is merely a proposal for assisting certain groups of British capitalists as against groups of German capitalists. What we must advocate is that the workers on the job by strike action refuse to handle German goods. This is not a practical proposition at the present moment. But the workers should be prepared by propaganda and agitation to take this form of action in the future, and to apply it at a moment when Hitlerism in Germany is being shaken by the mass struggle of the German workers.

It is obvious that Brockway has changed his arguments. His original argument was that the Soviet-German treaty had strengthened Hitler at a critical moment. Now this is dropped and in its place he suggests conditions for the application of international strike action on behalf of the German workers.

The curious thing about the whole boycott argument of Brockway's is that this policy was not brought forward in the conversations between the I.L.P. and the C.P. as an effective means of saving the German workers from Hitlerism, and that in fact it has been taken up by the "Left" parties, in a desperate attempt to differentiate themselves from the Communist International and to show that they, and not the Communist International, are giving real revolutionary leadership at the present moment.

It is further notable that Brockway did not, at the London meeting, attempt in any shape or form to define his arguments with regard to the Chinese Eastern Railway.

On international policy the line he took was that of deprecating the achievements of the Communist International by drawing a picture of utter collapse in Germany and weakness and ineffectiveness of the C.I. in other parts of the world. The one-sided picture of Germany was promptly disputed by Ellen Wilkinson, who, without expressing sympathy for the Communist International, gave a picture of the struggle of the German workers at the present moment.

It was notable, however, that Brockway could not advance an argument, that there was any other international body seeking to lead the workers other than the Communist International. His argument was that there could be no rebuilding of the Labour and Socialist International and that the C.I. would provide the best basis for international united action, provided it altered its policy, tactics and organisation. This shows quite clearly that

the I.L.P. leaders are having to pursue the two-and-a-half international policy very carefully in view of the hostility to this policy in the ranks of the I.L.P.

Actually, however, when analysed, all the arguments against closer association of the I.L.P. with the C.I. and the ultimate creation of one revolutionary party in Great Britain are seen to be arguments which combine Right wing slanders with Trotskyist counter-revolutionary calumny against the Communist International.

Indeed, the association of some local I.L.P. leaders who are attacking the C.I. with a small group of expelled Trotskyists is now patent to everyone.

The I.L.P. rank and file have been told that the C.P. is a Party repeating formula borrowed from Moscow, without any concrete idea of how to win the British working class for a revolutionary policy, and yet in experience they have found that the Communists have displayed the widest knowledge of the local and vital conditions obtaining in any town and district, and have brought forward practical proposals for mobilising the working class on the issues of the day.

Not only Communist propaganda but Communist activity is carrying forward the united front and obtaining the revolutionary co-operation between the rank and file of both parties, and is preparing the way for a united front party in Britain.

## In the Camp of Social Democracy

### The Congress of the French Socialist Party

By J. Berlioz (Paris)

The Party Congress of the Socialist Party of France, by 2,179 votes against 719, which were given for a centrist resolution, and against 752 given for a resolution introduced by Renaudel expressing complete approval of the parliamentary fraction, censured the majority of the socialist parliamentarians, who were guilty of having voted for the budget of the Daladier government, and threatened them with further punitive measures should they persist in this attitude.

This vote might lead one to believe that the Rights have been completely crushed and that the Socialist Party of France will now pursue a class policy. To spread this illusion was in fact the aim of the party congress which began on July 14, as it was also the aim of the party congress which was held at Easter in Avignon, which in the meantime had not changed anything.

Two theses confronted each other. The "Lefts" are of the opinion that radical phrases and fiery speeches on the theme: "All power to Socialism" are still able to keep a part of the working population from the revolutionary path. The Rights are of the opinion that these means no longer suffice, and that a stronger barrier must be set up against the militancy of the masses. As one of the speakers from the Seine district stated at the party congress:—

"There is a danger of a Bolshevisation in the party. The 'Left' comrades are running the danger of being overrun by their troops, who will carry out these methods."

Renaudel's friends believe that in order to avoid this danger the party programme must be openly revised and be placed undisguisedly in the service of French democracy, i.e., of imperialism, of defence of the Versailles Treaty, of increased capitalist exploitation and war.

As the requirements of the bourgeoisie are urgent, the Rights have gone a very long way on the path of revision. The "Temps" wrote:—

"For the first time in France a big organised party officially proclaimed before the country its belief in national socialism."

The speeches delivered by Montagnon, Marquet and Déat fully and entirely justify such an estimation. One can sum them up as follows: "We are horrified to see that the present regime is approaching its end. We do not believe that the working class can play the role which Marx allotted to it. The revival of nationalism destroys internationalism. Therefore one must organise socialism on a national basis, with the aid of the desper-

ate middle classes, by means of a strong State which restores the idea of authority and organises economy." That is Hitler's thesis. Social fascism has never before exposed itself so plainly.

Renaudel explained to the party congress that the crisis of socialism coincides with the crisis of capitalism and proceeds parallel with it. This explains also the ideological collapse of the socialist parties and of the Second International. Their prosperity was the reflection of capitalist "prosperity."

French imperialism was not attacked even once at this party congress, but, on the other hand, German imperialism was stigmatised as being solely responsible for the coming war. Déat said in the name of all:—

"In the sphere of foreign politics agreement prevails between the policy which determines the action of the government, and the principles of Socialism."

There exists only a difference of method between the "Lefts" and the Rights, both of whom are equally devoted to French imperialism.

Vandervelde in his speech to the congress made frequent references to the great responsibility resting on French socialism, which now occupies the leading position in the Second International. The party congress replied to this by confirming, in spite of differences of opinion on the surface, the unanimous advocacy by the S.P. of France of the way out of the capitalist crisis within the limits of the capitalist system and the nation. This is the attitude of the other sections of the Second International. It is impossible to hide the fact that this International is an International without internationalism, which has fallen to pieces just as it did in the year 1914.

It was this view which dominated the four days' discussion at the party congress. The "Lefts" opposed nothing more serious to it than the "horrification" of Blum, who was afraid of the effect which the submission of the social-fascist programme might have on the rank and file of the socialist party and the masses, from whom they have up to now cunningly concealed their features. Paul Faure likewise declared that he does not believe in the revolution. Blum declared himself in favour of national defence in the same way as Renaudel, when they both argued that the democratic fatherland must be defended against the threats of fascist imperialism. Paul Faure, just the same as Uhry, attempted to show that Mussolini, Hitler and Roosevelt are influenced by the socialist programme. All were inclined to obey the exhortation addressed to them by Vandervelde at the commencement of the party congress: to rescue the "imperfect democracy," this democracy which is gradually being fascised.

The policy defined by the Rights has triumphed, in spite of the final vote. What will happen now? There was much talk of a moral split between the tendencies. It will be possible for French social democracy to maintain its ambiguous attitude for some months. But on the reopening of parliament in October, the government will bring in the Bills for the financial and economic reorganisation and elaborate a foreign policy which implies serious threats to the working population. Out of fear of a breach with those over whom they still have influence, the socialist party will not be able as a whole to support the contemplated measures. Daladier will attempt to carry out a concentration, firmly supported by the "Left," in order to be able to extend it to the Right. The socialist leaders will have to disrupt the united-front struggle against the new dangers. It is possible that as a result there will be a split in the socialist party of France. Paul Faure already revealed the manoeuvre of the last reserve of capitalism when he said:—

"The socialist party will lose its troops if it does not dissociate itself in good time from the Radicals who are in favour of government concentration. It must become the rallying centre for those who believe that capitalism is at the end of its career."

Thus a new formula for the division of labour will be found, in that one section will immediately collaborate in the fascisation, whilst the other group will promote it by attempting to prevent the fight of the proletariat. It is the task of the Communists of France to frustrate these plans for supporting imperialism by redoubling their efforts to win the socialist workers and draw them into the fight for minor demands, at the same time enlightening them as to the true nature of their social-fascist party.

## The Norwegian Labour Party

By V. Olsen

Of the seven independent parties which, together with the Independent Labour Party of England, issued the Paris manifesto on international unity, the Norwegian Labour Party (D.N.A.) is the largest and the party which plays the greatest role in Norway. It is, therefore, not due to chance that this Party, through its leadership, also plays a big role in the group of the seven independent parties, just as it is no accident that it has shown itself to be capable in regard to carrying out big international manoeuvres whose purpose it is to keep back the workers from the revolutionary class struggle. In the past ten years, since the break with the Communist International, the leaders of the D.N.A. have had many experiences in this field. Although the Norwegian Labour Party does not formally belong to the Second International, it would be a mistake to assume that it is anything else but a social-democratic party. In 1927 the D.N.A. united with the Social-Democratic Party inasmuch as it actually adapted its entire policy to this Party. Right after the elections in 1927, the Norwegian Labour Party had the honour of forming a government. True, this government was not in power very long at that time, but still it lasted long enough to send soldiers into the forest regions so as to "call to order" the fighting lumber workers who were fighting for the recognition of the trade union.

The leadership of the Norwegian Labour Party officially declared itself to be in favour of Marxism and that it is based on Marxism and the experiences of the class struggle in other countries. Its "Marxism" is, however, of such a nature that it, for instance, does not recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat but, on the contrary, opposes the slogan of a people's government to these fundamental principles of Marxism. In the present period of intensified class struggle, the bourgeoisie makes great demands of all social-democratic parties. One of the demands which the Norwegian bourgeoisie made of the leaders of the D.N.A. is that they should entirely put a stop to the use of any sort of revolutionary language. The last Party Congress of the Norwegian Labour Party, which took place at the end of May last, also shows that the leaders of this party knew how to adapt themselves to this new situation. The revision of the programme which was made at the Party Congress was a clear expression of this. They no longer speak of the revolutionary class struggle in the old form, as was the case previously, but, on the contrary, the theory of state capitalism as a transitional form to Socialism is being inserted in the programme. It is not a chance occurrence that Editor Thommesen, one of the leaders of the "Freisinnige Linke Partei" (Conservative Party), in a big political speech in June of this year, expressed himself to the effect that the bourgeoisie need have no fear of the D.N.A. because it will not carry out the social revolution. The leaders of the D.N.A. have already proved this a long time ago. After the battles in Menstad in June, 1931, when the government sent warships, soldiers and armed State police against the workers who were fighting against the strike-breakers, the leaders of the D.N.A. prevented the extension of the struggle of the workers against these measures. In the municipality of Lørnskog, in the neighbourhood of Oslo, where the D.N.A. had the majority on the Town Council, they even sent the police against the unemployed on their own initiative when the latter demonstrated before the Town Council with the demand for bread. In all the local governing bodies where the D.N.A. has the majority, it carries into effect reactionary laws which deprive the unemployed of the right to vote in the municipal council.

The bourgeoisie has nothing to fear from the leaders of the D.N.A. Of course, these leaders still make big speeches about the struggle against the war, against the transport of war materials, against the production of war materials and against fascism. Under the pressure of the masses, they even often allow the appropriate decisions to be adopted in the trade unions, as was the case in Oslo, for instance, last year. But they act quite differently in practice. The harbour workers in Oslo thought that these speeches were meant seriously and refused to load war materials (shells, etc.) which were supplied by the Raufoss factory and went on strike on December 5, 1932. The leadership of the Norwegian Labour Party on this occasion stabbed the workers who were fighting against the war in the back, and the leaders of the reformist trade unions, almost all of whom are at the same time functionaries of the D.N.A., concluded an agreement with the employers in

which they guarantee the further transport of war materials. The leaders of this party adopted a similar position in regard to the struggles of the workers against the employers' offensive. Last year, when the ballot of the new agreement for the lumber workers was taken, the overwhelming majority of them rejected the agreement. But the reformist leadership of the union made the crudest swindle and signed the agreement with the employers despite the fact that the workers had rejected it. Part of the lumber workers went on strike as a protest against the reduction of wages and against the swindle of the union leadership. The leaders of the Norwegian Labour Party supported this traitorous union leadership.

Their entire press was placed at the disposal of the union leadership and it carried on an incitement against the fighting lumber workers. Not only the armed State police went to the forest regions in **Osterdalen** in order to fight against the lumber workers who had gone on strike. On September 4, Mr. Peder Vestad, the chairman of the Lumberworkers' Union, and a well-known member of the Labour Party, went into this district with 40 men from the so-called "Arbeiterwehr" (workers' defence) of the D.N.A., in order to carry through a split in the Lumberworkers' Union and in that way to break the fighting front of the workers. But the members of the "Arbeiterwehr," who were themselves workers, realising the shameful character of the work, went away and left Vestad in the lurch.

The present Mowinckel government in Norway, which has just put through a boycott law against the trade unions, came to power with the aid of the D.N.A. The D.N.A. makes no secret of the fact that it helped this government to come to power and collaboration with the bourgeoisie is also openly taking place in parliament. During the discussion on the boycott law against the trade unions, **Norem**, a bourgeois politician, expressed himself to the effect that the Labour Party need have no anxiety about this boycott law because it will help it to defeat and put down the elements that breed unrest in the trade unions. The leaders of the D.N.A., who speak about international unity of the workers, are themselves really carrying out the policy of splitting the trade unions in Norway. They have expelled the majority of the workers in the trade union councils in **Bergen** from the national organisation and founded new "splitting" trade unions. The chemical workers in **Odda** and **Tysedal**, the majority of the building workers in **Trondheim** and many local trade unions of the lumberworkers were also expelled from the trade unions. That is their policy of "unity" in practice.

The social-fascist character of the policy of this Party is also very strongly expressed in their struggle against the Soviet Union. The press of the Labour Party carries the worst type of instigating articles against the fatherland of the international proletariat. Through the pressure of the masses, whose sympathy with the Soviet Union is constantly growing, the leaders of the D.N.A. found themselves forced to form a special committee which is to collect allegedly concrete factual material on the condition of the workers in the Soviet Union. In an article on the work of this committee, which is published in the "Arbeiterbladet" (the chief organ of the D.N.A.) of July 1, the following is stated, among other things:—

"Russia is a country of pure Party dictatorship, built up on force from top to bottom, without the slightest trace of local independence or local self-determination."

At its last congress, in May of this year, the D.N.A. decided against unconditional recognition of the Soviet Union. In this field it does not differ from the bourgeois parties.

Such a party has dared to issue the slogan of international unity of the workers against war and fascism. In actual fact, however, it does not want this unity. After the appeal of the seven independent parties, the **Communist Party of Norway** made an offer to the D.N.A. for a united front, with a concrete platform of struggle against the capitalist offensive and against growing fascism in Norway. Thereupon the leaders of the D.N.A. replied with the demand that the Communist Party should entirely dissolve itself and join the D.N.A. That is how the leaders of the D.N.A. fight for the unity of the working class. This party is not a champion for the revolutionary unity of the workers, but, on the contrary, it is the main social support of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the working class, otherwise it would not split the trade unions of the workers and expel the revolutionary workers from the trade unions, as it has done within the past three years. The working class will be able to march forward only if we convince the workers of this and win them over for the Comintern.

## The Work Provision Plans of the Austrian Trade Unions

By Keller (Vienna)

The national conference of the free trade unions of Austria, which was held recently and was attended by representatives of the reformist trade unions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, could find nothing better to do, at a moment when so many old illusions among the broad masses are being dispelled and the illusion of the "People's Petition" campaign in particular threatens to fizzle out entirely—than to conjure up fresh illusions in their place. The "Arbeiterzeitung" closes its commentary on the national conference with Herwegh's words: "Bread is liberty, liberty is bread!" But all it means is that where the masses demand political liberty, the social democrats will fob them off with illusions of daily bread, and where they call for bread, the social democrats will sidetrack them by some fata morgana of the conquest of democracy by means of collecting signatures and other "fighting weapons."

The special programme of the trade union conference was the adoption of proposals for the direct provision of work for 200,000 unemployed. **Otto Bauer**, in giving his address, was cautious enough to observe repeatedly that his calculations had been made very carefully, but nevertheless the amount of the figure named is in itself astonishing. If **Otto Bauer's** calculations are right, then Austrian social democracy has found the means of combating the crisis effectively in one country. For it would scarcely be possible to imagine a mightier "revival" of economy than that represented by the sudden provision of work for 200,000 unemployed at trade union wages. How many more would be given work as soon as these newly occupied workers commenced to purchase the requirements which they have to do without for so many years? **Otto Bauer** is quite right in saying that this would aid many ruined small tradesmen, and that the agrarian crisis and the crisis of the federal railways would be overcome to a great extent by the increased revenues of the State, the provinces, and the municipalities.

In a word, for Austria a golden age of prosperity would dawn in the midst of the world economic crisis. It seems a wonder that the government has not seized upon this plan at once, and nominated **Otto Bauer** as minister of economy.

But we cease to wonder when we read the proposals of the trade union conference for realising this vast programme of work schemes. **Otto Bauer** and the leaders of the free trade unions have made their calculations simpler by ignoring a few "trifles"—the existence of capitalism and imperialism, for instance.

Listen to the proposals:—

The chief proposal for the provision of work is public works, the building of means of transport, roads, agricultural irrigation, etc., erection of dwelling houses, large-scale settlements, etc. The financial means are to be raised by utilising a part of the Lausanne loan and of the coming inland loan. **Otto Bauer**, in his speech, indignantly opposed the plan of using the sums accruing to Austria by these financial operations for the repayment of the debts of the State to foreign countries and to the National Bank (the National Bank intends withdrawing from circulation the banknotes returning to it if this plan is carried out). This deflation must not be carried out, declares **Otto Bauer**, but must be replaced by a policy of "credit extension," but without depreciation of currency. **Otto Bauer** pretends not to know that international capital has dictated exactly, in the Lausanne protocol, for what purposes both the Lausanne loan and the inland loan are to be used. He pretends not to be aware that this Lausanne loan represents nothing more nor less than the conversion of the old short-term loans and arrears of interest into a long-term loan, and that the foreign capitalists have only granted the Lausanne loan in order to avoid having to support bankrupt Austria out of the Geneva loan in accordance with their guarantee obligations.

The second proposal is for the expansion of exports by means of a system of preference duties in the Danube district. **Otto Bauer** states, however:—

"We decline any one-sided political and economic binding of Austria, whether to Hungary and Italy, or to the Little Entente and France, as politically and economically dangerous. We demand the political neutralisation of Austria as the prerequisite for a closer economic contact of Austria with all its neighbouring States by means of a system of preference duties."

Otto Bauer again pretends to have no idea that preference duties can only be granted to Austria when the great imperialist Powers, in this case Italy and France in particular, have come to an agreement as to their interests around the Danube, and that then—perhaps even under the attractive pacifist catchword of “neutralisation”—Austria will not be the country to profit by this new system, but will be exploited by it.

Besides all this, the calculations based by Otto Bauer on the realisation of these proposals lead nowhere. He demands with assumed naïveté:—

“Would it be utopian for me to assume that by means of a system of economic preference duties with all our neighbouring States we could increase our exports only by the amount which our exports declined between 1931 and 1932?”

Otto Bauer does not, however, reply to this rhetorical question. It is easy to understand why he does not, for the only answer could be: Yes, indeed, it would be utopian to assume that the decline of economic relations between Austria and its neighbouring States, due to the advance of the crisis since 1931, can be slowed down, much less reversed, by any kind of agreements. It would be utopian to suppose that by means of some agreement the purchasing powers of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, etc., could be suddenly restored to the level of 1931.

But Otto Bauer, in advancing these economic proposals, has forgotten to mention one country which has long since extricated itself from the effects of the capitalist crisis, and actually possesses the purchasing power enabling it not only to maintain its imports from Austria at the level of 1931, but to increase them above this level, if Austria would be prepared to meet it. Otto Bauer did not mention the development of economic relations with the Soviet Union. A very significant sign! As a rule this demand is one of Otto Bauer's pet “Left” hobbies. But he has now so definitely lined up in the national front that on this occasion he relinquishes the idea. Is it by accident that this speech by Otto Bauer, in which he ignores economic relations with the Soviet Union, appeared in the “Arbeiterzeitung” on the same day as the publication by the “Reichspost” of a provocative article on “famine” in Soviet Ukraine?

The final proposal is for reduction of legal working hours to 40 per week. At the same time the employers must undertake to increase the number of workers employed by one-fifth in undertakings where full time has hitherto been worked.

Once upon a time a certain Karl Marx pointed out that the length of the working day is the product of the struggle between the capitalist class and the working class. But to-day Marx would certainly have been relegated by Otto Bauer to that opposition which he recommends for “suppression” in his article in “Kampf.”

The trade union conference simply substitutes for the class struggle the law by which the State is to shorten working hours against the interest of the Austrian capitalists. Just as Otto Bauer's first proposal ignores the existence of international finance capital, and his second the existence of imperialism, so his third simply passes over the not inconsiderable fact that in Austria power is still in the hands of the capitalist class. By means of such conjuring tricks as these he manages to point out a “way” of overcoming the crisis, and bluffs his audience with his: “Is this utopian?”

But it is not merely utopian. It would be utopian if it were to be taken literally. But in reality it is a very subtle policy, envisaging its utopian illusions precisely along the lines already pursued by the propaganda of the fatherland front and the Dollfuss government.

Provision of work by means of public works to be financed by 50 million schillings from the inland loan, and to include “voluntary labour service,” is one of the chief attractions of the government's propaganda. And the rapprochement to the neighbouring States under the wing of French and Italian imperialism is the main pillar of the Dollfuss foreign policy.

We ask once more: Is it by accident that the demands of the trade union conference coincide so nearly with the programme of the government? We might as well ask whether it is an accident that social democracy, under the leadership of Otto Bauer, held back the masses in Austria from any struggle against fascism, sidetracking them by the Utopia of the conquest of power by means of bourgeois democracy, until this democracy lay shattered at the feet of fascism.

## First of August

### For August 1st of United Front and Action

By Marcel Cachin (Paris)

A socialist functionary said to me:—

“A day of fight against fascism and against war and for the defence of the Soviet Union? I realise that it is necessary in certain countries, but in France there is no danger of fascism and we are numerous enough to guard our democratic liberties; there is no fear of war, and the military budgets have this year been reduced by two milliards; the Daladier Government has the best intentions towards the Soviet Union and is doing everything to bring about a genuine rapprochement between the two States. Therefore, I do not understand why the Communist Party calls for work against dangers which do not exist.”

This opinion is fairly widespread. The French bourgeoisie has been able to manoeuvre cunningly in order to make the masses believe that it is the champion of resistance to fascism, the champion of genuine pacifism and of cordial relations with the proletarian State. Not a few workers and peasants have been caught by this swindle, and the Communists must disillusion them by means of a broad campaign of enlightenment.

The “Humanité,” in a number of impressive articles, has just shown how much value is to be attached to the “pacifism” of the government. It was able to show that out of a budget totalling 50 milliards, 20 milliards are devoted to war preparations, and that the French Army to-day numbers about one million men more than in 1913, while its equipment is ten times superior to that of 1913 and includes an air force superior to that of any other State.

The Non-Aggression Pact, the arrival of Litvinov in Paris, the honeyed declarations of M. Alphand, the new French ambassador in Moscow, might make one believe that French imperialism is no longer vying with Great Britain for the leading position in the capitalist united front against the Soviet Union. The French Communists have constantly pointed out the true motives behind this apparent change of attitude. The Soviet Union is a great Power which plays a leading role in the world. French industry would be only too glad to receive orders from a State which is able to place them and pay for them. The French government is driven by the strong demand to exert pressure on Germany by taking advantage of its diplomatic isolation.

The French bourgeoisie does not cherish the slightest sympathy for the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has shown to the peoples the only possible way out of the crisis. Paris, in violation of the Non-Aggression Pact, remains the centre of a powerful system of alliances with the Little Entente and Poland, which is directed against Moscow, and at the same time is the centre of intrigues and military preparations of white guardists. The fact that the Daladier-Bonçour government has granted asylum to the counter-revolutionary, Trotzky, is one of the symptoms indicating the true feelings of bourgeois France towards the Soviet Union.

For all these reasons, and also because it is inspired by an active proletarian internationalism, the Communist Party of France has joined in the appeal of the brother parties for a First of August of mass struggle against fascism and war. It has given its organisations definite instructions that this day is above all a day of action in the factories and a day of the united front.

The C.P. of France has everywhere set up the following slogans:—Defence of the Soviet Union, abolition of the Treaty of Versailles, support of the fight of the colonial peoples, evacuation of the colonies, support of the German proletariat, drastic reduction of the military budgets, abolition of annual training of reservists, nine months' military service, against the reduction of wages and salaries and for their increase, improvement of social insurance, 40-hour working week without wage reductions. The revolutionary Trade Union Federation (C.G.T.U.) is officially taking part in this day and in numerous places the Communists have been able to convince the Amsterdam Committees and the anti-fascist committees of the necessity of supporting their campaign.

## Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

# The Way of the Soviet Village to Socialism and Prosperity

### The Enemies of the Collective Farms

By Our Special Correspondent in Moscow, L. F. Boross

#### I.—THE DROUGHT AND THE HOT WINDS

Given favourable weather the Central Volga District is one of the richest granaries of the Soviet Union. Its land can, it is true, not compare with the Central Black Earth District for fruitfulness, but its tremendous area (in 1932 over 10 million hectares of tilled land, of which 8 millions were worked by the collective farms) is a tremendous source of foodstuffs even with primitive tilling methods. But when not a drop of rain falls in June, when at the end of June the half-ripe ears are seized by the hot winds which bake the ground and dry every vestige of sap out of the roots, then the district turns into an area of starvation and terrible suffering for the working people. The drought is a dangerous enemy. It is a hostile force of nature. However, it would be radically wrong to suppose that its effects had nothing to do with the existing class relations.

In India and China millions of toilers perish almost every year as a result of droughts and bad harvests and no one bothers about them. The starvation periods in the villages of Poland, the Balkans and other countries are well known. And the hunger catastrophes in Tsarist Russia were the same. As the result of such hunger catastrophes masses of peasant farms were destroyed for years, and the effects penetrated deep into the ranks of the middle peasantry. Tremendous unemployment in the towns followed the drought in the countryside. But at the same time the rich landowners and kulaks producing for the market enriched themselves as a result of the boom which followed the shortage and as a result of the cheaper possibilities of exploiting the impoverished masses.

The first hunger year which the young Soviet power experienced, in 1921, found it unprepared. War and imperialist intervention had caused a great economic weakening of the Soviet power. Industrial production had sunk to a fifth, and agricultural production had sunk to half that of the pre-war period. Under such circumstances it is clear that the tremendous efforts made by the Soviet power and the international proletariat could only ameliorate the consequences of the catastrophe and not prevent it.

But ten years later, in 1931, this hostile force of nature suffered a definite defeat, thanks to the previous defeat of the kulaks. However, the loss of 100 million cwts. of grain in this year was a heavy one, and the toilers of the Soviet Union cannot content themselves with the fact that the consequences of such natural catastrophes are less severe now than in former years.

The drought must be finally defeated by the new collective agricultural order and by the work of socialist construction. In a few years this thousand-year-old scourge of history will have ceased to exist in the Soviet Union. In a number of districts in the Central Volga area we saw the projected lines for the new irrigation works marked out with stakes. South of Kammyshin the preparatory work for the construction of the "Volgastroi" has already been commenced. This new power station will put all other existing power stations, including Dnieperstroï and Colorado, in the shade in point of size and capacity. Its capacity will be from 1.8 to 2 million kilowatts, whilst the capacity of Dnieperstroï is 850,000 kilowatts. With the assistance of this new power station on the Volga, 4.5 million hectares of barren land will be irrigated with an annual stream of 20 milliard cubic metres of water. Future hopes? Yes, but hopes of the near future. The strict Bolshevik orders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet government, issued on the 23rd May, 1932, declare in Paragraph 6 that the time fixed for the completion of the Volga power station, the pumping equipment and the irrigation works is the year 1937.

At the same time steps are being taken to irrigate the upper section of the Central Volga area. Paragraph 7 of the same in-

structions declares: "The Energy Committee of the People's Commissariat for Heavy Industries is instructed to continue its work for inquiry into the question of the erection of a power station at Samara."

Until these irrigation schemes have been carried out a few years will pass, or to be exact, the period of the second Five-Year Plan. Only in the period of the third Five-Year Plan will it be possible to pour water in the necessary quantities over these lands. Are two or three further hunger years to rob the Soviet Union of hundreds of million cwts. of grain until then?

The answer of the collective farmers is no; a hundred times no. So long as we are not able to get water from other sources artificially, we shall do our utmost with all the methods of modern agricultural technique to conserve the natural water resources of the area and at the same time to speed up the process of crop ripening to such an extent that the hot winds will no longer be able to do it much harm.

This is the chief method of struggle against the danger of drought in the period of the second Five-Year Plan. This method was applied on a mass scale for the first time during this year's spring sowings campaign, and it will at the same time increase the yield by several cwts. per hectare.

The quality of collective work must be increased. All the technical and organisational possibilities offered by a modern socialist large-scale agricultural system as compared with the primitive methods of individualist small-scale agriculture must be utilised in order to increase the yield per hectare. This is the technical-economic solution of the problem of Soviet agriculture begun with great energy in the period of the second Five-Year Plan. This is also the economic basis for the chief political task summed up in the slogan: "All collective farms must be Bolshevik, and all collective farmers must be prosperous!"

All the technical and agricultural achievements of the Soviet Union are at the disposal of the collective farmers, and they are utilising these aids to an increasing extent. "Win a few days from nature!" was the slogan under which the spring sowings were conducted last year, and modest attempts began to start the spring sowings as early as possible. Immediately the snow had begun to melt a little the collective farmers began to sow, and having noticed that such early sowings showed a greater quality of resistance to the drought and the hot winds than the later sowings, and having noticed that they produced a larger crop, the method of sowing early in the mud left by the thaw has been generally adopted on the collective farms this year. A series of other technical agrarian measures have also been applied on a mass scale this year. Particular success has been achieved by the collective farmers with the "Yarovisazia" method. You will not find this word in the dictionary; it means that prior to the sowings the seed grain is ripened as far as possible by wet warmth and then sown in a semi-germinated condition. Experience has shown that this method of sowing produces a speedier maturity of the crops and a bigger yield per hectare.

These new methods were applied on a mass scale during this year's spring sowings and they were complemented by a new slogan issued by the secretary of the Central Volga District Committee of the C.P. of the Soviet Union, Comrade Shubrikov: "Win a further 5 to 7 days from the old petty-bourgeois slovenliness!" What is this petty-bourgeois slovenliness? It is the attempt to plant the old customs of the individual farmer into the work of the collectives: a collective farmer comes to work when he feels inclined; when he is bad tempered he works slowly and badly, and when he is good tempered he works better. Or, the collective farmers continue to drive the draught animals or the tractors from the village to the place of work, which is very often quite a long distance away, every morning and thus they lose a lot of valuable time, instead of trying to provide some possibility for the draught

animals or the tractors to spend the night at the place of work and thus save a lot of time. This slovenliness is recklessness towards common property. It shows a lack of understanding for the mutual interdependence of the work of all members of the collective farm.

The slogan: "Win a further five to seven days from the old petty-bourgeois slovenliness!" presupposes a considerable measure of collective consciousness and the development of an active leading cadre in the collective farms. The carrying out of this slogan demands that the members of the collective farms learn the technique and organisation of a modern large-scale agricultural farm. The carrying out of this slogan demands that the division of income on the collective farms is organised in such a fashion that each member of the collective is strengthened in his belief that the general well-being of the farm is his own personal well-being. The carrying out of this slogan also demands a firm Bolshevik labour discipline. Were these preliminary conditions present in this year's spring sowings campaign? In any case, they were there to such an extent that in the Central Volga area it was possible to finish the spring grain sowings two weeks earlier than last year. The consolidation of the Bolshevik leadership of the collective farms has thus robbed the drought and the hot south-eastern winds of two weeks in which they could do damage and perhaps destroy hundreds of million cwts. of grain. At the same time it has created the preliminary conditions for a considerably higher yield per hectare than was the case last year. If these successes obtained by the Bolshevik leadership of the collective farms are continued and consolidated throughout the weeding, and the harvest, then the collective peasant will be able to double, treble or even quadruple his income as compared with last year. The prospects for the division of income on the great mass of the collective farms in the Central Volga area this year are from 6 to 10 kilos of grain and 3 to 5 roubles in cash per work-day unit, and that already represents a very big step forwards towards general well-being.

This year the Central Volga area has done its fair share of the work in the struggle against hostile natural forces and for a higher yield. The above examples show that the struggle to control nature, particularly in the present stage of the collectivisation, is indissolubly connected with the struggle against the class enemy, and above all, against the kulak, but also with the struggle of the collective peasants against themselves, against their past attitude towards the work as individualist peasants, with the struggle "to master their own souls."

## The Greatest Machine Building Works in the World Opened

Sverdlovsk, 16th July.

Yesterday witnessed the inaugural ceremony of the Ural Works for heavy machine building, a new giant of socialist industry. Over 40,000 workers assembled in the "First Five-Year Plan" Square of the new socialist town. The best shock brigaders of the undertaking, and the guests arriving from all parts of the Soviet Union—the representatives of the workers and collective peasants—took their places on the newly-erected grand stands at the foot of the great statue of Lenin. The greatest enthusiasm prevailed at the meeting. One column of workers followed another, carrying the flags of free work, with music and singing, across the square. The whole socialist town was decorated.

From the grand stands a view could be obtained of the workshops of the "Uralmasch." The opening of this new undertaking coincides with another anniversary. On 15th July, 1919, Koltshak was driven out of the Urals, and on 15th July, 1928, the first blow of the axe fell which was to clear the forest for the Uralmasch. Many of the workshops have already been running for some months, and are supplying the smelting industry and the mines of the Soviet Union with complicated mechanical equipment. The Uralmasch is the largest machine-building undertaking in the world, both as regards extent and equipment. Here the working class of the Soviet Union demonstrates convincingly what brilliant results have been attained on the economic front under the Soviet Power. Uralmasch is one of the many undertakings completed in a brief period by the Soviet Union. The undertaking has been erected—opened—supplies machinery. This does not, however, mean that the workers can now abate their energy and rest on their laurels. They are now faced with the great task of mastering the complicated technics of the undertaking, of getting the utmost

output of the machinery, of building high-grade machines for the socialist heavy industry.

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U., in its congratulatory telegram, states:—

"Uralmasch gives the Soviet Union a new basis for its emancipation from dependence on foreign countries, and for the rapid development of the smelting industry and other branches of heavy industry. The opening of the Ural Machine-Building Works is a great victory in the development of the second coal and metal basis of the East—the completion of the Ural-Kusnetz combine."

The works have been given the name of the People's Commissar for Heavy Industry, Ordshonikidze.

## The White Terror

### New Terrorist Laws Against the Working Population of Latvia

By N. (Riga)

The Latvian bourgeoisie is preparing a fresh fascist attack against the working people.

On the 1st of August next the new penal law comes into force. The purpose of this penal law is physically to exterminate the revolutionaries and to throttle completely any proletarian fight against the fascist "crisis plans" of the bourgeoisie.

The new penal law provides for punishments twice as severe as the old Tsarist laws (4 to 15 years' hard labour). Under this law prisoners can be loaded with chains weighing up to 2 kilogrammes for a period of three years when the court in pronouncing sentence so orders, and up to one month merely on the order of the prison governor. Apart from this the position of the political prisoners is greatly worsened by the introduction of a so-called "progressive punishment regime" according to which "incorrigibles" are deprived of any support from outside (food parcels, letters, etc.). This means certain death.

The initiative for the introduction of this law came from the Latvian social democracy. Under the cloak of revising the mediæval laws of Tsarism and fighting against fascism (!), the social democrats, in the year 1924, when they were in the government, set up a commission for revising the penal laws in the sense of the present new law. The social democratic government also introduced summary courts "for the protection of the Republic," as well as the system of the "progressive penal regime."

The political prisoners at that time commenced an heroic hunger strike against the decision of the "socialist" government. It was only after a 13 days' hunger strike and the energetic protest of the working class that the social democratic government published special instructions which exempted the political prisoners from this regime. The bourgeoisie, with the toleration of the social democrats and even with their active support, is now introducing the new penal laws. They are directed exclusively against the proletariat and provide special prohibition of strikes and imprisonment for anyone calling for or organising such strikes.

Our comrades in the prisons are determined to reply to this provocation with a fresh hunger strike. It is clear that, if in the year 1927 they had to go on hunger strike for 13 days, they are now faced with a much harder fight. The fascists intend bloodily to suppress this fight; they have armed the prison warders with Cosack whips.

The introduction of the new penal law is the first step to the "legal" introduction of fascism in Latvia. The next step is to be the expulsion of the workers' and peasants' fraction from parliament, the arrest of the members of this fraction, following the example of Bulgaria, and the setting up of an open fascist regime.

On the 1st of August next there commences the heroic hunger strike of our comrades in all the prisons. Class comrades in all countries! We call upon you to support us in this fight. The bloody plans of the Latvian fascists must be frustrated! Adopt protest resolutions and publish them in the press. Send protests to the Latvian government and the Latvian embassies! Demonstrate against the terror of the Latvian bourgeoisie! Save our comrades from death!

Long live the international solidarity of the working class!  
Long live the anti-fascist united front!

## Organisational Questions

### After the Congress of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement

By D. P.

The April Congress of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement was faced with the most important task of indicating the ways and methods for the mobilisation of the unemployed masses in defence of their class interests in conditions of the profound crisis and the sharpening offensive of the bourgeoisie. The Congress has quite correctly placed in the centre of its work the question of the struggle against the policy of the bourgeoisie. The National Government is trying to form among the unemployed a base of support for its policy of fascisation and forced labour in the form of **Social Service Centres**, and to shift all the burdens of the crisis on the shoulders of the toiling masses. The Congress has also emphasised the necessity of developing the work of the N.U.W.M. on the basis of **broad unemployed councils** uniting both the organised and unorganised unemployed, both the unemployed who are members of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement and those who are connected with the Social Service Centres and the reformist unemployed associations.

But the Congress did not raise in all its sharpness the question that the main pre-requisites of the successful mobilisation of the masses is the persistent struggle against the labourists who are splitting the organisations of the unemployed and by their whole policy helping the bourgeoisie in its fierce attack on the working class. This struggle presupposes also the most persistent work for joint action of the militant workers and the rank-and-file members of the reformist organisations. The National Administrative Council of the N.U.W.M. has already corrected before the Congress the sectarian line that existed in the ranks of the N.U.W.M. that the workers belonging to the reformist unemployed associations are "blacklegs," "disrupters," etc. It was precisely the task of the Congress to make it perfectly clear that our essential task was to struggle against the leaders of the reformist organisations and to establish simultaneously fraternal alliance with the rank-and-file members of such organisations. The Congress did not altogether cope with this task.

The ruthless struggle against the labourist leadership of the trade unions presupposes simultaneously the most persistent work for strengthening the political and organisational influence of the N.U.W.M. The increase in the number of the unemployed associations and the bourgeois social centres for the unemployed, with the simultaneous stagnation of the N.U.W.M.—the motive force of the struggle of the unemployed for their interests—represents a menace for the development of the counter-offensive of the unemployed masses. To overcome this stagnation, to create a broad base for the N.U.W.M. among the masses of unemployed, and to rally round the N.U.W.M. the widest sections of the unemployed on the basis of the united front—such are the fundamental tasks which confront the whole National Unemployed Workers' Movement, also, after the Congress.

In developing its work after the Congress, the National Unemployed Workers' Movement must in the first place take into account the prospect of a further increase in unemployment and a still more embittered attack of the National Government on the living conditions of the unemployed masses. The uninterrupted increase in unemployment in the basic industries, in the coal, textile and some branches of the metal industries, dooms thousands and thousands of unemployed to a beggarly existence. The government has balanced its budget through the most ruthless "economy" at the expense of unemployed insurance, national education, etc. But even these "economies" do not satisfy the bourgeoisie. It is elaborating schemes for further worsening the condition of the unemployed masses and is preparing to "unify" the whole system of insurance and of relief to the unemployed so as to carry through more ruthlessly the Means Test, cuts in relief, removal of the unemployed from relief, etc. It is preparing for a further reduction in the period of the payment of unemployment benefit and the amount of same.

The successful struggle of the unemployed against the offensive of the bourgeoisie mainly depends upon whether the National Unemployed Workers' Movement will be capable of explaining to its members and all militant workers by which **methods** and in

which forms the day-to-day systematic work must be carried on among the entire mass of unemployed.

This work in social centres must be pursued in two directions:

(1) The N.U.W.M. must mobilise the unemployed, who are connected with social centres, for the struggle for their interests within the four walls of these centres. The unemployed should raise before the management of the centres concrete demands, such as: Committees only of unemployed; no forced labour; no task work for unemployed attending the centres. The demand should also be put forward, in accordance with the concrete conditions, for a reduction in the prices of food in the shops of the social service centres, the placing of halls and sport grounds at the disposal of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement in those cases in which the latter has no possibility of utilising other halls and grounds, the cessation of military drilling and against all kinds of organisations of a military type within the centres, such as "labour corps," etc. It is thus, on concrete facts which show the contradiction in the interests between the unemployed masses on the one side and the capitalists and clergymen who are organising the social centres, on the other, that the unemployed will convince themselves of the reactionary policy of these "charity mongers," and of the correctness of the path indicated by the N.U.W.M.

(2) The N.U.W.M. must clearly remember that the unemployed who visit the social centres are by no means lost for the class struggle, that they can and should be drawn into the class-front of the proletariat in the process of defending their interests. This is why no action organised by the N.U.W.M., no demonstration, no strike pickets, no unemployed committees should proceed without the participation of the unemployed connected with the social service centres.

At the same time we must more energetically expose the social centres. The masses must be mobilised with the object of hindering the bourgeoisie from opening new centres and opposing these centres by the clubs and sports grounds organised by the workers themselves and functioning under their direct control, so as to put a stop to the activity of these centres of bourgeois fascist influence on the working masses. The unemployed and employed workers must wrest from the town councils necessary funds for the organisation of clubs, sports grounds, bands, etc. It is only through such manifold work that we will make clear to the workers that the social centres are preparing the ground for wide schemes of the bourgeoisie for forced labour for the unemployed and that the social centres are a base of fascism among the more backward working masses.

The N.U.W.M. must devote no less attention to the unemployed associations. The labourists, through these associations, are striving to split the ranks of the unemployed masses, to undermine their fighting capacity, and weaken the influence of the N.U.W.M. But every member of the N.U.W.M. must remember that the rank-and-file worker, who belongs to a reformist unemployed association, has common class interests with him and can and must be drawn into the struggle in defence of these interests.

The task of drawing the members of the reformist associations into the militant front of the unemployed will be successfully solved provided the N.U.W.M. will pursue the same activities in these associations as in the Social Centres, i.e., work within the associations and work for drawing their members into the united front of the unemployed masses. The N.U.W.M. must organise the militant workers within these associations into groups which should carry out systematically day-to-day work among the members of the associations. At the same time, the N.U.W.M. should persistently pursue the tactics of the united front in relation to these associations and draw them and their members into united front activities against the Means Test, against the threatening new offensive on the living conditions of the unemployed masses, against compulsory labour, for a 40-hour working week, without a reduction in wages, etc.

The fear of working among the members of the reformist organisations and of establishing contact with the workers' organisations, headed by the reformists, has not yet been overcome in the ranks of the N.U.W.M. Voices are still to be heard against drawing representatives of the trade unions into the broad unemployed councils, for the alleged reason that the participation of trade unions in these councils will create a menace for the revolutionary activity of the unemployed councils. Is such a position correct? It is undoubtedly not. The N.U.W.M. must first and foremost have in view that its fundamental task is to establish contact with the

entire mass of workers so as to spread among them the revolutionary influence and so as to draw them into the class struggle for their interests. This task cannot be accomplished outside and apart from the work within mass organisations, such as the trade unions are, which still have a great influence on the masses of workers. This is why we must encourage in every way and try to secure, that both the representatives elected from the unemployed associations and from the trade unions, trades councils, etc., should be drawn into the broad unemployed councils. It does not, of course, follow from this that the unemployed councils must be a sort of superstructure that unites all the trade unions and nothing more. The unemployed council must in the first place, be an organ that represents the entire mass of unemployed and must consist of representatives of the unemployed. At the same time, it should include also the representatives of the organised workers so that it may extend the struggle for the interests of the unemployed to the employed workers also, so as to utilise trade union channels for winning the whole mass of workers for the struggle of the unemployed. The task of the unemployed councils is to secure the election of representatives of the trade unions at large meetings of T.U. members, so that the work of these representatives be placed under the constant control of the members who elected them. In the case of differences of opinion between the members of the unemployed councils, the questions in dispute should be placed before the working masses for their consideration. The decision of the workers themselves must be binding upon the entire unemployed council.

The Congress of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement has not yet removed the confusion which still exists on the question of the structure of the unemployed councils. Is it advisable to form unemployed councils from special commissions formed for the struggle for the school feeding of children, or work among the women, or trade union work, etc.? Such a structure is, as a rule, not advisable. The formation of a council from commissions elected for special work reduces its authority and its competence. At the same time such a structure scatters our forces and hinders the formation at every Labour Exchange, in every working class area and street, etc., of a competent organ responsible for the entire work in a particular area.

On the basis of international experience, it must be recognised that the following structure of the unemployed councils will best answer the purpose. Unemployed committees for the direction of the entire work should be formed at the Labour Exchanges, the Public Assistance Committees and in working class districts. The representatives of these committees form a Central Council for the entire city, and for a whole district, in the larger centres. The formation of the committees should take place in the process of the struggle for one demand of the unemployed or another, such as the demand against evictions; for a rise in the rates of relief paid by the Public Assistance Committee, etc. As the work of these committees develops they must pass over from specific demands to general demands and problems confronting the working mass.

The auxiliary commissions for the organisation of activities inside the unions, the struggle against evictions; the women's commissions, etc., should be formed in the process of the development of the work. Militant workers who have won their authority in the masses, must be placed at the head of the committees and unemployed councils as well as the individual commissions. The election of N.U.W.M. militants to the leading organs will depend upon the active work of the N.U.W.M. among the unemployed. By proving in the practice of its daily work that it is the organiser and leader of the unemployed masses, the N.U.W.M. will secure the confidence of the unemployed as their leader in their struggles.

Does the wide development of work around the Unemployed Council mean that the N.U.W.M. as a leading factor in the organisation of the entire struggle of the unemployed has become less important? Of course not. It is precisely the work among the masses of unemployed that will bring new life into the organisations of the N.U.W.M. that will bring new content into the work of the N.U.W.M. branches. The N.U.W.M. is the organiser of the entire work among the unemployed masses. But this requires, in the first place, the organisation of the work of the N.U.W.M. itself, systematic meetings of its members for the discussion of questions

of the tactics and organisation of its work, it requires that the entire membership of the N.U.W.M. should be drawn into active responsible work. The formation of the councils will base the N.U.W.M. branches on a mass foundation and will destroy their sectarian nature. The tremendous tasks with which the N.U.W.M. is faced, require also a change in methods of the work of the N.U.W.M. branch committees. An end must be made to the situation when a small group of two or three comrades stand at the head of a branch and when the departure of one comrade stops its entire work. The N.U.W.M. branches must have a collective leadership. Active workers, enjoying popularity and confidence among the unemployed masses should be drawn into the leadership of the branches. The leadership must report systematically to the masses of members of their branches, they must submit their plans to the masses for discussion and should report upon their work to their members. The stagnation in the N.U.W.M. membership, a stagnation which frequently takes place despite a whole series of successful campaigns, carried through by the N.U.W.M.—such stagnation is to be explained by the absence of an inner life in the N.U.W.M. branches, by the absence of collective leadership, by insufficient day-to-day mass activities of the N.U.W.M. branches.

The N.U.W.M. must, in the whole of its work, start from the recognition of the closest community of interests between the unemployed and employed workers. During the course of the last month, the N.U.W.M. rendered invaluable aid to strikers in a number of strikes: the railwaymen's strike in Ireland, the strike in the Hope factory in Birmingham, in the Venesta factory (London). This support of the struggle of the employed workers by the unemployed must be developed in every way. Not a single strike without the active support of the unemployed—such must be the line of the N.U.W.M. At the same time much greater attention must be devoted to bringing the questions, that interest both the unemployed and employed workers, into the trade unions, into the very midst of the employed workers. Such questions as the struggle for a 7-hour day in the mining industry, the struggle against the more-loom system in the weaving industry, the struggle against overtime work in the metal industry and the struggle for a 40-hour week in the engineering and shipbuilding industries—such questions interest equally the employed workers and the unemployed. We must try and secure that the employed workers organise a concrete struggle for these demands, that they should pass over from resolutions protesting against the Means Test, and demanding a 6-hour day in the mining industry without a reduction in pay, etc.—to concrete actions such as demonstrations, meetings, strikes, etc.

The close linking up of the struggle of the employed workers and the unemployed requires systematic day-to-day activities of the unemployed in the trade unions. The unemployed must be organised according to the individual branches of industry and unions, they must meet systematically for a discussion of their work in the trade unions, they must establish contact with the opposition elements, and, in the first place, with the rank and file movements, such as the Busmen's Rank and File Movement, the Railwaymen's Vigilance Movement, etc.

The trade union work of the N.U.W.M. members must develop simultaneously with their activities in the factory. The N.U.W.M. must secure that all its members, and the unemployed as a whole, should not lose touch with the factories, should continue to maintain contact with their late colleagues in the factories, that they should be represented in all sorts of united front committees in the given factories. The N.U.W.M. will in this way help to intensify the revolutionary activities in the factories and to extend the revolutionary cadres in the factories and works.

By persistently and systematically carrying out the lines brought forward by the delegates of the N.U.W.M. Congress, the lines on the work among the entire mass of unemployed on the basis of broad unemployed councils, undeviating work for the establishment of the united front of the militant unemployed by the unemployed belonging to the reformist and bourgeois organisations—it is this that will turn the N.U.W.M. into a real leader and organiser of the unemployed masses and will add to the class army of the proletariat, new hundreds of thousands of champions for the cause of the working class.

Single copies (Britain only), 2d. Subscription rates: Great Britain, six shillings half a year; U.S.A., Canada, five dollars a year. Other places abroad, £1 a year.

Published by UNTHANKS BOOKSHOP, 31, Dudden Hill Lane, London, N.W.10, and Printed by THE UTOPIA PRESS, LTD. (T.U.), 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.2.