

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 14 No. 33

PRESS

8th June, 1934

CORRESPONDENCE

CONTENTS

Politics		The Labour Movement	
Speech of Comrade Litvinov in the General Commission of the "Disarmament" Conference	866	Kostas Grypos: The Strike of the Greek Seamen	883
"Pravda" on Comrade Litvinov's Speech	869	The White Terror	
L. M.: The Geneva Negotiations	870	Gabriel Peri: The Workers' Delegation in Indo-China	884
Lam-Aliff: The War for Imperialist Domination in Arabia	871	Fight against Fascism and Imperialist War	
		Karl Braun: Important Conferences of the Front against Imperialist War and Fascism in Czechoslovakia	886
Germany		Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union	
The Collapse of the Transfer Conference	872	E. A.: The Problems of Machine-Tool Construction in the Soviet Union	887
Growing Antagonisms in the German Fascist Camp	873	Against Counter-Revolutionary Social Democracy	
The "Labour Battle" against the Workers	873	J. Berlioz: The Socialist Party of France in a State of Disintegration	888
Millions of Workers against Hitler!	874	In the International	
W. Mueller: Leninist Tactics in the Saar Question	875	M. Thorez: The C.P. of France in the Struggle for the United Front	891
Germain Gautier: The International Campaign for the Release of Thaelmann	876	Twenty Years Ago	
		The Imperialist Antagonisms before the World War	889
India			
L. M.: The Situation in India	878		
The Agrarian Problem in India	879		

Litvinov's Warning

When the so-called disarmament conference met two and a half years ago at a time when the guns were already going off in Manchuria and before Shanghai, and the leader of the delegation of the Soviet Union, Comrade Litvinov, made the urgent proposal that in order to prevent war the conference should immediately begin with real disarmament, the Turkish delegation declared that war was not a possibility at all for the moment and that history would give the nations a generation in which to solve the question of peace guarantees. Even then the words of peace fitted ill to the warlike acts which were being committed, although at that time the disturbances were a long way away from Geneva.

Since then the situation has fundamentally changed. There is no more the same talk of peace. No matter from what side, no one is prepared to say to-day that humanity still has a generation in which to solve the peace problem. We are, in fact, on the eve of a new imperialist slaughter. This is the frank admission of all those who really know what the situation is. The question is no longer, will war break out, but where will it break out next?

This fact shows the tremendous change which has taken place during the last two and a half years. Comrade Litvinov practically pointed out the warmongers. A party which can obtain power only by whipping up nationalist and chauvinist feelings and which pursues a reckless social demagoguery, which was perfectly well aware that it had no intention of carrying out any of its promises, that it can maintain itself for a time solely by chauvinist incitement, such a party knows clearly that there is one chance open to it and one chance only, namely, war. And therefore it is doing everything possible to prepare for it.

Comrade Litvinov declared:—

"In various countries governments have changed, parties in power have changed, the ideology of parties and governments has changed and their methods of dealing with international questions have changed. In spite of the adoption

by all States, in virtue of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, of an international undertaking to renounce war as an instrument of national policy, we have witnessed the method of furthering national policy precisely by the development of warlike activities on the territory of neighbouring States. Some States which are not yet in possession of sufficient forces to carry out such a policy confine themselves for the time being to verbal and printed propaganda of the idea of expansion and the seizure of other people's lands by force of arms."

As not all countries have an interest in war, including the majority of those countries which are members of the League of Nations, as, in fact, they have every interest in avoiding war, Comrade Litvinov made the following proposal:—

"I propose that this conference be transformed into a permanent body concerned to preserve by every possible means the security of all States and safeguard universal peace. In other words, I propose that this conference be transformed into a permanent and regularly assembling Conference of Peace. Hitherto peace conferences have been held on the termination of wars and have had as their object the division of the spoils of war, the imposition on the vanquished of painful and degrading conditions, and the redistribution of territories, the refashioning of States. But the conference which I have in mind should sit for the prevention of war and its terrible consequences. It should work out, extend and perfect the measures for strengthening security, it should give a timely response to warnings of impending danger of war and to appeals for aid, to SOS from threatened States and it should afford the latter timely aid within its power, whether such be moral, economic, financial or otherwise."

Comrade Litvinov expressed regret that the peoples had not exercised sufficient pressure on their governments in order to support the proposals of the Soviet delegation. Had they done so, then quite a number of things would never have happened.

This time pressure should be exerted and any form in which it is exercised would be a good one. But the best and most effective form is that of mass action, an intensified anti-war campaign for which we must mobilise the broadest masses of the toilers: workers, clerical employees, peasants, artisans, small traders, and above all the women, in fact those who will be the first victims of the new slaughter. This tremendous anti-war action must embrace all capitalist countries, including those countries which at the moment have no interest in war, for the greater the pressure exercised the greater will be their objection to war and the more they will be prepared to support the Soviet Union in its struggle against the warmongers.

In the factories, at the labour exchanges, in the streets the masses must be warned that a new world slaughter is being prepared, a war which will be much more terrible and will demand many more victims than the last one. We must call upon the masses to close their ranks in opposition to this fearful crime. Meetings in the towns and villages, district and national conferences and world congresses must strengthen the campaign against war. And our words must be supported by actions: demonstrations, the boycott of munition and other war transports, temporary strikes supported by millions and millions of workers. All that will be the best support we can give the Soviet Union for its peace proposals in Geneva.

In the same Geneva Week the Executive Committee of the Second (Labour and Socialist) International met in Brussels. The meeting was a private one, but the report intended for public consumption betrayed enough of the dangerous questions which were discussed. The collapse of the social democracy in Germany and Austria has affected their nerves. The revenue of the Second International is declining rapidly to such an extent, in fact that a

cheaper country has to be found for the head office. The Second International gives fascism a whole epoch, and should fascism extend and develop, then a new middle age will open up (as is known, the Middle Ages cover a period of not less than a thousand years). In their own words:—

“If fascism succeeds in winning further gains then it will throw civilisation back as the barbarian invasions once did.”

If that is true then certainly any struggle against fascism is hopeless. Fascism, which is already writhing in its difficulties, may be thankful to the gentlemen of the Second International, for it would not be possible to render it greater assistance than the latter body does with its prophecies. The report given to the public does not reveal whether the session even mentioned the danger of war, but one decision they did adopt, namely, to forbid their followers to take any part in the anti-war campaign of the Amsterdam Committee and in particular in the world anti-war congress of the women. The gentlemen succeeded in preventing a proletarian united front against fascism in Germany and now they want to prevent a proletarian united front against war. The Second International, which has lived in shame since the 4th August, 1914, is now prepared to go under in shame. At least we have no wish to prevent that; let it go under, but it must not drag the proletariat with it. We must win the masses of the social-democratic workers for a united struggle against fascism and war. Only what falls can be trodden under foot, and this is true of both the Second International and of fascism.

The working masses must live and they will live. They are joining the anti-fascist and anti-war front in increasing numbers.

They are advancing into the struggle. They are advancing to victory!

Politics

Speech of Comrade Litvinov in the General Commission of the “Disarmament Conference”

There are two questions before the present session of the General Commission. In the first place, it has to state whether the direct purpose of the Conference—namely, to solve the problem of disarmament—can be achieved or not, and in the latter event to establish the causes of failure. I may be permitted to doubt whether all the delegations represented at the Commission can arrive at a common opinion as to the causes of failure, but in my view it would be necessary and very valuable for individual delegations, at any rate, to make their observations on this subject.

The second question, which will probably give greater concern to the Commission, is that of the fate of the Disarmament Conference itself. We shall have to decide whether it should continue at all, and if so for what purpose, or whether the Conference should voluntarily pass out of existence.

Without wishing to anticipate the discussion, I will permit myself here and now to start my remarks from the premise that it will be impossible at present to find a solution of the problem of disarmament, on account of the irreconcilable differences which have come to light. For the sake of brevity I will enumerate only the fundamental differences. From the very beginning of the work, not only of the Conference itself but also of the Preparatory Commission, two basic tendencies made their appearance—one represented by the Soviet delegation, and the other by nearly all the other delegations. The Soviet delegation refused to consider disarmament as an independent or self-sufficient objective, serving merely economic, budgetary, propagandist or other ends. We desired to see in disarmament the most effective means for abolishing the institution of war, and the concrete realisation of that idea which later became the foundation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, accepted by every State in the world, for the renunciation of war as an instrument for the settlement of international differences. We considered and still consider that a genuine renunciation of war cannot be effective without a complete renunciation of armaments, and that so long as armaments exist peace cannot be ensured; that only one kind of peace is possible—a disarmed peace—and that an armed peace is only an armistice, an interval between wars, the sanctioning of war in

principle and de facto, and the negation of the principle embodied in the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

The Soviet delegation therefore began by proposing total universal disarmament. The acceptance of this proposal would have eliminated beforehand the numerous differences which arose at the Conference on the subject of dividing weapons into defensive and offensive, on the criteria of security, on various formulæ for reduction of armaments, on equality in armaments and particularly on the subject of control, etc. Nothing is easier than to control the complete absence of armaments, and nothing more difficult than to ascertain the reduction or limitation of armaments.

The adoption of the Soviet proposal, I may add, might have prevented a number of regrettable political events which have occurred since that time in various countries, with the rising tide of nationalism, jingoism and militarism, and might have left its mark on the international economic situation as well. We made our proposal at a time when the so-called pacifist ideology was in full bloom, and leading many to believe that war was impossible, at all events in the immediate future. The Soviet delegation, however, even then foresaw and foretold that the coming of an era of new wars was inevitable and close at hand, and it therefore insisted on the most speedy adoption of radical measures to avert those dangers. I believe that if the peoples of the world, who at that time had more influence over the policy of their governments than they have to-day, had seen as clearly beforehand the development of international political life, they would not have allowed the Conference to get away so easily from the Soviet proposal for general disarmament.

Unfortunately, our proposal aroused the opposition of all the other delegations, with the exception if I well remember of the Turkish, and the basis of their opposition was the view that the question of war and peace was not pressing, and that history had placed decades at our disposal, in which the problem of the guarantees of peace might be solved by easy stages and homeopathic doses.

We are convinced as before, nay, still more firmly than before, that if the peoples—after possibly a further painful, disastrous

experience—return once again to the idea of seeking out international methods for averting wars by means of disarmament, they cannot fail to recall the **Soviet proposal for general disarmament, and this time take it up with all seriousness, since this guarantee for peace is the most effective of all while the present social and economic system is maintained in the non-Soviet States.**

The difference of principle just mentioned by me could not, however, bring the work of the Conference to a standstill. The Soviet delegation had not put forward its proposals in the form of an ultimatum, and declared its readiness to co-operate with the other delegations also in working out a system for the partial reduction of armaments. But it was just at this point that real difficulties began. While the Soviet delegation declared its readiness to accept any measures of reduction applying to any forms of armaments, differences arose among the other delegations. The primary conflict was whether to reduce existing armaments, or to limit them to the present level. **Although it seemed at one time that this dispute had been settled by a vote of the Conference in favour of the reduction of armaments, we now have before us once again a proposal only for their limitation.**

As to the reduction of armaments, we have no unanimity up to this day as to the degree, the principles or the criteria of such a reduction. There is no single opinion as to whether reduction should embrace all forms of armaments, by land, sea and air, or only some of those forms. A decision appeared at one moment to be approaching for the complete prohibition of aerial bombardment, from which there logically followed the necessity of abolishing the instruments of bombardment themselves. But here, too, we came up against a proposal for the maintenance of these instruments, but with a limitation of their activity to definite regions and particular objects—as though we could be satisfied with fixing destination-boards to our bombing planes, as they do to railway carriages, marking them "Ostend-Interlaken." The question of supervision is also in a far from satisfactory state. I shall abstain from enumerating the many other differences. It is sufficient to say that not on a single question raised at the Conference have we either concrete decisions or even general formulæ on which all the delegations have come to agreement.

I must add that in the meantime political events have not waited on the end of discussions at Geneva, and have pursued their course. In various countries governments have changed, parties in power have changed, the ideology of parties and governments has changed, and their methods of dealing with international questions have changed. In spite of the adoption by all States, in virtue of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, of an international undertaking to renounce war as an instrument of national policy, we have witnessed the method of furthering national policy precisely by the development of warlike activities on the territory of neighbouring States. Some States which as yet are not in possession of sufficient forces to carry out such a policy confine themselves for the time being to verbal and printed propaganda of the idea of expansion and the seizure of other people's land by force of arms. Can we be surprised that States which are interested in the maintenance of peace have seriously taken the alarm, and are displaying still greater hesitation than before on the question of disarmament?

Similarly the principle of equality in armaments, which had already been adopted by the Conference, has been seriously shaken. No one can object to equality when all States show the same active interest, even though it be in words and by adopting suitable international obligations, in the maintenance of peace. **But the question has now arisen, what is to be done with States whose rulers have quite openly sketched out a programme of conquest of foreign territories (of course by means of war, since no one voluntarily gives up his territory); and when the abstract principle of equality comes face to face with quite real perils involved in its application?**

I am not saying this in order to draw conclusions as to the equality or inequality of all States in respect of armaments. The Soviet delegation is not faced with this question, which arises from documents to which the Soviet Government was not a party. Furthermore, such a question when discussed in the sense of rearmament, cannot concern a confidence for disarmament or for the reduction of armaments. I only desired to point out the new atmosphere which has arisen as a result of certain political events, and which has considerably complicated the work of the Conference, involved as it was in sufficiently vast difficulties already.

And to-day, summing up more than two years' work of the Conference, we must openly say that the difficulties which made their appearance at the very dawn of its existence have not been allayed as time went on, but on the contrary proceeded crescendo, and brought us in the long run to a blind alley.

For, after all, what way out do we see ahead? There was no way out when the last session of the General Commission closed, and indeed it was closed because there was no way out. There were some who pinned their faith to the conversations which had begun within the narrow confines of a few States, but no agreement was arrived at even in that limited circle. At all events, we have before us no draft decision by all those who participated in those negotiations. And even if such an agreement had existed, it would be hardly likely to receive the endorsement of the vast majority of States which took no part in the negotiations I referred to. We know, too, of the statements made by some States—and those far from small, far from suffering from an excessive love of peace—to the effect that they will not accept any measure of reduction of armaments whatsoever. These statements alone are sufficient to register the complete failure of the Conference, so far as disarmament is concerned.

Delegations may perhaps be found here to suggest to us that we be satisfied with crumbs, so to speak—with measures which, though they have little in common with disarmament, were nevertheless touched upon at the Conference. For example, we might once again confirm what has already been adopted as an international obligation, such as the prohibition of chemical warfare; or we might again undertake not to increase armaments above the existing level. But who can believe that such obligations can really be universally fulfilled under present conditions, and that the fulfilment of such an obligation can be effectively supervised? **This being so, will it not be politically more honest and courageous to admit that international life, and particularly political events in some countries during recent years, have prevented the Conference from carrying out its direct task of drawing up a disarmament convention?**

I do not want to be misunderstood. The Soviet delegation has not altered its attitude to the cause of disarmament in the very least, and continues to attribute the greatest importance to that cause. We do not in any way propose to abandon the further discussion of the problem of disarmament. **Even less do we raise any objection to schemes of disarmament which may be put forward. On the contrary, we declare in advance our consent to any scheme of disarmament acceptable to the other States, and in particular to our nearest neighbours. Let anyone produce such a scheme likely to receive the support of all the delegations. But there is none. Neither our respected President nor the previous speaker gave any indication of a scheme of that kind. I have no reason to expect later speakers to introduce new schemes or new proposals, or that such proposals will meet with a better fate than those which were discussed already. We are therefore obliged to record that the futility of such a discussion on disarmament, in the absence of any proposals whatsoever which have a chance of securing universal acceptance, has been demonstrated. After all, we cannot engage in discussion for the sake of discussion, or offer up prayers for disarmament. We don't want to close our eyes to facts, however unpleasant they may be, and we draw the inevitable conclusions from the situation which has been created.**

From what I have said, it would seem logically to follow that the Conference itself should be closed down. This would be very well, if the question were to be approached only from the formal or pedantic point of view, taking into account merely the title of the Conference. But the Soviet delegation, as I have already mentioned, continues to have in mind a wider conception of the Conference, as intended by means of disarmament to bring into being one of the guarantees of world peace. **Consequently the question is not of disarmament itself, since that is only a means to an end, but of guaranteeing peace.** And since this is so, the question naturally arises, cannot the Conference feel its way towards other guarantees for peace or at any rate may it not increase the measure of security for at least those States which, cherishing no aggressive designs, are not interested in war, and which in the event of war may become only the objects of attack?

I may be asked, what guarantees have we that the Conference will be more unanimous on such questions than it was on the question of disarmament, and that the new activity of the

Conference will therefore be any more fruitful or successful? To this I will reply that in order to achieve any degree whatsoever of reduction in armaments, the unconditional agreement of nearly every State is essential, and that the whole cause may be frustrated by the disagreement of even one more or less important State, let alone one of the Great Powers. **But unanimity is not required to realise other measures of security. Of course the Conference must do everything in its power to induce every State to accede to these measures.** I hope that that will happen, and that consideration for their own interest will induce even States which do not sympathise with these measures not to exclude themselves from the general system set up. **But even if there should be dissident States, this should not by any means prevent the remainder from coming still more closely together to take steps which will strengthen their own security.**

Questions of security are far from unknown to the Conference. The Conference even created a special political commission for these questions. More than that, the Conference has already discussed these questions, without it is true carrying the discussion on to its conclusion. I will remind you in the first instance of the Soviet proposal for the definition of aggression, which has already been approved by one of the commissions of the Conference, and which has since been embodied in a number of international treaties. The further increase of the number of supporters of the Soviet definition of aggression would considerably facilitate the application of other proposals dealing with security which have been made at the Conference.

Finally, there may be made new proposals of a similar character, as, for example, proposals for sanctions of various kinds against an aggressor in the meaning of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. A graduated scale of such sanctions may be established, without pushing it to the point of military measures not acceptable to all States. Independently of a more or less universal or European pact, there might be concluded in addition separate regional pacts of mutual assistance, as proposed upon a former occasion by the French delegation. There is no question of military alliances, or of the division of States into mutually hostile camps, or still less of a policy of encirclement. **We must not create universal pacts which would exclude any State wishing to participate, or such regional pacts as would not admit all those interested in the security of the particular region concerned. In measures of security of this kind, the principle of equality of all States without exception cannot arouse any doubts or hesitation.**

If we proceed along these lines, the time and energy spent on the Conference will not have been lost, and we shall not return empty-handed to the peoples who sent us here. And who can say whether the reinforcement of security, and the effect which it will have on aggressively inclined governments, will not create conditions enabling us to take up once more the problem of disarmament with greater chances of success?

As you see, I do not by any means speak of security in contrast to disarmament. Nor do I propose to exclude disarmament from the programme of work of the Conference. Everything that bears upon a system of guarantees of peace, and consequently disarmament likewise, must receive the careful attention of the Conference. But every question ought to be raised when it has some chance of a satisfactory solution. To-day it may be security, to-morrow disarmament. I ask forgiveness for so frequently using the word, "security," which, in the eyes of so many of us, is an antagonist of disarmament. But I find no more suitable term to express that which is understood by the word "security."

But I am far from wishing to put a limit to the Conference, either of scope or of time. **I propose something much more, much wider, namely, the transformation of this Conference into a permanent body, concerned to preserve by every possible means the security of all States and safeguard universal peace. In other words, I propose that this Conference be transformed into a permanent and regularly assembling Conference of Peace.**

Hitherto peace conferences have mostly been called on the termination of wars, and have had as their object the division of the spoils of war, the imposition on the vanquished of painful and degrading conditions, the redistribution of territories, the re-fashioning of States. **But the Conference which I have in mind should sit for the prevention of war and its terrible consequences.**

It should work out, extend and perfect the measures for strengthening security, it should give a timely response to warnings of impending danger of war and to appeals for aid, to SOS from threatened States, and it should afford the latter timely aid within its power, whether such be moral, economic, financial or otherwise.

I can foresee objections pointing to the existence of the League of Nations, which is bound by Articles 12, 15, 16 and other of its Covenant to pursue the same objects as those to which I would like to see the work of this Conference directed. But, in the first place, the League of Nations has a multitude of tasks, it is occupied with a great deal of business, both great and small, it was created at a time when the peril of war seemed to many to be eliminated for years to come. To-day, when the peril of war stands before our very eyes, we might consider the creation of a special body with all its activity concentrated upon one objective—the preventing or the lessening of the danger of war. Secondly, the League of Nations is too straightly bound by its statutes, appeals to its authority, and the taking of decisions are too stringently regulated, while the tribune of the Conference might be made more accessible, more free, more responsive to the needs of the moment. Let the Conference continue to be considered an organ of the League, using the services of the League: let it be far from replacing the League, which will maintain its prerogatives in their entirety. I am fully aware of the difficulty of setting up a new international organisation entirely divorced from, or competing with, the League of Nations; and such a proposal is foreign to my intentions. **But, after all, the very summoning of this international Disarmament Conference proves that the framework of the League is inadequate for such great problems as disarmament, while my proposal treats of a still greater problem—the permanent safeguarding of peace.**

Ladies and gentlemen, I see no other alternative. The Disarmament Conference was called at a time when to many war seemed only a theoretical or an historical possibility. Can the Conference, must the Conference close down completely and disappear without a trace, can we peacefully disperse to our homes with the consciousness that we have not done our duty—just now of all times, when the peril of a most bloody war, or rather of a series of such wars, overhangs every continent and the whole of humanity? There are few States nowadays which can consider themselves removed from such a peril. It may affect some earlier, others later, but it is not to be escaped.

I know there are politicians whose sum-total of wisdom consists in beating out a track for this peril away from themselves, in the hope that, having selected one direction, the peril will never seek another. Vain hopes! History knows of no case in which imperialist States, being inclined to conquest and to the extension of their power, displayed affection for only one part of the globe—south, west, east or north. Consolidated in one direction, they hurled themselves with renewed and increased energy to new conquests in other directions, and most frequently in all directions. In face of such a danger, not a single State—if only in the interests of self-preservation—has the right to wash its hands of responsibility and refuse to participate in the common international cause of averting this terrible peril. **We shall thereby do a service not only to our own peoples, but to those peoples who, against their own will, and for purposes which are foreign to their desires, may be thrown into the furnace of sanguinary and adventurist experiments.**

The Soviet government looks back, not without pride, to those measures of security which on its initiative have been adopted during recent years in that part of Eastern Europe with which it is particularly concerned. By means of pacts for the definition of aggression, pacts of non-aggression and their prolongation for the maximum periods possible, the Soviet government has succeeded in strengthening mutual confidence with the vast majority of its neighbours, and in reinforcing their feeling of security. It has thought out a new variety of pacts and declarations which, I trust, will in the future find widespread practical application—namely, pacts and declarations by stronger States, which guarantee the independence of weaker States lying between them or close to them. Not on all occasions has the Soviet government succeeded in these its efforts, and not always has it found a response from those States which it approached. But even in such cases the Soviet proposals have done their service

to the cause of peace, by helping to bring out into the light of day the points at which a breach of the peace might be expected.

But the Soviet government is prepared to add its contribution to even wider measures for the safeguarding of universal peace. And the co-operation of the Soviet government in an international cause, or with any international organisation, brings with it the tremendous moral force of an increasingly powerful State of 170,000,000, which has finally broken with the common past—of military conquest, plunder and annexation—and during the sixteen years of its new existence has given abundant proof of its sincere devotion to peace.

The "Pravda" on Comrade Litvinov's Speech

Moscow, June 1, 1934.

The "Pravda," in its to-day's leading article, writes:—

In the speech of its chairman, Comrade Litvinov, the Soviet delegation drew the balance of the more than two years' activity of the Disarmament Conference. The Disarmament Conference has suffered a complete fiasco.

During the last two years the capitalist States, and in particular, the most aggressive of them, have achieved a great deal in the sphere of armaments. It is well known that Japan and Germany left the League of Nations in order to be able to increase without hindrance their armaments for imperialist robber actions. This fact dealt a heavy blow to the idea of disarmament. The armaments race is being continued with increasing rapidity and on a gigantic scale. The spread of militarism and chauvinism has assumed enormous proportions. War is openly preached in the fascist newspapers and periodicals of Germany and Japan, and is inspired by certain imperialist circles in Great Britain. The danger of a second imperialist war for a fresh division of the world is now greater than ever. It is therefore not surprising that the fate of the Conference is in question.

The responsibility for the failure of the Conference rests entirely with the capitalist world, especially with the imperialist States which are preparing a new war for the immediate future or are already waging war on land belonging to the suffering Chinese people. The Soviet Union was and remains the advocate of the most radical means of combating the danger of imperialist war. It was and remains the staunch advocate of general and total disarmament. For the working people of the Soviet Union there exists no doubt that "only one kind of peace is possible, namely peace based on disarmament, and that armed peace is only an armistice between two wars and is a sanctioning of war." However, as is known, all the Soviet proposals of total and partial disarmament were rejected at the Geneva Conference, and the capitalist States continued piling up armaments. Even now, when the failure of the Geneva Conference is obvious, the Soviet Union declares, through Litvinov, that it is prepared to discuss any disarmament scheme which would have any prospect of being accepted by all States. The Geneva negotiations, which are rich in experience, the Disarmament Conference, which has lasted for two years, show that there exists no hope that such a scheme would be accepted by all States. The appropriate conclusions must be drawn from the given state of affairs. If disarmament as a means of guaranteeing peace has suffered a failure, then, of course, other means must be sought, because for the Soviet Union the question is still that of guaranteeing peace. If the Geneva Conference is not in a position to consolidate general peace with such a means as disarmament, it by no means follows that the Geneva Conference must be buried, as the German fascists and the Japanese imperialists, as well as the bellicose groups of other capitalist States, propose. No, those who are interested in guaranteeing peace are bound to exert every effort in order that the Conference shall be able to "find other guarantees of peace, or at least to strengthen the degree of security of those States which have no aggressive designs, are not interested in war, and which in case of war might therefore merely become objects of aggression."

The Conference renders necessary a new concrete and effective fighting programme for the consolidation of peace. Litvinov set forth this programme in his speech. In putting forward its proposals the Soviet delegation took into account the real circumstances. The danger of a war and an attack on the Soviet Union is arising out of the sharpening of the imperialist antagonisms. These antagonisms have also led to a split in the anti-Soviet camp. The capitalist world to-day consists of countries which are actively

striving for war and are preparing to attack the Soviet Union. It consists of countries which, although they do not wish to be drawn into war, are in fact preparing the way for war by encouraging and spurring on the war-mongers. Finally, the capitalist world consists of countries which at present are not interested in war, and wish to avoid it and therefore are prepared to work with those who are interested in maintaining peace. This situation permits efforts to be made to unite together practically a majority of States for guaranteeing universal peace with new means.

The capitalist States which rejected the projects brought forward by the Soviet Union for total or partial disarmament, were acting in accordance with their class interests. Here two worlds and the policy of two classes come into collision. This or that capitalist State, in concluding with the Soviet Union non-aggression agreements or agreements regarding the definition of what constitutes aggression, likewise acted in its class interests. But here the antagonisms between the imperialist countries themselves were at work. Very many capitalist countries which rejected the Soviet Union's disarmament proposals, and thereby predetermined the failure of the Geneva Conference in its first stage, were compelled to draw nearer to the Soviet Union in one way or another, the more so as they themselves were threatened with danger and they could not ignore such a powerful factor for peace as our country constitutes. Therefore there exists every possibility of assuming an effective guarantee even if this or that State does not agree to it. "This would by no means prevent the others from coming even closer together in order to carry out the measures which strengthen their own security." (Litvinov.)

Litvinov proposed a number of such measures. The first was the acceptance of the Soviet definition of aggression; secondly, this or that sanction against violators of peace; and thirdly, to conclude regional pacts embracing one or another group of countries. At the same time, however, the Soviet delegation proposed something more than individual measures and individual guarantees. The delegation proposed to continue the Conference and to convert it into a permanent body doing everything possible to protect the security of all States, to protect universal peace. Up to now, declared Litvinov, peace conferences have been held primarily after a war and had the object of imposing upon the vanquished heavy and humiliating conditions, redivision of territories by the participants in the spoils of war. They thus sowed the seed of new war. "The Conference which I have in mind," said Litvinov, "is to be created in order to prevent war. It is to work out, broaden and perfect methods of strengthening security, to respond in time to warnings of impending war dangers, to call for aid from States which are threatened, and to render the latter effective aid, whether moral, economic, financial or any other." The programme of struggle for peace submitted by the Soviet delegation is practical, and will undoubtedly call forth a big response from the working masses not only in the Soviet Union but in the whole world.

The danger of war threatens the whole of toiling humanity. There is no country which can consider itself free from danger. The ruling class of England and of some countries which lie on the threshold of Eastern Europe must not cherish any illusions that they will succeed in diverting war in the direction desired by them. The plans and designs of marauders will not be realised. And these countries can again find themselves in a very unenviable situation. The speech of the British Foreign Minister Sir John Simon is a splendid illustration of the situation, described by Litvinov. Sir John Simon's oratorical efforts cannot conceal the fact that he played the part of advocate of German fascism and opposed Litvinov's proposals. M. Barthou's speech exposed with sufficient clearness the meaning of the speech of Sir John Simon, who openly defended the policy of destroying all peace guarantees and facilitated the policy of the war-mongers and their criminal work. Simon's speech shows that there are forces which are driving humanity to a new disaster.

The Soviet Union has spoken its word. It has submitted its programme for strengthening peace and for security against war-inciters. This programme accords with the interests of the whole of toiling humanity; it is directed against the intentions of the fascist oppressors and militarist cliques. We do not doubt that this programme will meet with the complete approval of the broad masses of people all over the world and will be supported by the power and authority of the proletarian fatherland, whose faithful sons are standing guard over peace and security.

The Geneva Negotiations

By L. M.

The dance on the edge of the volcano is in full swing. The General Commission of the "Disarmament" Conference is sitting in Geneva. What are the most important results of this conference? What changes have taken place in the relations of the imperialists to each other and in their relations to the Soviet Union as indicated by the discussions in Geneva?

Just those imperialist Powers which are working most energetically for a new imperialist war and above all for a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union were conspicuous by their absence from the deliberations. Japan and Germany are no longer members of the League of Nations. Germany is taking no part in the conference, and although the Japanese representative has not yet been recalled, Japan also can be regarded as absent for all practical purposes.

The absent warmongers—the German fascists and the military-fascist clique in Japan—have, however, a representative in Geneva. His name is **Sir John Simon**, and he is the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of His Majesty George V. This time Simon appeared in the role of advocate for German fascism and delivered a speech on behalf of German rearmament. His speech was not altogether a success. It is generally known that there are fierce disputes in the camp of the British bourgeoisie and in the Cabinet of the so-called national government, not concerning the principles of foreign policy, but concerning tactics. MacDonald wants to get rid of Simon as Foreign Minister; as he could not succeed in doing this, Anthony Eden was appointed **Lord Privy Seal** at his side. It is doubtful whether Simon's speech in Geneva has strengthened his position in the British Cabinet. At the moment he is engaged in preparing an understanding between Japan and the United States in the naval problem in order to guarantee Japan freedom of action against the Soviet Union. In Geneva he fought for German rearmament in order to give German fascism freedom of action against the Soviet Union. Since the accession of Hitler to power in Germany one of the most important changes which have taken place in world politics is that France has abandoned its role as leader and organiser of the anti-Soviet bloc. For the moment the most important question of French foreign policy is Germany, but naturally this does not mean that there are no supporters of the policy of an understanding with Germany amongst the "Lefts" around Daladier and amongst the Rights around Yberragaray. As a result of the French retirement, Great Britain has taken over the role of leader in the anti-Soviet bloc. The fact that German rearmament threatens and undermines the military hegemony of France on the continent is a supplementary advantage from the point of view of British imperialism. After the world war France became too strong on the continent, and the traditional policy pursued by Great Britain, the "Balance of Power," will not brook a too strong military Power on the continent.

But Great Britain has other fears and "**The Times**" admits them very plainly:—

It would appear that France reckons that the Hitler regime will not last much longer, but, even assuming that this is correct, is it so certain that the ensuing regime in Germany—which can be only either national socialist or Communist—will be any better from the standpoint of France and Europe?"

British imperialism is not only anxious to support Hitler against the Soviet Union and against France, but it also wants to support him against German Communism, and for that reason Simon pleads in favour of German rearmament.

More security guarantees for France? British imperialism is very far from wanting that. Lord Lothian has openly admitted the reasons. If Great Britain were involved in a European war it might happen that the British dominions would refuse to come in. It might also happen that a war would take place between Great Britain and the United States in the question of the freedom of the seas. It might happen that the dominions and the colonies within the range of Japan would be threatened and seek safety in the arms of the United States. Lots of unpleasant things of that sort might happen, and therefore Great Britain rejected any idea of an alliance with France. The Locarno Treaty is a scrap of paper and the chief aim of British imperialism is to organise the anti-Soviet bloc. Hitler Germany is the

most important factor in this bloc in Europe, as Japan is the most important factor in the Far East. The most important changes in world politics since Hitler's accession to power are: (1) that Germany has abandoned the policy of the Rapallo Treaty and replaced it by Rosenberg's drive against the East; and (2) that Japan in its preparations for war against the Soviet Union is working jointly with Germany.

France has no interest in any re-division of the world. French imperialism defends the Versailles division of the world. A number of small States which would have nothing to gain in a new world war and everything to lose, are on the side of France in this question. Both Greece and Turkey, the countries of the Little Entente and the members of the new Balkan Pact (including Rumania and Yugoslavia, which are also members of the Little Entente) second France. The Polish Foreign Minister, Beck, did not support the French security thesis and has remained silent on all important questions. As Germany is interested in a re-division of the world, as France is in favour of the maintenance of the Versailles Treaty and as Great Britain supports German rearmament, Barthou's position was clear.

That was not the surprising part of Barthou's speech that he spoke sharply against Hitler Germany, but that he spoke with equal sharpness against Great Britain. His speech revealed the whole depth of the Anglo-French contradictions. No doubt attempts will be made to patch up the Anglo-French friendship again with diplomatic demonstrations and breakfasts, but Barthou's speech has shown that the Tardieu group has won the upper hand in the policies of the French Cabinet and this group has been well aware for many years that in case of war Great Britain would not be a reliable ally of France.

Litvinov continued the struggle of the Soviet Union for peace. His speech and his proposals were nothing but an attempt to draw together all those forces which are still interested in the maintenance of peace.

Formally speaking, the situation of the Disarmament Conference is: There is the Litvinov proposal for regional agreements and to turn the conference into a permanent peace organ. There is the British proposal to outlaw chemical warfare, to make public military budgets and to create a permanent disarmament commission; the last proposal being in effect a funeral for the Disarmament Conference. In the name of those States which were neutral during the world war, Sweden has made a proposal which in effect is a galvanisation of the old MacDonald plan. The Turkish Foreign Minister then made a proposal which united the proposals of Simon and Litvinov. Apparently France and the Little Entente are prepared to support the Turkish proposal. The office of the Disarmament Conference is to draw up a compromise proposal embracing all these proposals. What attitude Great Britain and Italy will take up is not clear.

The Geneva negotiations have shown that those bourgeois States which are interested in the maintenance of peace are prepared to work together with the Soviet Union. There has been a certain rapprochement between France and the Soviet Union and between the Little Entente and the Soviet Union. The governments of Germany and Japan are not exactly pleased with this development. On this basis the question of League membership for the Soviet Union arises.

Lenin already answered the question of whether it is permissible for the foreign policy of a proletarian State to co-operate with capitalist States with a view to maintaining peace, when he declared that the Soviet Union remaining true to the principles of Soviet policy might even enter into military co-operation with bourgeois States if the interests of the Soviet Union demanded it.

In the Saar question a compromise was reached. After indulging in the usual torrent of swollen phrases, Hitler Germany swallowed most of the demands of the French government. However, no one doubts that the so-called guarantees of freedom of voting during the plebiscite are no guarantees at all, that the German Front will continue its campaign of terror in the Saar, and that the Hitler government regards the "guarantees" as being worth no more than the paper they are written on. No one doubts the fact that under the bayonets of the Saar police there can be no free voting, that the plebiscite will have nothing to do with a real self-determination of the people. The question of strengthening the Saar police has been left open, but the date of the plebis-

cite was fixed for January 13, 1935. Naturally the Nazis will hail this as a victory.

The Saar district remains a battlefield between French and German imperialism for the Saar coal, but at the same time it is a battlefield between the proletariat and fascism. The anti-fascists in the Saar have taken on the task of defeating Hitler in the Saar, but this is possible only if they actively continue their struggle for the freedom of meeting, the freedom of organisation, the right to strike and to demonstrate, the right of asylum, etc., against French mining capital, against Roechling, against the terrorism of the German Front and against the reactionary measures of the League of Nations Commission.

The War for Imperialist Domination in Arabia

By Lam-Aliff

Serious events are taking place on the Arabian Peninsula, between the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, which separates Asia from Africa. Two peoples, both of whom are of Arab nationality, have been at war with each other for a year. One inhabits Nejd and Hejas, with the sacred Mohamedan towns of Mecca and Medina, and the other inhabits Yemen, the richest district of Arabia, the "earthly paradise" of the Koran. Nejd and Hejas are ruled by King Abd El Aziz Ibn Saud, the spiritual leader of the Mussulman sect known by the name of "Ahuwan" (brothers) or "Wahabits," after the name of their founder, Wahib. Yemen is under the rule of the Imam Jahia Ben Hamid, who belongs to the first of the two sects into which the world of Islam is divided: Sunnits and Schiits.

Those who wish to absolve themselves of responsibility for the events taking place in Arabia maintain that they are due to religious rivalry. Others attempt to explain them as being due to the personal ambitions of the two oriental despots. Without denying the existence of these factors, we assert that they are not the causes of the war. Another factor must be mentioned: the economic, and therefore decisive, factor, namely the interest which the population of Nejd, a poor and almost desert area, might have in conquering the rich and fertile territory of Yemen.

There is no doubt that the imperialists are exploiting this factor. It would, however, be a mistake to look for the causes of the war in Arabia in the interests of its population. For in Arabia, as in all colonial countries, the interests of the imperialists are the dominating interests.

India is the richest and most important colony of the British Empire. The policy of Great Britain in the Near East, and before all in Arabia, aims in the first place at securing the routes to India. Arabia, owing to its geographical situation, commands the sea and air routes to India.

If one also takes into account the oil deposits and other natural wealth of the peninsula one will easily understand that British imperialism has every reason to endeavour to bring Arabia under its domination.

In 1916 Great Britain induced the Arabian tribes to engage in a "holy war" against Turkey for the independence of Arabia. This revolt was headed by the sheriff of Mecca, Hussein El Haschimi, to whom Great Britain promised the throne of united Arabia and the Califate of Islam. This, however, did not prevent Great Britain from handing over Palestine to the Zionists and dividing the Arabian Peninsula into several emirates.

In view of the dissatisfaction of King Hussein, which was to be attributed chiefly to the pressure exerted by the masses who were disappointed in regard to the promises made to them, the British imperialists incited Ibn Saud (at the time Emir of Hejas) against King Hussein, whom he dethroned and in 1924 banished to Cyprus, where in the meantime he died.

Later on differences arose between Great Britain and Ibn Saud, who refused to sign the treaty submitted to him by the British Ambassador, Sir Gilbert Clayton. And then, as if by the touch of a magic wand, a revolt broke out in Hejas, led by the Sheik Ibn Reffad against Ibn Saud. Serious rivalries arose between Iraq, which at that time was a mandated territory administered by Great Britain and Hejas. Guerilla warfare broke out on the frontier between Hejas and Transjordan, which is likewise a mandatory State of Great Britain. At the same time Egypt, which is controlled by Great Britain, boycotted the pilgrimages to Mecca, which did serious harm to Hejas, which lives to a great extent on the pilgrims. This state of affairs lasted until 1929, at which time Ibn Saud again entered into negotiations with Great Britain, and was later induced to sign the treaty which he had rejected.

Step by step Great Britain occupied Aqaba, Oman, Aden and Basra and brought them under its direct rule. It converted them into important fortresses. In this way, at the moment when the conflict between Yemen and Hejas broke out, there were on the Arabian Peninsula only two kingdoms—that of Ibn Saud and that of Imam Jahia—which had preserved a semblance of independence. **The war between these two countries has its origin in the intentions of British imperialism to conquer Arabia completely.**

Opposite Yemen, on the coast of Africa, on the other side of the Red Sea, is situated the Italian colony of Eritrea. The fascist State, which is seeking a way out of its insoluble crisis in imperialistic expansion in Asia and Africa, has chosen Yemen as a point of support for penetrating into Arabia. For this purpose fascist Italy, making use of Great Britain's difficulties with Ibn Saud (in the year 1926), induced the Imam of Jahia to sign a treaty of "friendship." Under this treaty numerous Italians settled in Hodeida, which became an important port for Italian trade in Arabia.

British imperialism, as a means of meeting this threat of its Italian rival, attempted at first to disturb the friendship between Yemen and Italy. It succeeded in this to a certain extent, for in the years 1930 and 1931 conflicts arose between the two "friends." On one occasion the Imam even expelled an Italian medical commission from his capital. Italy, on its part, did not remain inactive. In 1932 it signed a treaty with Ibn Saud, and at the same time his son, who is now leading the action against Yemen, was given a pompous reception in Italy. Shortly afterwards a conflict broke out between Yemen and Hejas over Asir, an emirate lying between the two countries. This conflict developed into the war which we are now witnessing. The hostilities between the two Arab countries are being followed from the immediate neighbourhood by the warships and aeroplanes of the imperialist rivals, who are supplying the belligerents with weapons and ammunition.

France, on its part, is no longer remaining indifferent to these events. It must not be forgotten that the route to India is at the same time the route to Indo-China, the "pearl" of the French colonial empire. At the same time, Aden lies opposite Jibuti and French Somali. Finally, the construction of the Haifa-Baghdad railway evokes a regular fight between France, which possesses Syria, and Great Britain for the traffic to Iraq and Persia.

That France is not remaining passive in the war in Arabia is proved by the fact that, for the first time since the world war, it has paid Ibn Saud the contribution due from Tunisia for the sacred places. France is now discussing the disarmament question with Italy and Great Britain. These negotiations are not without influence on its attitude to events in Arabia. The wars in Morocco and Arabia, like the wars in China and in Latin-America, are only preludes to the world war which is germinating on these remote battle-fields.

An analysis of the facts clearly reveals that the essential factor in the war in Arabia is the struggle of British imperialism for its domination. **This fight is not going on without collisions: collisions with its imperialist rivals, collisions with the national emancipation movement of the Arab masses.**

All this creates a complicated and, at times, confused situation. British imperialism does not shrink from employing any means in order to achieve its aims. We have seen how, during the world war, it carried on propaganda for the independence of Arabia. To-day we see how it is attempting to make use of the strong Pan-Arab movement, the champion of which is Ibn Saud. **Great Britain is not fighting for the hegemony of Ibn Saud or of the Imam Jahia, but is endeavouring to weaken them both in order to render them more subservient to its will.**

The national revolutionary movement has already repeatedly frustrated the imperialist plans in Egypt, in Arabia, in Palestine, and only recently also in Syria, where the French government was compelled to abandon its plan to conclude an enslaving treaty with the native feudal land-owners and reactionaries. The fact that British imperialism is compelled to resort to the Pan-Arab movement in order to achieve its purposes proves the strength of this movement. The Pan-Arab movement which is playing a big role in the events in Arabia, will become stronger precisely as a result of the policy of the imperialists, by the uniting of Yemen and Hejas under one single rule. But the creation of an independent federation of the Arab countries will not be undertaken either by Ibn Saud or any other Arab king. It will be the result of the revolutionary fight of the Arab masses against the imperialists and their native lackeys.

Germany

The Collapse of the Transfer Conference

At the end of May the transfer conference ended after a five weeks' session without any positive result, without an agreement between Germany and its creditors. The official communiqué does its best to cloak the collapse of the negotiations and to create the impression that an agreement was actually reached.

The Reichs Bank, acting on its own and appealing to the notorious diminution of its foreign exchange, has declared a six months' moratorium. After that period the creditors are to have the choice of receiving interest bonds at 3 per cent. for the interest due to them, these bonds to be redeemed in 1945, that is to say they are bonds of a very dubious nature, or they may receive 40 per cent. of the interest sum which falls due in cash. However, the value of even this offer is made utterly problematical by the following reservation which the Reichs Bank has made:—

"As the capacity of the Reichs Bank to make these payments will depend on the means of foreign exchange at the disposal of Germany for its obligations in foreign currency at the time the payments become due, the Reichs Bank reserves the right to withdraw its offer with regard to such cash payments on 30 days' notice."

The Swiss and the Dutch delegations immediately announced that they would reject this offer. The creditors from these two countries, which have a passive balance of trade with Germany, can compensate themselves at any time by means of a clearing operation, that is to say by retaining Swiss and Dutch monies respectively intended for the payment of German goods, and they are therefore not inclined to agree to the very dubious and very disadvantageous proposal which Dr. Schacht has made to them.

The British, French and Swedish delegations declared themselves prepared to accept the German offer, but upon two conditions which practically annul this preparedness, namely, first of all, that the interest payments on the Reichs loans, that is to say, above all on the Dawes and Young loans, must be continued without interference, and secondly that no other creditor country receives any preference in settlement. This second condition was also subscribed to expressly by the United States representatives.

Now the question of the Dawes and Young loans had been expressly omitted from the negotiations. The representatives of the British and French governments had declared categorically that their governments would insist on the unrestricted payment of the interest on these two loans. The German representatives made no official reply to this demand, but according to press reports Dr. Schacht intends to declare Germany unable to pay the interest on these loans also when the interest falls due on July 1. For instance, the "Berliner Boersen-Zeitung" wrote on the day after the close of the transfer conference: "This moratorium must without a doubt also apply to the Reichs loans." And the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" pointed out that on July 1 there would be no foreign exchange for the purposes of paying the interest "unless in the meantime a shower of gold falls from heaven."

Now that the foreign creditors of Germany have realised that for an indefinite period they are not likely to see the colour of Germany's money either for private debts or government loans the foreign press has taken on a much sharper tone when dealing with Germany's swindle and blackmail methods.

The collapse of the transfer negotiations therefore opens up the following prospects. Appealing to its slender and constantly diminishing resources in foreign exchange and gold, Germany will stop all payments on interest and amortisation with regard to foreign debts of all sorts for an indefinite period. The Western European States, which almost all have a passive balance of trade with Germany (not only Switzerland and Holland, but also Great Britain) will then compensate themselves by a clearing operation, that is to say they will retain the foreign exchange which should go to Germany in payment for German goods. The result will then be that Germany will have no foreign exchange at all, and no means of obtaining any, in order to pay for the imports of raw materials from overseas countries. The hoped-for raw material credits from the United States do not look at all promising at a time when, as "The Times" points out, "All that is left of Germany's credit is being hopelessly destroyed."

For the moment the German government has answered the threatening intensification of its economic and financial difficulties by new limitations of imports. The foreign exchange allotted for imports, which had already been reduced to 35 per cent., has now been reduced to 10 per cent., whilst the import of oil seeds, etc., has been completely forbidden. However, this represents an absolutely necessary fodder for cattle-breeding. The excuse of the German authorities that this measure has been taken out of "anxiety for the fat supply for the German people" is grotesque.

The confused and threatening economic situation of Germany is causing the greatest anxiety amongst broad sections of the population, and this anxiety is intensified by the fact that it is impossible to see from the German press what the situation really is. It is inevitable that prices should rise when neither manufacturers nor tradesmen know whether they will be in a position to replenish their stocks with goods of the same quality and price. The repeated and sharp pronouncements of the government against the rise in prices indicate that prices are rapidly rising. According to the official index for wholesale trade, prices have risen by 5 per cent. since the end of 1933, whilst agricultural prices have risen by 12 per cent. However, these figures give no real picture of the rapidly rising prices for various commodities.

The fear of inflation, which is very justifiable, expresses itself in rumours which it is difficult to verify. Despite the threats against "rumour-mongers," these rumours are spreading like wild-fire and meeting with credence everywhere. For instance, it is said that the printing works of the Reichs Bank has already printed milliards of marks of the new inflation currency, the "internal mark" or "Binnen mark," and that the government printing works are already printing cards for bread, potatoes, cotton materials, etc.

The small depositors are anxious because proposals are continually leaking out to the effect that their savings should be used for "provision of work," that is to say, for subsidies to the capitalists.

The tendency to take the savings of the "thrifty" in order to provide new millions for "provision of work" is increased by the fact that the prospects of raising any very considerable sums by means of internal loans are not bright. A new Reichs loan is about to be floated to the tune of 500 million marks, but in reality it is a question of converting old loans, the Hilferding loan of 1929 and the so-called "new property loan" which was floated when the old war loan bonds were revalued and indicated the low credit of the Reich with their quotation at 17.5 per cent. The result of this new floating therefore will not bring much new money into the treasury of the Reich.

At a meeting in Dresden which was part of the "campaign against the grumblers," the Reich's Minister of the Interior, Frick, dealt with the catastrophic economic situation. He informed his hearers that the drop in Germany's exports was due to the world boycott organised by the Jews. In reality, of course, the chief loss in exports suffered by Germany has been in its dealings with the Soviet Union, thanks to the provocative anti-Bolshevist policy of Rosenberg and Co. German exports to the Soviet Union in the first quarter of the current year were 21 million marks in value as compared with 39 million marks in the previous quarter and 89 million marks in the first quarter of 1933. German exports to the Soviet Union have sunk to a greater extent than Germany's exports to all other countries put together, which have fallen from 1,101 million marks to 1,074 million marks. An export loss of 27 million marks with all capitalist countries compares with an export loss of 68 millions with the Soviet Union. It is here therefore that the shoe pinches, and this is the chief reason for the drop in Germany's exports which has led to such intense pressure for the whole economic situation of Germany.

Terrible mass impoverishment and misery, a catastrophic worsening of the economic situation, foreign political reverses all along the line and a rising bitterness and hostility amongst all sections of the working people, that is the balance of the Hitler dictatorship after eighteen months of the "Third Reich."

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Readers will please note the new address of the International Press Correspondence, to which all subscriptions and communications should be sent: William Massey, 249, King Street, Hammer-smith, London. W.6.

Growing Antagonisms in the German Fascist Camp

According to a report that has found its way in the foreign press, it has come to sharp disputes within the Hitler government on the question of the grants made by the Reich for the maintenance of the S.A. The Reich Minister for Finance has declared that the cost of the S.A.—which he puts at the obviously too low figure of 600 million marks—can no longer be borne in view of the difficult financial situation. It is argued that the functions of the S.A. could be better performed by the S.S. and the Stahlhelm organisations, which require less in the way of grants as they have been recruited from the well-off sections of the population. The Finance Minister proposed that from October 1, 1934, the grants to the S.A. should be so cut down that company leaders only should be allowed their expenses, and brigade leaders should have a fixed rate of pay. As can be easily understood, Roehm, the chief of the staff, strongly objected to this proposal. He declared that as it was the S.A. leaders received only allowances for expenses, while the S.A. men only a cheap dinner and a trifling sum for pocket money. If State support were withdrawn it would mean that the S.A. would be driven into the arms of Bolshevism.

Seldte, the head of the Stahlhelm, sided with the Finance Minister. An agreement is said to have been brought about by the intermediation of Hitler.

As the Reich is no longer able to bear the cost of the upkeep of the S.A., a big collecting campaign for the S.A. is to be inaugurated on October 1. A gradual reduction of the strength of the S.A. would be desirable also for foreign-political reasons. On the other hand, the S.S., which is a more efficient military force than the S.A., is to be increased to 350,000 men. In order to placate the S.A. the action of providing the S.A. men with jobs in the workshops and factories is to be intensified under the slogan: "No unemployed S.A. man by the end of the year."

If this report is true, it means that it is intended to impose a new burden on the working masses by compelling them to contribute to the upkeep of the fascist terrorist-guard while at the same time the S.A. is to be purged of unreliable elements. There is no doubt that there are strong forces within the fascist camp in favour of the reduction of the strength of the S.A., and even Hitler is not opposed on principle to this plan. Herr *Riebertropp*, who has been specially entrusted by the Reichs Chancellor with the armament question, was sent some weeks ago to England and Italy, where he was to offer as a concession to reduce the S.A. Also the intention to send the S.A. on furlough for a month in the summer was generally regarded as meaning that it was planned to re-organise the S.A. with a view to purging it of unreliable elements.

It is true the financial question is not the chief consideration in regard to the proposed reduction of the S.A., nevertheless the 250 million marks for the upkeep of the S.A. represents a very big part of the expenditure on armaments, amounting to 1,300 million marks, provided in the budget. The military experts in the Reichswehr are of the opinion that such a large sum could be more usefully expended on other forms of armament. As a matter of fact, the double character of the S.A. as a force for terrorising the home population and as a reserve for the Reichswehr for imperialist war creates special difficulties for the fascist rulers. In order to increase the reserve of the imperialist army, as large a number as possible of young men capable of bearing arms has been pressed into the S.A. On the other hand, members of the S.A. have been given so much preference with regard to employment that many of the less class-conscious proletarian elements entered the S.A. in order to obtain work. This extension of the S.A., which served to create a reserve for the army, at the same time made these fascist troops less reliable for civil war.

The growing disappointment among the convinced national socialists, who are strongly represented in the "old guard" of the S.A., works in the same direction. In addition to the numerous unscrupulous mercenary elements who are prepared to commit any crime in return for sausage, tobacco, beer and a uniform, there are hundreds and thousands of men in the S.A. who honestly believed that they were fighting with Hitler for the national and social emancipation of the German people, and who have now had their eyes opened. There are many cases in which S.A. men have actively taken part in strike movements. Precisely those who came to realise the blessing of the "labour battle" when they were compelled to work at a feverish pace in the rationalised factories for wages which amounted to a little more than unemployment

benefit, have become the bearers of this discontent in the S.A. and in the N.S.B.O. (national socialist factory organisation). It is well known that already thousands of S.A. men have been sent to concentration camps and prisons for "mutiny."

As this oppositional feeling within the S.A. has grown of late as a result of the general sharpening of the situation, the position of that fascist wing which formerly relied on the Stahlhelm, i.e., the German nationalist monarchist circles, has become stronger. For this reason the Nazis have again commenced their demagogic incitement against their rivals with the slogan of "against reaction!" As if there could be anything more reactionary than the national socialist lackeys of capital! Thus the struggle between the Stahlhelm and the S.A. has broken out again. As the position of the fascist group which is at present in power in Germany is being more and more shaken by the economic and the home and foreign political failures, those fascist forces which have been pushed into the background by the Nazis are preparing for a counter-stroke. *Goering*, who has fallen into disfavour with Hitler, and after losing his position as Prussian Minister of the Interior, is afraid of being thrown overboard altogether, is ready at any time to go over to the camp of the German nationalists. Thus the fact that *Goering* caused *Goernemann* (the West German Stahlhelm leader, who was placed under preventive arrest in accordance with Roehm's decree against anti-S.A. intrigues of the Stahlhelm) to be released, is of significance.

The sharpening of the antagonisms within the camp of the bourgeoisie is reflected in the increased anti-monarchist propaganda of the Nazis. Thus it came to an open conflict in Potsdam between *Eitel Friedrich*, the second son of the ex-Kaiser, and the Nazi mayor of Potsdam, who demanded of the "prince" that he should place a part of his castle at the disposal of the national socialist party, whereupon the latter showed him the door. Whilst the Nazi "prince" *Friedrich* is indignant on account of the rumours spread in Potsdam that a Hohenzollern prince had fled to Holland in an aeroplane, his party comrade *Huebbenet*, the Nazi leader of the Central Silesian District, threatens the monarchists that they will be given the opportunity of emigrating to Holland, where they will constitute "a new type of emigrants."

It is known that German national monarchist elements are strongly represented in the opposition in the Protestant Church. But even Reichsbishop *Mueller* does not appear to be absolutely reliable in this connection. For, as it has now become known, in October last he addressed a letter to the ex-Kaiser in Doorn, in which he declared that "he considered it his duty humbly to inform his Majesty of the fact of his appointment to the position of Reich Bishop."

The strengthening of the opposition within the fascist camp, which relies upon the Stahlhelm and the German nationalists and is already venturing to play off the Stahlhelm against the S.A., reflects the fact that the bourgeoisie is becoming increasingly afraid of the catastrophe into which German capitalism is being driven under the leadership of the national socialists. The financial capitalists who have placed the Hitler bands in power in Germany are looking round for reserve troops to protect them against the threatening mass storm against the brown dictatorship.

The "Labour Battle" Against the Workers

Whilst exports are shrinking, the last reserves of gold and foreign exchange are dwindling into nothingness, Schacht and his consorts are sending abroad appeals for aid, and even the conjurer, *Goebbels*, admits that the economic situation is serious, at the same time the State Institute for Labour Exchange continues steadily with its publications of reports of victories in the "Labour Battle." The statement is made that in April unemployment decreased by 190,000. This is booked as a great "success." In reality this figure—if it corresponds with facts—falls far behind the customary decrease of the unemployment figures at this time of year and cannot be compared in the least with the increase of employment in a real boom. This seasonal decline of unemployment amounted in 1929 to 772,000, in 1930 to 250,000, 1931 to 368,000, 1932 to 295,000, and 1933 to 265,000.

As is to be seen the diminution of unemployment in 1929, before the crisis commenced, was more than four times as great as in this year, and during the years of the crisis, even the first year of Hitler's rule, it was much greater than this time. Hence there can be no thought of any improvement in economic conditions. Success has, however, been gained in reducing the number of registered

unemployed to 2.6 millions, the number of unemployed in receipt of benefit to 1.9 millions. The Minister of Finance, Schwerin von Krosigk, is able to report that in this year only 1.3 milliards are to be expended in unemployment benefit as compared with 2 milliards last year and 2.7 milliards in 1932. Unemployment has not been by any means reduced by one half—to-day the estimate may still be safely made at 7 millions—but State relief has been reduced to one half.

That this "battle" has been carried out at the expense of the employed workers is shown by the latest figures published on labour income. In the first quarter of 1934 this is stated to have amounted to 6.80 milliard marks. A comparison with the past year shows a **falling off in work income per head of the employed as follows:—**

	Working income in milliard marks	Average No. of employed (millions)	Average quarterly income per head
3rd quarter, 1933 ..	6.83	13.7	513 marks
4th " 1933 ..	6.77	13.8	490 "
1st " 1934 ..	6.80	14.1	482 "

This signifies—according to official figures—a 6 per cent. wage reduction!

In view of the whole situation, it is comprehensible that the man responsible for the improvement of the unemployment statistics, Dr. Syrup, expresses himself somewhat cautiously with regard to the prospects of the "labour battle" for the summer. Obviously he has no faith in an uplift of industrial activities, for he puts the task as follows:—

"For the rest, during this summer our chief efforts must be directed to employing outside of their residential district—for instance on motor roads—those unemployed who are concentrated in large numbers in the large towns and industrial centres."

The sending of unemployed workers to the rural districts, and the prohibition of the moving into the towns of the workers who find no means of subsistence in the country, is a method which actually increased the misery of the unemployed, but gives a better appearance to the unemployment statistics. How are industrial workers to find work in the rural districts, when already it is only by means of the severest measures that workers can be prevented from leaving the country to seek work in the towns?

For instance, Sprenger, State governor for Hessen, has published a decree against the "flight from the land," in which he not only prohibits the giving of employment to agricultural workers in industrial undertakings, but extends this prohibition to "all workers who could be employed in agricultural work."

"The labour exchanges"—states the decree—"must refuse under all circumstances to find work in industrial undertakings for unemployed persons who can be used for agricultural work. No agricultural worker may leave his place of work at the present time or during the next few months, not even if he is given the opportunity of industrial work."

For the young workers in particular it is to become the rule that they are not to earn wages in industrial undertakings, but should work gratis in agricultural undertakings. Dr. Jäckel, the leader of the Stuttgart labour office, makes the following proposal in the "Völkischer Beobachter":—

"All workers up to the age of 25, if not skilled in any particular trade and if suitable for agricultural work, must be employed in agriculture. Their places must be taken by older and married unemployed. The labour battle can only be won if real sacrifices are made on all sides: The industrial undertakings must relinquish the cheap youth labour, and the young workers must relinquish the momentary earnings in cash."

This year the question of the young workers plays a special role, for this year twice the number have left school as in the past few years. The Nazi authorities promised in many declarations to find work for these 1,300,000 young people. Under no circumstances were they to be left unemployed. And now this promise is being kept by sending them to perform work gratis in the rural districts or as domestic servants.

The 600,000 girls who left school at Easter are to be sent out as servant maids without salary. This is the meaning of the "household year for girls," for which the National Socialist women's organisations and youth organisations, collaborating with the Labour Office, are appealing under the attractive title of situations for girls "au pair"—without payment on either side. But how are these 600,000 unpaid maids to find situations in households without

displacing maids hitherto in these situations? In any case there are not many more than a million girls in such situations. It is true that Dr. Syrup announces in another decree that the engagement of these unpaid slaves is by no means to take place at the expense or the dismissal of other domestic servants. It is, however, perfectly evident that the mass of unpaid domestic aid thus offered is bound to reduce the already miserable wages of servant girls to nothing. The circular issued by the Labour Exchange Centre further states expressly that it is **undesirable** "in general" that such young girls should be found employment in industrial undertakings.

Here again it is obvious that the measures of the "labour battle" are definitely measures against the workers. That working girls who can find no gainful employment have to do housework for nothing is an arrangement which has always existed. But it is new to prohibit the engagement of working girls in industrial undertakings, in order that agriculture and private households may be given gratis workers.

However, here again the Nazi laws remain ineffective where they violate the laws of capitalist economy. Where more profits are to be made by the capitalist, cheap youth labour will always be preferred. If this is done against the instructions of the labour offices, so to speak "illegally," then the capitalists will be given a further pretext for paying these young girls at miserable rates, for it will be a special favour to give them paid work at all in face of the Nazi prohibitions.

In the name of the "labour battle" young workers are to be thrown out of the industrial undertakings, and their places taken by adult workers entitled to unemployment benefit, so that the figures of the unemployment statistics may be reduced. The gratis employment of young workers is further intended as a means of pressing down the wages of the adult workers to a lower level than before. By means of these methods, the apostles of the "community of the people" play off one section of the working class against another.

Our Young Communist League and the revolutionary trade unions have therefore to devote special attention to the young people leaving school, and to organise the struggle against the compulsory sending of young people to the rural districts or to domestic slavery—in the national socialist youth organisations in particular this propaganda must be organised.

Millions of Workers Against Hitler!

Appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany

Workers, Toilers in town and country!

Fascism has lost a battle. The Brown lackeys of the employers keep silent regarding their defeat. The overwhelming majority of the wage slaves in the workshops and offices, at the elections to the employers' confidential councils, voted against the Hitler dictatorship, against the rule of the great and of the rich. We millions of proletarians have demonstrated our hatred against the labour-slaving law, against the "leader" principle, the policy of starvation and terrorism of the fascist capitalist dictatorship. We have jointly, in accordance with the proposals of the C.P. of Germany, in united action inflicted a defeat on the Hitler dictatorship. Revolutionary Marxism is living and fighting, defiantly and unbroken. The fiery spirit of the revolutionary class struggle is glowing unquenchably until this order of profit-makers is destroyed.

Anti-fascists, social democrats and Christian workers and trade unionists! Again we summon you to the brotherly united front of anti-fascist action. We call upon you in the spirit of the glorious revolutionary traditions of the German labour movement. We call to mind our common historical responsibility towards our future and the whole toiling people. We have brought about a defeat of the fascist dictatorship. Are you prepared to take with us together the next step to the anti-fascist organisation of the struggle? We hope so! We expect it of each of you! The fascist regime of starvation and terrorism will disappear only if we overthrow it. Millions of oppressed are waiting for us to place ourselves at their head as the organisers of their struggles against starvation and terrorism. Let us, therefore, unite as determined fighters for socialism. Let us jointly proceed from mass protest at the confidential councils elections to organised mass action against the carrying out of the new labour law. We Communists and revolutionary trade unionists propose to you that you proceed jointly with us to the carrying out of the following practical fighting tasks:—

Let us unite in the factory, at the "labour front," in the

N.S.B.O., in the fascist youth, in the military and cultural organisations, into an **organised opposition working systematically and consistently!**

Let us **organise together the forces of resistance to and attack** against the labour law, against the reactionary factory regulations, against the intensification of speeding-up by means of the fascist payment of wage by results, against the robbery of holidays, for the struggle for higher wages and allowances for higher prices, for freedom of discussion and meeting, for our own elected shop stewards!

Let us make use of every **opportunity** to increase the fighting strength of the working class by drawing up our demands and suggestions of struggle to the workers and members of the "labour front." Let us **collect signatures!** Let us send **factory delegates** with our fighting demands to the employers' confidential-council, let us compel them either to join in our protest against the shameful function or to expose themselves openly as lackeys of the employers. Let us demand the **convention of meetings** in the factories and in the "labour front"! Let us set up permanent **commissions for wages, accidents, etc.**, and let us fight for their **recognition!** Let us set up **unity committees in the factories** which, according to circumstances, shall seize the initiative and become united front organs of struggle!

Fascism shattered our trade unions and our organisations after **Leipart and consorts** had prepared for their incorporation. We reply by setting up permanent illegal fighting organs, by forming rank and file committees in the factories, at the labour exchanges, in the labour service camps, by setting up factory groups of independent class trade unions on the basis of irreconcilable struggle against capitalism, fascism and social-democratic splitting policy. Every one of our steps is actuated by the firm desire to march through the daily class struggle to the mass strike movement, to the political mass strike, to the general strike, to the armed overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

Social-democratic class comrades! The miserable defeatist theories of the social-democratic, Trotskyist and Brandlerist leaders are refuted. They asserted that the proletariat is defeated for a whole epoch and that it is a crime and putschism on the part of the C.P. of Germany to fight against fascism. Life itself has confirmed the Marxist appraisal given by our revolutionary leadership, the Communist International and the C.P. of Germany, which declared already in October last that in Germany a **new revolutionary upsurge** is approaching. The stirring, self-sacrificing work of the revolutionary advance-guard has not been in vain. The Brown bureaucrats are faced by a hostile workers' army; the fascist leaders of the "labour front" are faced by masses of anti-fascists numbering millions. The elections to the confidential councils have proved it. The bankrupt leaders and sub-leaders of the social democracy wish "to begin again," by means of radical phrases to prevent the unity of the working class for the revolution, for the only Bolshevik path to power. The agents of Leipart and Grassmann, the Brandlerists, seek again to maintain the split in the working class by setting up reformist organisations. Let us jointly oppose the disrupters of our class.

Anti-fascists, social democrats and Christian workers and trade unionists! The fascist bankrupts know that they will have to face bad times in the coming months. Behind their big words they are trembling with fear of the future. Goebbels is raging against the grumblers and fault-finders, by which he means the growing indignation of the working people. The new fascist "People's Court," set up by decree, is to silence the grumblers and fault-finders by means of hard labour sentences and the executioner's axe, and their own recalcitrant followers by means of concentration camps. While casting ever-increasing burdens on our shoulders, fascism is initiating a **fresh campaign of chauvinist incitement throughout the country in connection with the Saar question.** The only justified war, the class war against the exploiters, is to be throttled by means of terror and chauvinist deceit. But we workers, working women and young workers have no wish to become the victims of devastating imperialist wars and fascist-capitalist barbarism.

We want to **abolish the accursed "Labour Law" which converts us into coolies of the factory owners.** We want to put an end to **profiteering, robbery of wages and relief.**

We want **higher wages and higher rates of benefit, holidays with pay, our own independent organisations, complete freedom of**

discussion, meeting and the right to strike, self-elected factory representation and independent class trade unions.

We wish to free our youth from the yoke of compulsory labour service and military drill for the imperialist war.

We want to release our brothers from the clutches of the fascist torturers, we want to smash the chains which fetter Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the revolutionary proletariat.

We workers and toilers wish to convert the country of capitalist slavery into our fatherland, the land of socialism, of happiness and well-being for all working people. We want a Germany which is worth fighting for and living for! We want a Soviet Germany!

We call upon all anti-fascists, all oppressed by the iron heel of capitalist dictatorship, to join the militant front of the German proletarian revolution.

Long live the anti-fascist fighting unity!

Long live Socialism!

Long live Soviet Germany!

Central Committee of the Communist Party of
Germany,

National Committee of the Red Trade Unions of
Germany.

Berlin, May 18, 1934.

Leninist Tactics in the Saar Question

By W. Müller

For the Communists the Saar problem, as a class question, has always been a problem of the German proletarian revolution. With the proletarian revolution in Germany they want at the same time, by means of the revolutionary mass struggle in the Saar, to achieve the social and national emancipation of the Saarland. The Communists were and are even more to-day of the opinion that the prospects of the proletarian revolution in Germany have become more favourable as a result of the revolutionary upsurge which is taking place. Therefore, they were, and are still to-day, of the opinion that the propaganda and preparation of the masses for the fight for Soviet power also in the Saar district must be continued and strengthened.

The fact that the date for holding the plebiscite has now been definitely fixed demands of the Communists a Leninist tactical decision in this question. None of the three alternatives on which the vote will be taken—namely, attachment to France, return to Germany, or the maintenance of the *status quo*, corresponds to the socialist aims. Owing to the fact that the social democracy in Germany and in the Saar have been able up to the present time to maintain the split in the ranks of the working class, that they have always striven by coalitions with other bourgeois groups to fetter the workers to the bourgeoisie, and owing to the fact that they have been able to prevent the unity of the working class on a revolutionary basis, the Communists are still to-day unable to lead the decisive political class battles in the Saar and to solve the Saar problem in the sense of their final socialist aim.

What conclusions result from this? The Communists are against the union of the Saar with France. They are equally against its union with Germany at the present time. They do not believe in committing suicide! To advocate union with Hitler Germany would mean to betray the workers, would mean to advocate their being placed under the heel of Hitler fascism.

The interests of the workers and the toiling population demand a decision which shall provide the greatest possibility for the development and extension of the anti-fascist class struggle. Under the present conditions, and in spite of the hostility of the Communists to any capitalist regime, this possibility is offered by the *status quo*.

The Communists can carry out this tactic without difficulty. Firstly, every revolutionary worker understands them, because he perceives that they fight irreconcilably for their revolutionary aims. Secondly, they are free and uninfluenced in any decision by the capitalists and imperialists. The social democracy are influenced and bribed by the German and French capitalists. The chauvinist German front is influenced and bribed by German capitalists. For the time being the Communists decide for the *status quo*. For them the *status quo* is not the reformist "lesser evil." A Communist Party exists also as a revolutionary legal party. As an illegal party it can, from the deepest illegality, as the Russian October Revolution proved, capture power at the head of and with the masses.

The Communists choose the *status quo* not because they thereby abandon their revolutionary aims. No, precisely because they keep unswervingly to their revolutionary aims they choose the *status quo* for the time being in order the better and more rapidly to develop the revolutionary forces. But their support of the *status quo* will cease the moment the proletariat of Germany takes up the victorious fight for power. Then they also—perhaps even as the shock-brigade of the German revolution—will join in the fight and achieve social and national emancipation in a firm, international alliance with the French and German proletariat.

The attitude of the Communists to the League of Nations and to the Saar Governing Commission is not thereby altered in the least. The League of Nations is not their League of Nations. It is true, the League of Nations, owing to the antagonistic interests within the imperialist Powers, constitute for the time being a hindrance to the outbreak of the imperialist world conflagration, but this does not alter the capitalist character of the League.

The Communists demand all the more energetically from the League of Nations that during the period of *status quo* the workers shall have freedom to hold demonstrations and meetings. They demand the right of free organisation and the withdrawal of the ban on the R.T.U.O. They demand freedom to strike against starvation wages in the Saar, drastic taxation of the capitalists, reduction of taxes for all small shopkeepers and small peasants. They demand work and bread for the unemployed. They demand factory councils freely elected by the workers. They demand an amnesty for all proletarian political prisoners and withdrawal of the prohibition of the possession of arms by members of the anti-fascist mass self-defence organisation. They are not only advocating but fighting for these demands, and will not recognise or leave any League of Nations Governing Commission in peace.

The main tasks of the Communists consist as before in undermining the Hitler regime in order to be able to overthrow it by means of the proletarian revolution. At the same time their fight in the Saar against Franco-German Saar capitalism and for winning the majority of the working class is being continued. The weaknesses of the Communists hitherto in their mass policy, in the united front from below, in the organised opposition work in the reformist and fascist trade unions, in the winning of the proletarian youth, in the fight against fascist and social-democratic ideologies, must be rapidly overcome.

The whole strategy of the Communists is directed towards the proletarian revolution. They declare most emphatically in face of all the opportunists and in face of the counter-revolutionary talk to be expected from the social democracy that the Communists are making a "volte face," that the tactics pursued by the Communists in the Saar were and are correct. They could not make the tactical decision they are now making six months or a year ago, because the development of the class forces and sudden and unexpected turns in events before the holding of the plebiscite might have rendered it necessary to adopt another attitude to the Saar question. That the development has not proceeded at the pace desired by them is due, among other things, to the criminal policy of the social democracy and the Second International. With the tactics they are adopting the Communists deliberately turn the attention of the proletarians of the Saar district and of all countries to the revolutionary upsurge which is taking place in Germany. To-day, even the enemies of the proletarian revolution are compelled to recognise this revolutionary upsurge which is taking place under the leadership of the C.P.G. To-day, every toiler in Germany and even the disappointed Nazi supporters will understand this step, particularly because they recognise that the attitude of the Communists has nothing in common with the pro-French and warmongering attitude of the social democracy.

The united front appeal of the Communists to their class brothers in the social-democratic organisations and in the trade unions is of decisive importance in this situation. Through their appeal they open wide the door of the Communist Party, and the social-democratic and non-Party workers will know that, in the united front of the Communists, they will find themselves in the revolutionary front which alone will defeat Hitler fascism, shake off every yoke of slavery and, under the leadership of the Communists, achieve the social and national emancipation of the working people of the Saar.

The International Campaign for the Release of Thaelmann

By Germain Gautier (Paris)

The means hitherto employed to express protest against the imprisonment of Thaelmann and other anti-fascists and to demand their release have proved effective. The fascist government press is furiously raging over the "exculpation offensive" of the International Release Committee. The German embassies and consulates are calling for police protection against delegations. On all the railways, in the Berlin Post Offices, and in the prisons the officials are talking about the huge quantity of letters and post-cards which are arriving conveying messages of solidarity to the anti-fascist prisoners. In all countries the masses are discussing the reports of the delegation of workers, intellectuals and jurists, the lies deliberately invented by fascist Ministers, the hatred of the Berlin population against the Nazi dictatorship, the torturing and murder of defenceless prisoners, the cowardice of the Brown murderers, who are depriving Ernst Thaelmann of any possibility of defence. We once again issue our slogans:—

Send letters from all parts of the world to **Thaelmann**, Berlin, Moabit, Untersuchungsgefängniss. Send letters to **Ernst Torgler** to the same address.

Adopt protest resolutions at all meetings of workers and send copies to the German Foreign Minister, Herr Neurath, Wilhelmstrasse, Berlin, S.W., to the German Embassy or Consulate, to the labour press and the local bourgeois paper.

Ring up all embassies, consulates and German institutions abroad on the telephone. Not a day must pass on which mass delegations do not besiege the German fascist propaganda centres abroad.

Arrange for fresh delegations to be sent to Germany to ascertain for themselves the condition of Ernst Thaelmann, to visit Ernst Torgler, to expose to the world public the conditions in the concentration camps in **Papenburg** and **Dachau**, to ascertain the real opinion of the working people of Germany, and then spread the truth about Hitler Germany all over the world!

The masses who are fighting together with the International Committee for the Release of Ernst Thaelmann have realised the meaning of Thaelmann's courageous blow with his fist on the barrier of the fascist prison.

The tasks confronting us are plain. The workers themselves have shown us the way. We mention a few examples:—

Goering, the inciter of civil and international war, was received in **Greece** with a furious storm of protest against the terror in Germany and vehement demands for Thaelmann's release. He hastily fled to his motor-car and was then constantly surrounded by a cordon of police.

In various ports in **Spain**, **America**, **England**, etc., leaflets protesting against the fascist terror were distributed on German ships. Delegations of dock workers and seamen demanded of the captain and crew a declaration against the monstrous terror, and called for the release of Thaelmann. Ships were compelled to lower the blood-stained swastika flag.

In **North France** the building workers struck work for a quarter of an hour as a protest and elected a delegation which interviewed the German Consul and energetically demanded the immediate release of Thaelmann.

In **New Jersey** (U.S.A.) the attempt of the Nazis and Stahlhelm to hold a mass meeting and organise a propaganda procession was completely frustrated by the workers.

Four thousand workers demonstrated in **New York** in the streets inhabited by German fascists, and then marched in a body to the Consulate, where they demanded the release of Thaelmann and Torgler.

In **Paris** anti-fascist writers, at their own expense, had a placard printed and pasted up addressed to the readers of the big newspapers: "Why does your paper not publish the report of the Thaelmann delegation?—Because it wants to introduce fascism here! A newspaper which remains silent regarding the plans to murder Thaelmann, aids Hitler! Workers in the big enterprises, send delegations with your protest resolutions to the newspapers which maintain silence and insist that they be printed by the paper!"

In the cinemas the anti-fascist workers hooted and kept up a disturbance until the Fox Weekly News-Reel, which is subsidised

by Goebbels and glorifies Hitler Germany and the Nazi leaders, was withdrawn.

Various German tourist offices in American and Spanish harbour towns had to close for a time because indignant masses of anti-fascists protested against the bloody sentences, executions and seizing of hostages.

In England and in Switzerland the Communist Parties have addressed an open letter to the social democracy and the trade unions proposing joint demonstrations, mass delegations, press campaigns and the setting up of Thaelmann release committees in the factories and trade unions.

These examples suffice to show that the masses are going over to higher and more effective methods of action against the fascist hangmen: hostile reception of Hitler's emissaries, refusal to load and unload German ships in foreign ports, protest strikes in the factories, sending of factory delegations during work-time to the Consulates, etc.

But these higher tasks demand of us thorough organisational work.

Committees in the factories, in the trade unions and workers' organisations in all localities!

Carry the international Thaelmann action into all the big enterprises. That is the first task that we must now set ourselves. But in order to realise this task we must set up release committees in the factories.

It is our duty in all countries to address an appeal to the big enterprises to affiliate collectively to the committee for the release of Thaelmann and all imprisoned anti-fascists and to set up a release committee in the factory, on which all workers' organisations connected with the factory shall be represented.

We are confronted with the task of presenting to the social-democratic, Christian and revolutionary workers in the mass trade unions the fight for the release of Thaelmann as a common task, and to win members of these trade union organisations as delegates and collaborators for the factory and local release committees.

We must wrest Thaelmann from the fascist "People's Court" and secure for him the free choice of a foreign defending counsel, full publicity of proceedings, and the presence at the trial of hundreds of international delegates.

We must frustrate the designs of the murderers and secure the release of Thaelmann, Torgler, Renn, Ossietzky, Neubauer, Kuntz, Peterson, Frau Beimler, Frau Steinfurth and others. Only a large-scale mass action, a wave of permanent actions will save Thaelmann and our imprisoned brothers.

Workers,

Fight for Thaelmann and thereby fight for your own freedom and your own lives. For Thaelmann is the symbol of international, death-defying, militant anti-fascism!

* * * * *

United Front Appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of France to the S.P. of France Paris, June 1.

The Central Committee of the French C.P. addresses an appeal to the socialist workers, the social-democratic local groups, and the Committee of the Socialist Party, which is printed to-day on the front page of the "l'Humanité" under the heading: "Save Ernst Thaelmann! For the Victory Over Fascism—the United Front of Action." The appeal, after pointing out that Thaelmann is in the greatest danger, emphasises that he can only be saved by mass action, by joint efforts on the part of Socialist, Communist and non-Party workers. The appeal proposes joint demonstrations in the second half of June in Paris, Lille, Rheims, etc.—a total of 19 different places. Demonstrations are also proposed for the first day of the trial in all towns where representatives of the Hitler government reside (embassy, consulate, etc.).

In order to bring about this joint action within the shortest possible time, the C.C. of the French C.P. is prepared to take part in a consultation with the Party Committee of the Socialist Party. The appeal concludes: "Our Communist Party, unwearying in its efforts for the united front, repeats its proposals. For months the united front has been welded, and is sweeping aside all hindrances and attempts at splitting. Hence we confidently hope that the united front of the struggle for saving Thaelmann will be formed and irresistibly consolidated between the Socialist, Communist and non-Party workers."

Amsterdam, May 31.

Protest telegrams against the imprisonment of Ernst Thaelmann—the costs of the telegrams have been raised by collections among the workers taking part—have been sent by the unemployed of the Amsterdam labour exchanges, by the diamond cutters organised in the Free Trade Union, by the compositors and foremen, by the syndicalist metal workers, by a group of Amsterdam teachers, by the dwellers in the Louis Botha Street in Amsterdam, by the relief workers in Tjalleberd-Friesland, by 236 participants who signed their names to a protest at a meeting in Ijmuide and by the Harleem local group of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Basle, June 1.

On 25th May the Tessin section of the social-democratic workers in Basle adopted a sharply-worded resolution against fascist reaction and terror in Germany, and against the government maintaining conditions unworthy of human beings. The resolution demands the immediate release of Thaelmann, of all anti-fascist prisoners and victims of Hitler class justice. The resolution was sent to the German Consul in Basle.

Copenhagen, May 31.

Last Sunday the preparatory conference for the organisation of a Thaelmann-Torgler Release Committee for Denmark was held in Copenhagen. Eight-two delegates represented trade union local groups, works and factories, Jewish and anti-fascist organisations, representing a total of about 10,000 workers. The conference drew up a plan for extending the network of release committees over the whole country. The first task of the committees is to be the sending of delegates to visit Thaelmann in prison.

New York, June 1.

Demonstrations for the release of Thaelmann are being held in all the States. Especially large demonstrations have taken place in New York, and in Jamaica in the State of Ohio. In Newark 8,000 anti-fascists took part in a Thaelmann march. The German Consulate in New York has been besieged all the week by delegations protesting on behalf of their organisations against the brutal treatment of Thaelmann.

Saarbrücken, May 31.

The social-democratic "Deutsche Freiheit" reports: "An extremely well-attended meeting of the typographical workers' cartel of Saarbrücken, after hearing an address, received with much applause, on the organisational and work agreements in the Saar country, and followed by a detailed discussion, adopted unanimously the following resolution:—

"The well-attended members' meeting of the Typographical Workers' Cartel of Saarbrücken, meeting on 26th May, 1934, protests energetically against the continuous maltreatment of the workers' leader, Ernst Thaelmann, and all other political prisoners. The meeting demands the immediate release of Thaelmann and all political prisoners."

Paris, May 29.

On behalf of the National Congress, that is to say, on behalf of more than 500,000 French anti-fascists, Henri Barbusse has addressed an energetic protest to the German Ambassador in Paris. This protest declares that the German government should note the fact that the French proletariat will not tolerate the crime planned against Ernst Thaelmann, who is to be brought before a fascist court solely on account of his political convictions. The protest is signed by Deputy Midol (Seine et Oise), Henri Barbusse as chairman of the World Committee, Cazaubon, Francis Jourdain, Marcel Prenant, Henri Gourdeaux, and Jules Mallarte. Barbusse, in his accompanying letter to the ambassador, points out that the delegations elected by the French National Congress against War and Fascism was not admitted to the ambassador. The request made by the delegation for an audience was ignored; therefore the protest is sent in in writing.

Prague, May 29.

The National Conference Against Imperialist War and Fascism sent the following message to Comrade Thaelmann: "Dear Comrade Teddy,—On Sunday, 20th May, a great united conference against fascism and imperialist war was held in Prague; you were elected to the honorary presidium with Dimitrov and Rakosi. One of the first resolutions of this conference was an appeal to the whole of the workers of Czechoslovakia for the struggle for your release, and for the release of all other imprisoned anti-fascists. The international proletariat, which released Dimitrov, will free you, too, the courageous leader of the German anti-fascists, from the hands of your enemies."

India

The Situation in India

By L. M.

The events in India denote a historical turning point in the development of the national revolutionary movement not only of India but of the whole colonial world. The Executive of the Indian National Congress decided by an overwhelming majority to cease passive resistance and to participate in the provincial parliaments as well as in the future federal parliament. **Gandhi**, it is true, reserved to himself the right to continue passive resistance individually, but at present he is solely occupied with his hypocritical campaign for religious equality of the "untouchables," and his gesture has little political importance, as he himself admitted that the members of the Executive of the National Congress, who already a year ago advocated the official cessation of the struggle, admission of the defeat of the National Congress and participation in the work of the legislative bodies, were right.

To-morrow, however, **Gandhi's** gesture may again acquire a political importance. He remains in reserve, just like the "Left" phrasemongers of the National Congress—**Jawaharlal Nehru**, **Subhas Chandra Bose** and the rest—who never tire of talking about "independence" and even about "socialist India," but in actual fact support the treacherous policy of the National Congress. We presume that the peace between British imperialism and the Indian National Congress will mean the release of **Roy**. **Roy** was always on the "Left" wing of the National Congress.

The decision on the final abandonment of passive resistance will not have any practical results. Passive resistance was already long since abandoned, and the "individual resistance" which **Gandhi** has now proposed only provoked a pitying smile even among the members of the National Congress. Of much greater importance is the fact that the National Congress already recognises the slave Constitution which English imperialism wishes to give to India and promises British imperialism its co-operation in the legislative bodies.

The new Constitution is not yet ready. There will still be severe fights on this question in the camp of the English bourgeoisie. The National Congress desires by means of its decision to strengthen the **MacDonald-Baldwin** wing against the **Churchill** wing. The Constitution which **MacDonald** and **Baldwin** are preparing strengthens the economic and political key positions of British imperialism in India. It strengthens the influence of the Indian princes, these vassals of the British crown, and the influence of the big landowners, these buttresses of British imperialism. It perpetuates the rule of incitement, the feuds between the Hindus and Mohammedans and Sikhs. It perpetuates the division of the Indian people into castes. It leaves the absolute control of the army, finances, foreign policy, and police in the hands of the British bureaucracy. It protects the big landowners and gives absolute right of veto to the Viceroy and the governors of the provinces against all decisions of the provincial and central legislative bodies. It is a Constitution of enslavement and national humiliation.

The Indian National Congress has accepted this Constitution. It has once again capitulated to British imperialism. It has even discarded the ineffective weapon of passive resistance and wants to bargain—the word "fight" would be out of place here—with English imperialism for its demands only in the confines of the Constitution.

The antagonism of interests and the conflicts between the Indian bourgeoisie and the liberal big landowners, whose interests are represented by the National Congress and British imperialism still remain. The miserable concessions which the Indian bourgeoisie have already received, and are now receiving, in no way do away with these conflicts and antagonisms. The Indian bourgeoisie, however, are more afraid of the revolutionary movement of the workers, of the threatening agrarian revolution of the peasants than of British imperialism. They place their class in-

terests above their national interests and conclude a fighting alliance with English imperialism against the working people of their own country.

In 1922 the National Congress in **Bardoli** betrayed the national revolutionary movement. The present decision of the Executive of the National Congress sets the crown to the unending acts of national treachery which the National Congress has committed since 1930, since the commencement of the famous salt campaign initiated by **Gandhi**.

The difference between 1922 and 1934, however, is enormous. In 1922 the National Congress announced the cessation of any struggle at a time when the national revolutionary movement was ebbing. At the present time, however, the wave of national revolutionary movement is rising in India. In 1922 the working class did not play an independent role in the national revolutionary movement. Since 1928, however, the working class has come forward as an independent political force and is fighting for hegemony in the national revolutionary movement. In 1922 the National Congress was the undisputed leader of the whole of the people, and the opposition of the working class and of the peasantry was only expressed in spontaneous outbreaks. To-day the working class is building up, even if slowly and under great difficulties, its advance-guard, the **Communist Party of India**, and the peasantry has shown in gigantic mass risings in **Burma**, **Berar**, **Kashmir**, **Alwar**, and **Bengal** how profound is the ferment, how great is the indignation against imperialist oppression, against the feudal yoke, against extortion and heavy taxation, how imminent is the agrarian revolution.

In 1930 **Gandhi** still had the urban bourgeoisie, broad strata of the intelligentsia and students behind him. The new shameful capitulation, the new shameful treachery is shaking the petty-bourgeois mass basis of the National Congress, and it depends upon the Communists, upon the revolutionary labour movement, whether the "Left" phrasemongers of the Congress, **Nehru**, **Bose**, will succeed in keeping the petty-bourgeois masses under their influence. A wave of acts of individual terror is sweeping India. This shows that the petty-bourgeois masses are turning away from the Congress methods; but it also shows that they have not yet found the way to Communism, to the revolutionary mass struggle.

The Indian bourgeoisie has again capitulated. The capitulation of the National Congress is taking place to-day on an incomparably higher historical stage than in 1922. The bourgeoisie is capitulating and kow-towing to British imperialism. The proletariat, however, is fighting! The textile workers of **Bombay** are marching again in the vanguard. More than 75,000 textile workers have been on strike for over a month, and in demonstrations and street fights are defying the combined forces of British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie. This strike struggle is also taking place on an incomparably higher plane than the big strike struggles of 1928 and 1929. The English government has caused all Communists in **Bombay** who could be found, and also the strike committee which, according to the reports of the government, is under Communist influence, to be arrested. The government maintains that the Communists prepared and led the strike, that the Communist Party of India is working to support the strike of the **Bombay** textile workers by a general strike of the jute workers, metal workers and railway workers, and by spreading the strike to all textile centres of India. In 1929 the English government wished to crush the strike of the textile workers by arresting the leaders of the **Girni Kamgar Union** and the leaders of the **Workers' and Peasants' Party**. To-day they are directing their counter-reactionary blow against the Communist Party.

The National Congress is capitulating—the proletariat is fighting under the leadership of the Communists.

The Agrarian Problem in India

I.—Imperialism, the Oppression of the Landlords and Moneylenders and the Peasants

(1) The Indian villages suffer from the bitter oppression and exploitation of the British imperialists, from the rule and exploitation of the landlords and money-lenders, from the ruin and handicrafts of home industries by foreign capital, from the exactions of the merchants and traders, from the fact that their vitality is drained by the British invaders and their numerous assistants and auxiliaries. They suffer together with the whole country from national servitude and slavery. They are crushed and strangled by the iron hand of British capital, which mercilessly squeezes out ruinous taxes, transfers Indian raw material to England at a trifling price, which has fixed its greedy claws into all the wealth of India and in every way hinders its industrial development. India is a colony of British imperialism. The sweat and blood of the millions of toilers of India is converted by British capital into super-profits. With their aid it maintains its domination over the defenceless and ruined country.

British imperialism works hand in hand with the worst oppressors and exploiters of the Indian villages, strengthening, inspiring and utilising them for the further enslavement of India. Its direct support consists of the **landlords, moneylenders and intermediary merchant capital**, which helps it to exploit the country. If the Indian peasant could freely cultivate his land and not slave on a pitiful plot of land rented from the landlord, if he were not strangled with debts and taxes, British imperialism would be unable to keep this enormous country with 300,000,000 inhabitants in hopeless servitude. At the same time, if it were not for the power of the British invaders, the power of their banks, their commercial and industrial firms, their domination in all the decisive branches of national economy, then the landlords and moneylenders would not be able to maintain their hold over the Indian peasants.

(2) British imperialism has cut India off from the rest of the world and hinders its free development. Having taken possession of the country by violence and trickery, British capital has seized the forests (half of the forests belong to the government) and the chief sources of irrigation (one-quarter of the cultivated land is irrigated from sources belonging to the government), has seized the best land for its plantations and estates (1½ million acres, the exported products of which comprise almost one-fifth of the cost of all the exports of agriculture), has established a barbarous system of taxation plunder and ruin of the peasants (the income of the Anglo-Indian government from the land tax and other taxes is almost nine-tenths of its total income, and even this sum is insufficient by 25 per cent. to cover all its expenses for the support of troops, officials and tax collectors). It has partly submitted to itself the old rulers, the native rajahs and feudalists, and has partly replaced them by zamindars and its own officials.

In some provinces the British conquerors have established the zamindar system, making the landlords responsible for the payment of the taxes. . . . In other districts they have introduced the renting of land by the peasants for indefinite periods and the direct payment of the land tax to the government. In addition, in a number of places, they have introduced a combined system, making the ownership of land depend on the payment of a tax depending on the harvest. This unevenness of the land system was caused, firstly, by the desire to utilise the conquest of India in order to plunder its land and forest wealth, to seize the irrigation system and carry on the most shameless taxation plunder. Secondly, the British conquerors have tried to remove the part of the upper Indian feudalists who offered some resistance, not wishing to give up their previous power and income. Thirdly, they aimed at strengthening their own power, acting as the supreme judge in conflicts between isolated groups of feudalists and landlords and in conflicts between the peasants and the feudalists and landlords who were not sufficiently yielding to the British. Finally, in this sphere also the British conquerors tried to carry out their fundamental rule, "divide and conquer," setting the local rank, caste, religious and tribal interests against each other, putting some in an unprivileged situation compared with others. Further changes took place in these land systems under the influence of the fact that British capital more and more converted India into a supplier of raw material and food for Great

Britain, while at the same time, owing to this, the power of the upper feudalists and landlords and merchant capital was increased, as the supporters and servants of the British invaders. In the districts of ryotwar, where the primary peasants to a great extent had access to the land, there has also arisen a landlord class which has seized the greater part of the land by violence, usury and chicanery. On the other hand, the ruin of the peasants in these districts by taxation also helped to deprive them of land and ruin them.

British imperialism keeps the chief banks in its own hands. It dictates the exchange rate of the rupee, compelling the population of India to sell at a small price and to buy at high prices. It squeezes out the accumulations of the country. It owns the railroads and steamers, arranging everything so that farm products can be easier and more cheaply carried to the ports for export. The population of India suffers from a shortage of everything, not having free access to the world market, not having even the possibility of unrestrained commodity exchange between the various provinces and districts of the country. While the internal trade turnover of India is twelve times as great as the foreign trade, the whole commercial system, consisting of innumerable middlemen and agents of British capital, from the foreign banks to the village aratdars, mahojahs, marwaris, etc., are constantly and untiringly working to deprive India of necessities and reduce the price of its products. Along these commercial channels, millions of yards of foreign textiles, masses of foreign manufactures, come into the country and destroy peasant home industries and ruin the small handicraft men. British imperialism has established a monopoly on salt, spirit, etc. It takes its levy on every pinch of salt. British capital stands fiercely on guard so that India cannot become a developed industrial country. It owns the mines, the big factories, which produce equipment, etc. It tries to leave India without big industry which could produce its own machines, and struggles frenziedly so that the greater part of India will remain a big village working to enrich the British bourgeoisie, its banks, factories and mines over the sea. In India a slow growth is taking place in light industry, chiefly the textile industry, giving work only to a small portion of those who cannot maintain themselves on the land in a state of semi-starvation.

The British raj means the constant, organised and merciless robbing of the Indian villages and their barbarous oppression. The unseen hand of the British invaders penetrates everywhere, into the most distant and isolated corners of the country, because British capital has violently taken possession of the chief sources of existence of hundreds of millions of Indians. It has possession of the minerals, the forests and the chief irrigation enterprises of the country. The best land has been taken for its plantations and estates. The Indian peasants have no fuel and no wood for small repairs. Their animals are dying from under-nourishment. Their land dries up from insufficient irrigation. They struggle helplessly on small scattered strips of land, harried by the tax collector, the landlord and the moneylender. But British capital receives hundreds of millions of rupees in profits from the Indian minerals, forests, land and water. The irrigation systems alone produce a profit of 20 per cent. on capital.

British capital has divided India into pieces and supports the existence of the native princes who occupy almost two-fifths of the area of the country. In these native states the peasants have no rights whatever. They are plundered as people were plundered only in the most distant times. They are not looked on as people. In British India the same takes place but in a concealed manner, under the cover of the British troops, the police and officials. Hundreds of villages, whole districts are ruined by plundering military posts organised to force out tribute. The word of the British sahib and his servants—the tasildars, judges, landlords or police—is law. And the law is a fist striking the peasant in the back. If a farm labourer or peasant wants to go on to new uncultivated land or to work in another country, or even into the town, he is not allowed by his state of servitude, which is guarded by British capital. It only takes farm labourers into its plantations when it needs them. The overwhelming mass of the village population are tied down to the land which cannot feed them because British goods have forced from the market the manufactures of the peasant

families and handicrafts, while the weak industry of the towns, crushed by British capital, cannot provide work for tens of millions of people who are unable to feed themselves in the country. Every year the Indian peasants on the average earn less than the British government spends to keep a prisoner in jail. All India forms a big British prison, but the Indian villages are the worst dungeons of this prison, where the convicts work for their jailors.

At least two-thirds of the land suitable for cultivation is owned by the imperialists and landlords, while more than nine-tenths of the village population of India own one-third of the land. In some provinces and districts (Bombay, Bengal, North Madras, the Central and United Provinces), big landed estates occupy a still larger area and still more drive the peasant masses into the impasse of starvation. The distinction between districts of zamindars and ryotwars is more and more being erased. During the time of British rule, there has been a steady growth in the ladder of intermediate rent receivers who rent out land which they themselves rent from others. A herd of parasites of various degrees feed on the backs of the Indian peasants. This takes place because the peasants are crushed down by the rule of the imperialists, big land ownership and usury. They cannot find free land for cultivation or find any other source of income. As a rule the peasants receive land from the landlords on share-cropping conditions (batai) and hand over to the landlords at least one-half of their harvest, but more frequently two-thirds or more. Sometimes the landlord lends seed and some implements to the peasants, most of whom are without land, and takes a larger proportion of the harvest. Sometimes the sowing and cultivation take place entirely at the cost of the peasants. However this may be, the whole existence of the landless peasants or those with little land depends on the whim of the landlord, usurer and tax collector. The fact that the peasant land is split into small plots widely separated from each other, the absence of pasture for the cattle, the absence of forest rights, the seizure of the water and the best situated land by the landlords and the village landgrabbers, the extreme poverty and smallness of the peasant equipment, all lead to the enslavement of the toiling peasants and farm labourers by the landlords and moneylenders. The Indian village is the kingdom of forced labour. Not only in Orissa, but also in Behar, Orissa, Bengal and other provinces, there is a flourishing system of "begar," compulsory labour service for the landlords. In many places the landlord has the right, without payment and whenever he thinks fit, to use the labour, oxen, plough and cart of "his" tenant peasant. The landlord forces from the peasants "salaam," "hatiana," "motorana," etc., whenever he needs money. The landlord's personal estate ("seer") is usually cultivated by unfree tenants. The tenant has no rights except to cultivate the land which he rents and to live in the house which he has bought or built. The parasite landowner owns the grass and the wild honey in the forests, the skins of all animals which die on his land, the brushwood. Especially in the native States, the landlords make all kinds of exactions on the peasants. The situation of the peasants without land and implements borders on slavery. The "Kamia" in Behar and Orissa receives in kind one-third of the pay which is given to a free farm labourer. He is also obliged to make his family work for the lord, he never sees money, and can never pay his debt throughout his whole life. A number of the native tribes supply farm labourers to the landlords, and these labourers are in the position of slaves without the right freely to dispose of themselves or their property.

The toiling peasants, plundered by the landlords, moneylenders and imperialism, are also compelled to carry out many services without payment. The landlords and the British officials compel the miserable, oppressed peasants to make new roads and repair old ones, to build and repair bridges, to clean water-pools and dig canals. The peasants do not receive anything whatever for their labour, for the work of their oxen or for their tools. The peasants are forced to supply transport free of charge for officials, elders, chowkidars and other lords. All this is an additional load on the peasants. If the ruined peasant cannot carry out the labour and transport obligations, he is heavily fined and sometimes is beaten up and flogged.

The peasants not only hand over to the landlords a large part of their harvest, but imperialism has given to the landlords the right to make all kinds of collections from the peasants.

If there is a birth, death, or marriage in the family of a landlord, the surrounding peasants have to pay from their harvest for

the expensive ceremony which usually accompanies such happenings. The landlord takes advantage of every such case to fleece the peasants still more.

When selling or mortgaging his tiny rented plot of land, the ruined peasant is sometimes compelled to pay 25 per cent. of the sale price or the mortgage to the landlord. As a result of all these additional exactions, not to mention labour and transport obligations, he frequently has to pay out half of the part of the harvest which the landlord takes for himself from the peasant strip. Unlimited and extensive exactions are additional and open plunder.

The priests and churches of all religions are also big landowners. The Hindu temples, their tremendous wealth and land, are the private property of the descendants of the founders of the temple. The incomes of the Mussulman "Wakfs" and the Sikh "Gurdwars" should be used for charitable purposes and education, but in reality they go into the pockets of the mullahs and mahants. The peasants live still worse on church land than on the land of the landlords. They have to supply vegetable oil, food and their own labour for the temple services. They have not even such limited rights as are given by "permanent" tenancy on landlords' land. Imperialism is the defender and patron of temple and priest landownership. Increasing the land tax on the peasants, imperialism reduces the tax on the land of the temples, mosques or altars, or else remits it altogether. Under the protection of the British plunderers, church landownership flourishes greatly. In Punjab one-tenth of the land tax is paid by temples and altars. Temple land reaches a great size in the south of India (Madras and the native States). Inam land in Bombay and Madras is also a means of enslaving the peasants.

The British invaders have deprived India of freedom and independence, and at the same time have ruined home industries and handicrafts, taking a great deal from the Indian villages as regards these important sources of income, and giving nothing in exchange. The textiles of Lancashire in England and the chief Japanese textile goods are rapidly killing the spinning wheel. The products of foreign factories are taking the last handful of rice from the Indian poor peasants, but at the same time there is nowhere to go from this want and poverty. In a backward, enslaved country, the machine and the gains of science and technique are available only for a few selected rich people who exploit Indian poverty. The peasants' common land on which they formerly fed their cattle has been plundered by the imperialists, the landlords and the moneylenders. In Bengal it was needed to sow jute which was necessary for the British factories, and the landlords soon seized it. Only a minority of the Indian villages can keep cattle for cultivating the fields. If a farm has less than 20 to 40 acres, a pair of oxen or buffaloes would eat up everything. The starved and dying cattle cannot give milk to the sick and the children. Therefore in India death carries off twice as many people as in England. Child mortality is three times as great.

The peasant has nothing with which to repair his plough or door or to warm his family. The forests are owned by the British invaders and the zamindar landlords, who do not even allow cattle to graze in the forests.

The British rulers in India are building enormous dams and other structures for artificial irrigation, so that the Indian land will not cease to grow raw material for their factories—cotton, jute, oil seeds, etc., but the water has been seized by the strong of the world. The landlords, zamindars and landgrabbers are the owners of the streams and springs, while the water, without which the land will die, is more and more leaving the drying peasant pools.

But it is worst of all with the land. The village land is tilled everywhere in petty little strips scattered in ten to thirty different places. The peasants only exhaust their strength and exhaust the land for which they have no fertiliser. In some of the strips it is not even possible to turn a plough. The plots are so close together, so intertwined with each other, that the land which should feed the peasant becomes a trap for him. Even on these pitiful plots of land, mostly rented, he is squeezed by the hand of the landlord. The law does not allow a peasant to dig a small water-pool without the permission of the landowner. He cannot put up the necessary buildings. He seeks for water and separates himself from his neighbour by thick walls, goes to law for every inch of ground, and rushes from side to side, unable to find his rights anywhere.

The greater part of his harvest goes to the landlord and

moneylender. He must pay his rent either by selling or giving up the harvest. He sells his harvest at a time when the market is full of agricultural products and when prices are low, because the landlord, the moneylender and the tax collectors stretch out their hands towards the peasant harvest. The peasant is underweighted and plundered, and from this his exploiters forge out new wealth for themselves. The peasant gets ever deeper into debt servitude because any misfortune on his farm, a bad harvest, the death of his cattle, a sickness in the family, the death of relatives or the marriage of a daughter drags him into the net of the moneylender.

His farm is ruined more and more. He cannot buy agricultural implements. He has neither land nor seed nor water to carry on a profitable rotation of crops, while, as a rule, the Indian peasant and his family are starving and without work for nearly half the year. He grows grain to feed himself, but, instead of feeding him, his labour supports and nourishes his ruin and servitude. After the landlord and tax collector, a ravenous horde of baki, mahojans, marwaris, etc., rush on his harvest, which has been produced by the hands of farm labourers and peasants, and they take the fruits of his unbearably hard labour to the enslavers of the country, to the British imperialists. The Indian soil is becoming less and less fertile from this ruin of the peasants. The rice harvest in Japan is twice as high as in India. The harvest of wheat in America is higher by one-third. The administration of the Indian villages is in the hands of the British invaders, appointed or hereditary pottels, police and the panchayats who help them, consisting of representatives of the highest castes, office holders and landgrabbers. The peasant masses have nowhere to turn for help and protection.

II.—The Class Differentiation of the Villages

The Indian villages are no longer the previous villages which lived isolated to themselves, divided into castes and not knowing what took place around them. From behind the back of the foreign enslavers of India there has arisen a new power, the power of money, the market, wealth. Some representatives of the old landlord ranks were unable to combine the power of the fist with the power of the purse, and they went under. While in their place there arose rich moneylenders, city capitalists, prosperous landowners, etc. Many brahmins, who previously lived on the backs of others by the right of blood, now stretch out their hands for alms, while the moneylenders, merchants, or new landlords from Sudra squeeze profits out of the toilers who are in their power. The old castes are beginning to lose their old power as a source of division of the toilers and exploited. However, the division into higher and lower castes and untouchables is supported by the imperialists, landlords, moneylenders and the representatives of the highest castes who live by renting out land, usury and the exploitation of the labour of others. The shameful division of people into castes is required only by slaveowners. Not only the caste system, but also the former apparently irreconcilable division of Hindus and Mussulmen into "higher" and "lower" tribes, etc., no longer has the same influence on people as previously. Though in one part of the country the blood of the Hindu peasants is sucked by the Mussulman spider—the landlord or moneylender—in another part the blood of the Mussulman peasant is sucked by the Hindu spider—the moneylender. Capital has invaded the country and sorted out people in a new manner. It is not the former castes and ranks, the division according to religion or tribal origin, but **classes**, which have begun to unite people in their life and struggle for their national rights, for their burning class interests and demands. In places where private property is growing and multiplying in the means of production, where there is an increase in the number of people who hire working hands so that these hands will work on their land with the help of their machines for their advantage and enrichment, in such places society inevitably splits into two camps, into two divisions. One division consists of those who, having nothing to work with, are compelled to sell their labour power for work on means of production belonging to others. The other division consists of those who exploit the labour power of others owing to their wealth. Capital and labour are the two really irreconcilable camps of every bourgeois society. In India this division is becoming stronger and stronger, simultaneously with the growth and deepening of the gulf between British imperialism and the Indian people. British capital rules and dominates in India. But in India there are the Indian city bourgeoisie, Hindus and Mussul-

men, who own factories in Bombay, Ahmedabad and other places, who have their banks and commercial offices, their steamers, shops and warehouses. In India there is a numerous factory proletariat working in the factories of British and Indian capital. The Indian exploiters try in every way to keep the Indian villages back from the class struggle, and, with this deceitful aim, they claim that there are no classes in the Indian villages. They try to maintain peace between the landlords and the peasants whom they exploit, between the village rich and the farm labourers. In reality, the development of capital has turned the entire old system of village relations upside down. The exploitation and oppressions of the foreign invaders, the servitude and oppression of the landlords and moneylenders are becoming more and more unbearable because it is already impossible to live in the old manner, while imperialism and its hangers-on are trying to maintain and preserve the rule of the old servitude in the form of bondage and combine it with the new hired slavery.

Capitalism is the system of hired slavery, while feudalism is the supreme power of landlord servitude and the stick. India is at the crossroads. It has moved from its previous place in the direction of capitalism, but cannot reorganise itself from top to bottom on capitalist lines because imperialism inspires the old servitude and prolongs it by renewing it. Nevertheless the power of capitalism is already making itself manifest in the fact that in place of the old self-contained village there has arisen the new village, not living to feed itself but working for the market. The village community is more and more falling to pieces owing to the growth of property inequality and the exploitation of one member of the community by another. The community rights in the panchayats and in everyday life are more and more being seized by rich land grabbers from the highest castes, moneylenders, merchants and kulaks. The villages increase the sowing of jute when the price of jute rises and cut down on the sowing of cotton when the price of cotton falls. The power of capitalism manifests itself in the fact that in addition to the vast majority of the landlords who rent out nearly all their land and get rich by enslaving the tenants, there is growing a new strata of landlord employers who are beginning to run their own farms, using more modern implements, seed, fertilisers and hired labour. On the other hand it is manifested in the fact that the once united peasants are becoming differentiated, and **kulaks** or village bourgeoisie are being formed from the richer strata who have some surplus in the means of production (land, cattle, implements, seed, etc.) compared with the number of working hands in the family. They cultivate the land by means of constant hired labour. In addition to the kulaks at the top, there is growing up at the bottom a numerous class of **constant hired agricultural workers and day labourers**, who possess nothing but their labour power. **The village poor**, who form the majority of the Indian peasants, do not possess the necessary means of production to carry on their own farming. They have to sell their labour power to keep alive. However, the greater part of them are deprived of this possibility because they cannot find work either in the town, because of the insufficient development of industry or in the village which is suffering from the decline of agriculture. They are ruined, deprived of land, become paupers and starve. The intermediate position between the kulaks and the village poor is occupied by the middle peasants who do not constantly use hired labour, who suffer from insufficient land and the oppression of the landlords and moneylenders, but who sell part of their products on the market and can only make ends meet in the most favourable years.

In India a number of **districts of commercial agriculture** have already been formed, where special crops for the market are mostly sown and cultivated. These are the cotton districts of the Deccan, the jute districts in Bengal, wheat in Punjab, rice in Burma, sugar cane in the United Provinces, ground nuts in Madras, Bombay, Orissa, the Central Provinces, tobacco in Bombay and Madras. Along with these there are the British tea plantations in Assam. Dependence on the market is greatest in these very districts. Here the **enrichment of a small group of landlords, moneylenders, merchants and kulaks who trade in these crops**, is going on most rapidly. Here the toilers without land or with very little land are most rapidly being converted into the agricultural proletariat. Here hired labour is mostly squeezing out the usual landlord and moneylender servitude. Here capital subordinates all the conditions of production to itself more than anywhere else. The capitalist development in agriculture is carried out here not suddenly, not en-

tirely, but in a partial manner, paying great tribute to the accustomed servitude. Before starting a big capitalist farm, the landlord forces the tenant to sow on the rented land the crops which are most profitable to him. He begins to give out improved seed and lends cattle and implements so as to assure the most profitable harvest. He introduces capitalist farming with strong animals, machines and workers, first of all on the land of the "seer." Thus he becomes a big supplier of wheat, cotton jute, sugar cane. He changes from a landlord enslaving the tenants by means of land rent into a manufacturer of wheat, cotton and jute, exploiting hired workers.

The kulak most frequently starts by obtaining working hands, lending out part of his productive surplus and fodder to the poor and middle peasants at hard times and afterwards compelling them to work off their debt. In addition to this, in view of the great shortage of cattle and especially fodder in India among the vast majority of the peasants, there is a flourishing system of hiring out cattle and implements. In reality the peasant who works on his own bit of land to pay for hired cattle or implements is not working for himself but for the person who receives profit from the surplus of cattle, implements or seed. Often the kulak is a small village shopkeeper. He gives out goods on credit and takes the harvest of the debtors as half-payment.

As the great mass of the village population in India use hired strips of land to provide the most miserable income, it is not surprising that the kulak very often gets rich by moneylending. He makes people work for him not as hired workers but as debt slaves. He contrives to jump on the peasant's back like a new landlord enslaving tenants. The very air in the Indian villages is infected with shameful slavery, and the people are so crushed and downtrodden that it is sufficient to have one or two pairs of bulls, a surplus of seed, fodder or food, to have a little extra money or commodities, in order to become not only the master but the lord before whom all must bow. Surplus land gives almost unlimited power over the tenants. In India there are no free peasant farms on free land. The land and water are in servitude. The farm labourers and the toiling and exploited peasants are in servitude. The kulaks gather scattered plots of land into one unit, consolidate themselves on the best land, seize on the use of water. The kulaks rent land on better conditions than the poor and middle peasants. For them the land is not a source of food, but a means of growing rich. The kulaks sell their commodities at higher prices than the exploited masses of the villages. They can wait for a good buyer and higher prices. They are nearer to the town market and are not so much short-weighted. For great masses of the peasants the use of the land means lifelong servitude and work for a single landlord and moneylender, from whom it is impossible to escape. The statement of the imperialists, landlords and capitalists that co-operative societies will set them free from the net of the moneylender is false and deceitful throughout. Most of them give loans only to the landlords, moneylenders and kulaks, and serve as an instrument for enriching and helping them.

But along with this mass in India there is a numerous **agricultural proletariat**. Year after year hundreds of thousands of workers come from Madras, Bengal, the United Provinces, Behar and Orissa, to the tea plantations in Assam, from the North of Behar and Orissa to gather the jute and cotton in Bengal, from the upper parts of Madras to the delta districts. Hundreds of thousands of coolies go to work in the tea plantations in Ceylon, South Africa and other places. For the farm labourer, a nameless master—to-day one person, to-morrow another, to-day in one place, to-morrow in another—is more profitable than a parasite which sucks out the whole life of its victim and never releases it.

The village poor are also drawn into seasonal work for wages. They themselves partly lead the existence of hired workers. Frequently the poor peasant is a farm labourer with a plot of land, working his whole life to pay rent to the landowner. However, in view of the great shortage of work and the tremendous shortage of land the poor peasants are tied down to their poverty-stricken life in the place where their fathers lived previously. It is their lot to carry the chief burden of the landlords' exactions, servitude, usury, debt slavery and caste oppression. If the agricultural worker comes from the ranks of the poor and is unable to break away from his accustomed place, he suffers especially from the savage system of servitude and slavery. According to the 1931 census in British India (without the native States), 22 per cent. of the 75½ million village population were reckoned as

farm labourers and village servants. In the plantations of the imperialists there is semi-forced labour. The recruiters bring in workers like cattle, compelling them to submit to the despotism of the planters. Coolies and plantation workers are recruited by special recruiters and sirdars who rob them. In some places the planters give them plots of land, reducing them to servitude and reducing their wages to a miserable level. At the same time, feudal servitude in many places keeps the farm labourers in the position of debt slaves or household servants, enslaved together with their families.

If the agricultural workers come from the so-called lower tribes—i.e., those without any rights—or out of the ranks of the lower castes or outcast, they are mercilessly exploited and reduced to the level of cattle. A tremendous stratum of the agricultural proletariat consists of a mixed mass of debt slaves, absolutely impoverished and starving peasants, coolies without rights, along with farm labourers working for wages. It is precisely this which prevents the agricultural proletariat from uniting into an independent class force. However, it is more and more being forced to such an independent situation by the conditions of its life. The pressure of the market, the power of money and the new capitalist order compel the farm labourers and peasants to seek new places, to leave the districts where the power of the landlord, the moneylender and the tax collector is maintained most strongly, to places where this power is less, where there is more free undivided land, where there are greater possibilities freely to apply labour to the land. In these places kulak farms grow up most quickly and there is most need for hired labour power. But even there the imperialists give out the land to the big landlords, moneylenders and merchants. The uncultivated land and partly cultivated land at the edge of the jungle is a safety valve from the old servitude which has existed for centuries in the old populated places. However, even here there is little space. Millions of acres of land in India lie uncultivated because the peasants are tied hand and foot by unpaid taxes, labour obligations and unpaid debts. In freedom, they live as if in prison. They have no strong cattle and good implements to cultivate new land. They are chained down to exhausted plots of land which can hardly provide a starvation existence because they are kept back by the chain of British imperialism, the chain of the slavery of the landlords and moneylenders.

The capitalist development in agriculture in India is taking place slowly, with difficulty and delays. It is accompanied by the dying out of millions who cannot get a handful of rice for their labour, worn out by starvation, malaria and epidemics. In sweat and torment, India produces raw material for the factories of the British capitalists. It is a market for their goods. It is a milch cow for capitalist robbers who seek fabulous super-profits in the conquered country. India exports a large proportion of its produce over the seas as tribute. The Indian peasant cannot always cover his expenses, but simultaneously the country is dying from industrial backwardness. The imperialist town plunders the colonial village for every spool of cotton, for every piece of iron. The majority of the population of India are without work for months, but at the same time they suffer a shortage of everything, while the number of workers in subsidiary branches of industry connected with agriculture is very small. The industry of India, squeezed in the vice of imperialism, is kept undeveloped. At the same time, **hundreds of millions of rupees of the "educated" Indian lawyers, capitalists, and merchants are buried in the ground, forming a new burden, a new slavery for the Indian villages.** In the Indian villages, only 10 per cent. are literate. There are no hospitals, no doctors, and over two-thirds of the taxes which are squeezed out of the peasants are expended on the suppression of India, for the support of the British army, the police and officials, grafters and robbers.

British capital keeps India in savagery, slavery and oppression, but again it is the toiling population of India which has to pay for this humiliation and backwardness. Various districts of India which produce jute, cotton, ground nuts, rice, work chiefly not for the home market but for export, and above all for the payment of colonial tribute. But precisely because the Indian villages work like convicts chained to a cart, the products of their fields and orchards are being forced out from the markets of Europe, Asia and Africa, by the competition of countries whose land has not been exhausted by barbarous servitude and who utilise modern machine technique. Indian wheat has been killed for ever as a marketable

commodity by the tractor and combine. Indian cotton is attacked by American and African cotton. The ground nuts are killed by the competition of African farm oil, while sugar is threatened by the plantations of Java, Cuba and the Philippines. In the jungle world of capitalism, the backward are struck at. Thus India, bound in imperialist chains and entangled in landlord and usurer servitude, also suffers **the blows of capitalist rivalry**. The more the country exhausts itself by unbearable labour for its enslavers and local parasites, the more it supports its own slavery, poverty and backwardness.

The last four years of acute poverty, hopeless ruin and starvation should open the eyes of all the toilers to the real position of the Indian villages. It is as if a destructive storm had passed over the peasant huts and barns, sowing calamity and misery everywhere. **The price of all village commodities has fallen to half or even a third.** The raw material produced by peasant hands has sharply fallen in price. There has been a specially big fall of the raw material exported for British and other factories. In the rich imperialist countries, which enslaved colonies, capital is being crushed by its own wealth. The rivalry of the capitalists, the disorganisation of economy by them and the ruin of the masses have reached such a point that the market is without buyers. The factories, which have been stopped by the capitalists, no longer swallow up Indian raw material, and India as a colony has to play the pitiful role of an **appendage** of the manufactures of others. The price of goods brought over the sea has not fallen from all this half as much as the price of jute, cotton and ground nuts, but the greedy claws of the parasites—**the imperialists, landlords and moneylenders**—stretch out towards the throats of the peasants. It is true that the crisis has badly hit also some landlords and moneylenders, merchant and industrial bourgeoisie and kulaks, and some have profited. But, naturally, the chief blows have fallen on the toilers. The peasants have not been able to cover their expenses for cultivation and are being compelled to pay increased rapacious taxes, interest and rent. **Over two milliard rupees gold were withdrawn to England during these years from India, which was dying of starvation and ruin.** During these years the British robbers filled the villages with their troops and police so as to force out of the peasants absolutely all taxation arrears, moneylenders' debts and unpaid rent. In ordinary times, the Indian villages are constantly underfed and pauperised because the pressure of taxation and the hungry claws of the moneylender and landlord have compelled them to produce more and more but to sell always **cheaper and cheaper** for export. Now this impoverishment has reached the last extreme because, in view of the general stoppage of the market, unemployment and falling prices, they are compelled to pay rent which was inflated long before the crisis to such a level that it could only be paid if the peasant's products were sold at the **most favourable prices**. The knife of the moneylender, whose debt cannot be paid because of falling prices, has cut into the body of the peasants. The peasant masses, deprived of their last anna, are squeezed to the wall by the tax-collector. At the same time hundreds of thousands of workers in the towns, on the railroads and building works, in the plantations and rich capitalist farms, tens of thousands of handicraft men are deprived of their wages and have **come into the villages for food**. The crisis has caused specially strong devastation in the districts which sowed only jute or cotton, or rice or oil seeds, in the districts of Burma, Bengal, Punjab, United Provinces, Bombay, Behar, Madras. Hopeless poverty makes it impossible to reorganise the peasant farms. Watering his crops with tears and blood, giving over the land to the moneylender, the peasant is **forced to further produce low-priced crops** because he is strangled by a cruel noose of debt.

The crisis has not weakened but has **strengthened the exploitation and oppression of the imperialists**. It has not weakened but **strengthened the servitude of the landlords and moneylenders**. At the same time, while the majority of the peasant farms are undoubtedly in a state of ruin and decline, capital even in the present conditions gains new victories in the Indian villages. A small circle of capitalist landlords and kulaks in the United Provinces, in Bengal, in Madras, have partly begun to produce sugar cane themselves and have partly compelled the peasant tenants to go over to this crop, because this is favourable to the interests of the British imperialists in supplying England with Indian sugar. In Sind, Rajputana and Punjab, there are increased sowings of high-grade cotton. Over four years of starvation and ruin have thrown millions of Indian peasants into the ranks of the landless farm

labourers, have greatly increased the indebtedness of the peasant masses to the imperialists, landlords and moneylenders, increased the dependence of the peasants on them, enriching the British financial sharks with hundreds of millions, giving new millions of acres of peasant land to the landlords, moneylenders and kulaks, bringing about the **rapid enrichment of a small "selected" upper group of kulak land-grabbers**. Lies and deceit are spread by the pretended friends of the people, who claim that all suffer equally from the fall of prices, the stoppage of industry and unemployment. No. Four years of ruin have shown that the strong and rich always get richer and stronger at the expense of the toilers and the exploited, at the expense of their poverty and humility. They are even now seeking this way out of the situation—the imperialists in the further enslavement of India, the Indian parasites in the further ruin of the majority of the people. The crisis teaches the toilers of India one thing—salvation lies through struggle, through a conscious, organised and irreconcilable struggle against the oppressors and exploiters, and not through peace with them. Peace with them means reconciliation with our own slavery and ruin.

(To be continued.)

The Labour Movement

The Strike of the Greek Seamen

By Kostas Grypos

Reports are coming in from the various ports of Europe, Africa and America regarding the last outbreaks of the strike of the Greek merchant seamen, which commenced in some English ports at the beginning of March and then spread to all the Greek ships coming into harbour.

The Greek mercantile fleet is one of the most important branches of Greek industry. The fact that it was capable, under the severe conditions of the economic crisis, of standing the competition of English and Norwegian shipping is solely owing to the circumstance that the Soviet Union has chartered the larger part of the Greek ships and because the exploitation of the crews is monstrous. The pay, the food and the living quarters provided the Greek seamen are the worst in the world. No medical attention is provided. If a seaman falls sick whilst on a voyage he must simply wait till the ship puts into port. The position of the Greek seaman is so indescribably bad that some months ago the London "Times" strongly criticised the inhumane conditions in the Greek mercantile marine. This was, of course, not out of sympathy for the Greek proletarians, but in order to show by what means the Greek shipowners are able to compete with their English rivals.

In the most remote ports of the world there are unemployed Greek seamen who are handed over to misery and despair. The unemployment benefit which the Greek government grants to the unemployed seamen is a mockery. The unemployed seamen abroad obtain support from the Greek Consulates only when they enforce it by agitation under the leadership of functionaries of the Red Seamen's Union.

But this degree of exploitation of one of the oldest and best developed sections of the Greek proletariat would be impossible were it not for the active co-operation of the reformists and reactionary leaders of the seamen's union, who live on the sweat of the seamen and are prepared to commit any base treachery at any time. A year ago the result of this co-operation between the shipowners and the reformists was a regulation of wages which legalised the misery of the seamen.

It was precisely against this regulation that the present strike, which is now approaching its end, broke out—of course against the will of the reformists and mainly under the leadership of the Red Seamen's Union. The striking seamen have almost everywhere put forward the same demands: (1) increase of pay to 7 to 7½ English pounds a month; (2) eight-hour day; (3) improvement in the exceedingly bad food and its control by a ship's committee; (4) abolition of the fascist penal regulations, and granting of trade union liberty; (5) unemployed seamen to be granted benefit to the extent of 40 drachma a day, free sleeping accommodation and food, and medical aid for themselves and their families; (6) engagement of seamen to be under the control of delegates elected by the majority of seamen; (7) general amnesty for working-class fighters in Greece.

No matter into what ports the Greek ships put in, everywhere the Greek seamen have ceased work; for instance, the crew of 17 merchant ships in Buenos Aires, over 20 in Rotterdam, all ships in the Italian ports, 56 in the ports of the Soviet Union, all ships in the English ports, and also in Marseilles, Bordeaux, Antwerp, Danzig, etc.

The shipowners, whose position has been profoundly shaken by the strike, have received fullest support from the Greek government. In Piræus and other Greek harbours all meetings of seamen were prohibited and several seamen were arrested. Also in the foreign ports the authorities of all capitalist States have given the most active support to the Greek shipowners and Consuls. In the German, English, and American ports whole crews were arrested and, after long journeys through various countries, handed over to the authorities in Piræus, where they were brought before the court as "mutineers." In Antwerp a Greek seaman was sentenced to one year's imprisonment. Of course, in the ports of the Soviet Union the case was just the opposite; the Red Seamen's Trade Union and clubs came to the aid of the strikers, supported them in every way and thus helped to bring about their victory.

Greek harbour officials were sent to England in order to terrorise the strikers and thus break their front. The Minister of Marine drew up a fascist Bill enabling the shipowners to instantly dismiss any striking seamen, and on the other hand rewarded every strike-breaker by not allowing him to be dismissed during the whole of the following year.

Nevertheless, all these measures proved unable to compel the striking seamen to return to work. The strenuous efforts of the reformists to come to the aid of the shipowners proved abortive in face of the fighting spirit of the seamen. The fact that the wages settlement, on account of which the strike broke out, was their own creation did not prevent the reformists posing from the first day of the strike as the "saviours" of the seamen. They sent their representatives to London in order to do everything on the spot to throttle the strike. The most cunning trick to which they resorted in order to hold back the indignation of the seamen consisted in convening an extraordinary "Congress" of seamen to which, however, the representatives of the Red Seamen's Union were not admitted. Nevertheless, the representatives of the unemployed seamen spoke in the name of the Seamen's Union and exposed the reformists.

The Seamen and Harbour Workers' International played a leading role in all foreign ports, and through its sections helped the strikers financially and by the provision of free meals, as well as by big solidarity demonstrations. Thanks to the good agitation amongst the foreign unemployed seamen, blacklegging was prevented, in spite of the enormous unemployment. The secretary of the International was arrested in an English port and then expelled from the country. One of the leaders of the English seamen, **Pat Murphy**, was sentenced in Cardiff to 2½ months' imprisonment for actively supporting the seamen in their strike. Needless to say, the greatest support was accorded the Greek seamen in the Soviet Union ports.

In the first days of the strike the first victories were reported from English ports. Since then nearly all the striking ships succeeded in obtaining the full or partial fulfilment of their demands, especially increases in pay. In a few ports, such as Danzig, the authorities and the Greek Consul permitted ships to sail with incomplete crews, which is contrary to law, whilst the striking seamen were left behind to starve. This strike, which broke out against the will and the frantic efforts of the reformists and in spite of the terror of the State, has raised the prestige of the Red Seamen's and Harbour Workers' International. Messages of greetings came from ports all over the world. Hundreds of seamen have entered the Red Seamen's Union. In the next few weeks there will take place the All-Greek Red Congress of seamen.

Working Youth Demonstration in Budapest for Rakosi's Release

In the evening of 28th May great demonstrations were carried out in Budapest by the working youth against the death sentence threatening **Rakosi**. The demonstrations were carried out under slogans calling for the release of **Rakosi** and all other political prisoners. A number of the demonstrators defiled in front of the windows of the house of the President of the Court of Justice, **Terki**, a notorious executioner of the Hungarian workers, and protested tempestuously against the White Terror. The police attacked the young workers and arrested seven.

The White Terror

The Workers' Delegation in Indo-China

By Gabriel Péri (Paris)

The workers' committee of investigation sent by the French section of the **International Labour Defence** and the revolutionary trade union federation of France (C.G.T.U.) to Indo-China has now been back in France a month. The committee has reported on the results of its investigations in public meetings in Paris and throughout France. On the basis of the material provided by the committee's report the French section of the I.L.D. has now opened up a campaign of agitation and propaganda throughout the country to demand a general amnesty for the people of Indo-China. Over eighty meetings are being organised to this end.

The Committee, which left Marseilles at the end of last January and returned to France in the second half of April, had a double aim. In the first place it went to investigate the complaints made by the relatives of the victims of French imperialist oppression in connection with the great trial which opened on May 7, 1933, and resulted in the passing of terms of imprisonment totalling nine hundred years. And, secondly, it went to investigate the extent of the crisis and its effects on the working masses of Indo-China.

Naturally, the delegates of the French proletariat were subjected to all sorts of chicanery and sabotage on the part of the authorities. They were refused permission to enter two of the French protectorates, namely, **Annam** and **Tonking**, and where ever the delegates went they were followed by a mob of special police and detectives who dogged their footsteps. Instructions were given by the authorities to prominent personalities in Indo-China not to receive the delegation, and the natives were forbidden under pain of severe reprisals to hold any converse with the members of the delegation. The delegation was forbidden to give a public report of its doings at a meeting in **Saigon**. With all these measures the Governor-General hoped to make the work of the delegation impossible of performance and to cause its members to break off their visit without having achieved their objects. However, the delegation refused to permit itself to be sidetracked and remained the appointed period in Indo-China. Despite all the measures of the authorities the members of the delegation succeeded in getting into touch with the relatives of the victims of French imperialism, and they succeeded in studying the conditions of the toiling masses in **Cochin-China**, if not in **Annam** and **Tongking**. Despite all the efforts made to isolate the delegation, its presence and its activities rapidly became known all over the country, and again and again the native population expressed its sympathy with the delegation by displaying bunting with slogans of welcome at prominent points and by hoisting red flags. There is no doubt that the activity of the delegation—the first of its kind—did much to encourage the national-revolutionary fighting spirit of the toilers of Indo-China.

The Governor-General at first announced loudly that the delegation would be able to achieve nothing, thanks to the police measures which had been taken, but after a time the press changed its tone, and during the last few days of the delegation's stay regret was expressed that it had ever been allowed to land in the colony and endanger public order and security.

Another fact which indicates the effect of the delegation's visit was that during its stay the Governor-General felt it wise to publish an official statement denying the charges which have been levelled against the French administration by the **Amnesty Committee on behalf of the people of Indo-China**. This fact alone is enough to prove the anxiety and discomfort caused in the ranks of the colonial exploiters by the solidarity action of the working masses in the motherland. During its stay in Indo-China the workers' delegation expressed this solidarity in the most concrete fashion.

At the end of its investigations the delegates drew up a list of demands on behalf of the people of Indo-China and forwarded them to the Governor-General. Many newspapers were compelled to publish the demands. The chief demand put forward was for a general and unconditional **amnesty** for all the victims of imperialist oppression in Indo-China. The memorandum issued by the delegation gave details of the horrible conditions prevailing in the prisons and on the notorious island of **Poulo-Condor**.

Prior to the granting of a general amnesty the delegation demanded treatment as political prisoners for all the victims of imperialism and the punishment of all police and other officials who have been implicated in the torture and maltreatment of prisoners.

The delegation also strongly condemned the wage-cuts, the system of fines in the factories and the imposition of corporal punishment. It demanded a weekly day of rest for the coolies, free medical assistance, unemployment insurance at the cost of the State and the employers, and the abolition of the prevailing system of compulsory arbitration under the dominance of the police.

Despite all difficulties placed in their path, the delegates of the French workers were able to study the working conditions prevailing on the plantations and the miserable conditions under which the coolies live who are compelled to work in the Hevea forests. On their behalf the delegation demanded the abolition of compulsory contracts, the abolition of the forced recruitment of labour and the abolition of the compulsory labour quota which keeps the coolies chained to the plantations.

Cochin-China has been hit most severely by the crisis owing to the drop in the demand for rice. The district is almost wholly dependent on the rice crop, and the economic crisis has ruined the rice peasants, who are in consequence in a state of ferment. The poor peasants, the seasonal workers, and the small leaseholders, who are the chief figures in Indo-China, are threatened with increasing misery and even starvation. It was clear to the delegation that these categories could be saved only by the immediate adoption of various measures, including the abolition of the leasehold system, the quashing of usurious loans and the arrears, the prohibition of the seizure of the peasant land and foreclosures, no imprisonment for the non-payment of taxes, taxation to be borne by the well-to-do and not the poor, the distribution of the municipal lands to the peasants under the control of peasant committees, the distribution of the rice stores amongst the indigent, the distribution of the government subsidies and grants to the peasants and not to the plantation owners.

The rapid development of the economic crisis in Indo-China threatens to cause the collapse of the whole colonial system. Seventy years ago France gained a hold on Indo-China, and ever since the apologists of French imperialism have announced that French rule has developed the productive forces of the colony, and that there has been increasing prosperity for twenty millions of people as a result.

These two excuses which have served French imperialism for over half a century to justify its robbery have now been completely robbed of all justification. Above all, French imperialism in Indo-China has developed only those branches of industry which were calculated to make the colony dependent on the motherland and to turn it into a market for French goods and a basis for French imperialism in the Far East. French imperialism has, however, carefully avoided any attempt to utilise the natural resources of the colony in iron ores, etc. At the moment the chief natural product of Indochina is rice, which represents 70 per cent. of its exports. Forty per cent. of this was sold to China via Hongkong. Since 1930, however, the price of rice has steadily fallen and Indo-China has also suffered from the effects of the world economic crisis.

However, the policy of French finance capital, the policy of imperialism, has intensified the consequences of the rice crisis. The French authorities have replaced the old silver piaster, which had the same value as the Hongkong dollar, with a gold piaster, which is worth two Hongkong dollars. As a result, the rice peasant of Indo-China saw his income halved, whilst his expenditure, his debts and his taxes were still reckoned in the same number of piasters as before. As a result, the budget of the rice grower and small leaseholder simply will not balance, and they become the easy prey of the **Bank of Indo-China**. The purchasing power of the rice peasants has been cut away to nothing, and during the past three years no less than 350,000 hectares of rice land have been let go out of cultivation.

There is no doubt, however, that a return to the old silver piaster would not solve the problem, because the rice crisis is one of the consequences of the world economic crisis, because Indochina not only sells, but also purchases, and because the improvement brought about by the greater facility to sell goods abroad had as a counterweight the increase in the cost of living at home. However, it is a fact that the stabilisation which has been carried

out, and which has so worsened the situation of the Indo-Chinese working masses, had one main aim, namely, to guarantee and protect French capital investments in the colony. The rice fields may stand bare and twenty millions of people may go hungry so long as the interests of the capitalist speculators are protected.

The aim of French imperialism was further to strengthen the bonds between the colony and the motherland, to place **Marseilles** in the place of Hongkong, and to place the French firms, Denis Frères, Distilleries Fontane, etc., in place of the Chinese merchants who previously controlled the major portion of Indo-Chinese trade. The measures of French imperialism have disorganised the internal market of Indo-China. Ninety thousand Chinese have left the country, and **Cholon** has been almost completely ruined and presents a picture of closed and dilapidated shops. In other words, the colonial policy of finance capitalism, of imperialism, is ruining Indochina.

In its report the French workers' delegation has not failed to stress this cardinal fact, and it urges the necessity for the proletariat of France to support the toiling masses of Indo-China and their Communist Party in their efforts to obtain the independence of Indo-China.

The **Communist Party of Indo-China** is subjected to fierce repression and persecution, but the blows which have descended upon it have not crippled its fight. After every bloody orgy of French imperialism it has succeeded in mobilising and organising its forces to continue the struggle. The Party lives in close touch with the heroic Communist Party of China, whose glorious example serves as a beacon to the Communist Parties of the East, like the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist Parties of the West.

Solidarity With the Toilers of Bulgaria in the Struggle Against the Fascist Military Dictatorship

Appeal of the International Labour Defence

In Bulgaria a fascist military dictatorship has been proclaimed according to the Latvian model. The composition of the new Cabinet reveals its character: The Prime Minister is Colonel **Kimo Georgejev**, one of the main organisers of the fascist upheaval of June 9, 1923, and of the bloody orgies during the Zankov regime. In its first manifesto the new government proclaimed the fight against Communism as its main task. All legal revolutionary mass organisations were dissolved. At the same time, following the example of Hitler and Dollfuss, parliament has been abolished.

The toiling masses of Bulgaria are replying with protest actions to the proclamation of the open fascist military dictatorship. In spite of the censorship, reports have come through of unrest in the provinces, demonstrations in Sofia, mass arrests and house searches. In Sofia alone, thousands of revolutionary workers were arrested.

Three years ago, in 1931, the bloody **Liaptchev-Zankov** government was overthrown and replaced by the **Muchanov-Gitcheff** government. This last government, which based itself upon the peasants' league and the former bourgeois oppositional parties, developed a broad demagogy in order to consolidate the shaken position of the bourgeoisie. As, however, the resentment of the toiling masses and their struggles led to a great upsurge of the revolutionary movement, the Bulgarian bourgeoisie resorted to its last means—the proclamation of the open fascist military dictatorship—in order to maintain its rule.

The demagogy of the **Muchanov** government was, however, accompanied by terrorist methods against the toilers. The terror was particularly intensified in the last few months, during which numerous mass trials took place and dozens of death sentences were pronounced on revolutionary workers, soldiers and sailors.

Only recently, on May 17, the district court of **Sevlievo** pronounced judgment on 93 persons, mostly young, accused of membership of revolutionary mass organisations and condemned 55 of them to a total of 190 years' compulsory labour and 11½ million leva in fines. Sixty-one of the accused were excluded from the court proceedings on the first day of the trial on account of the courageous manner in which they conducted their defence, and were thus deprived during the whole proceedings of the right to defend themselves. Every day the court received numerous protest telegrams from workers' organisations and protest meetings. When judgment was pronounced the accused arranged a fighting

demonstration by hoisting a red flag, which they had hitherto concealed, and shouting "Down with fascist justice!"

The fact that **General Midleff**, the Minister for the Interior, is at the same time Minister for Justice, signalises the extreme danger that the death sentences pronounced on 56 revolutionary soldiers, sailors and anti-war fighters, the carrying out of which had been prevented by the protest campaign at home and abroad, will now be carried out.

The proclamation of the open fascist military dictatorship in Bulgaria, the terror in the other Balkan countries, are at the same time a symptom of the feverish preparations for war, and before all the war against the Soviet Union. The Union of Reserve Officers, the main support of the new government, is at the head of the campaign against the Soviet Union.

The I.L.D. summons the toilers of the whole world at once to organise solidarity actions with the toilers of Bulgaria. Fight under the leadership of the I.L.D. against the bloody suppressive measures of the fascist military dictatorship, against the wholesale arrests and the suppression of the revolutionary mass organisations! Launch a mass protest in order to prevent the carrying out of the death sentences pronounced on the revolutionary soldiers, sailors and anti-war fighters! Demand at the same time the release of the arrested railway workers in Rumania, who are again being placed in the dock! Support the fight of the I.L.D. for the general amnesty for the political prisoners in Yugoslavia! Support the toilers of Greece in their struggle against fascism and in defence of their revolutionary mass organisations!

Fight Against Imperialist War and Fascism

Important Conference of the Front Against Fascism and Imperialist War in Czechoslovakia

By Karl Braun (Prague)

The National Congress of the Front against Fascism and Imperialist War, convened for 20th and 21st May in Prague, was banned at the last moment by the Prague police, who at the same time ordered that the Preparatory Committee of this Front should cease its activities. In the course of the campaign for the Congress many hundreds of delegates were elected in the works and factories, towns, villages, and districts, by the working population, irrespective of party. Even during the last week numerous fresh notifications were sent in, especially from delegates of social-democratic bodies. The police knew very well their reasons for prohibiting the Congress; they were determined to prevent a meeting which would have been a mighty mass congress of the united front against fascism and imperialist war.

Although this National Congress has not taken place, its prohibition will be replied to by a broad protest campaign for forcing the legality of this Congress and of the unity committees of the Front, and the two conferences of the Front held in Prague at Whitsun in themselves brought ample proof of this widespread growth of the militant movement against fascism and imperialist war developing under the auspices of the Front. The Congress was prohibited, but it was made possible to carry out successfully the **National Conference of the Front against Fascism and Imperialist War**, as also the **Anti-Fascist Youth Congress**, and to carry out the programme envisaged. This success must be the more highly estimated because the police dispersed the national conference after it had been sitting for scarcely an hour, but the more than 100 participants in the conference, down to almost the last man, succeeded in meeting again in a hall arranged for this emergency, where the conference was able to proceed for five hours.

Both of these conferences were distinguished by the fact that they were real **unity conferences**. The national conference of the Front, whose delegates represented the most important industrial undertakings and districts of Czechoslovakia, was taken part in by 109 elected delegates belonging to various parties and to all the nationalities of Czechoslovakia. Out of these 109 delegates—who included 11 women and 15 youth representatives—13 were members of social-democratic parties, 7 of them Czechs, 5 Germans, and 1 Polish social democrat (the majority of these social-democratic delegates were at the same time members of reformist trade unions or other reformist mass organisations), 6 delegates

were members of reformist mass organisations only, 2 were Czech national socialists, 1 a member of the Narodni Sdruzeni (fascist trade union organisation of national democracy), 12 non-party unorganised delegates. The rest of the delegates were members of the Czech C.P., the Red Trade Unions, and the revolutionary mass organisations. Only the most important of the industrial undertakings represented at the conference are given below, and it should be specially noted that the greater part of the factory delegates were non-Communist, most of them being social-democratic workers: Ceskomoravska Kolben Danek (2 national socialist delegates); Iron Works Trinec (1 Polish social democrat); Metal Works Krizek, Bodenbach (1 German social democrat); Iron Works Sandau (1 German social democrat); Neudecker Wool and Yarn Spinning Mills (1 non-party delegate); Iron Works in Filakova, Slovakia (1 Slovakian social democrat); Glass Works Herrmannshuette, South Bohemia (1 Czech social democrat); Textile Mills Kemka, Bruenn (1 Czech social democrat). Besides these there were delegates at the conference from the most important mines in the coalfields of Moravian-Ostrau, Kladno, Bruenn and Handlova. Of the remaining delegates, mention need only be made of those from the Poldi Smelting Works in Kladno, the Iron Works in Rokitzan and Beraun, and the extremely important Chemical Works in Great-Bockov (Carpathians).

This composition of the delegations lent to the whole course and negotiations of the national conference a **definitely united front character**. It must be emphasised that the non-Communist delegates adopted a much clearer and also much more militant attitude than has formerly been the case at such conferences. The discussion was carried on to 70 per cent by these non-Communist delegates, especially by social-democratic workers, who criticised in the sharpest terms the policy of their parties and leaders, and expressed plainly that in the Communist Party they see their sole real leader. It was precisely this fact which contributed greatly to the extreme enthusiasm and militancy of the whole conference, for this attitude on the part of the non-Communist delegates gave the participants in the conference the assurance that the Front against fascism and imperialist war has already penetrated successfully into the masses of the non-Communist toilers, and is beginning to form the united front of the toiling population of Czechoslovakia in the struggle against fascism, imperialist war, and national oppression.

In spite of the great difficulties in carrying out the conference, practically the whole of its programme was carried out. Comrade **Kopecky**, in a detailed address, analysed the situation in Czechoslovakia and the concrete tasks set in the struggle against fascism and war, and in the further development of the Front, tasks which will have to be accomplished under the conditions of the present greatly-intensified persecution. The discussion maintained an extremely high level, and dealt with all questions concerning the struggle against fascism and imperialist war. It is especially worthy of note that the speakers taking part in the discussion did so in an eminently definite manner, and made numerous proposals for the further activities of the Front.

The **resolutions** of the conference included: A manifesto to the whole toiling population; a **programme of action** for the Front, whose fundamental lines have already been laid down and will now be developed in accordance with the decisions of the conference; the immediate preparation of a widespread campaign for 1st August (20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Great War); and finally the election of a **National Committee of the Front**, composed of representatives of the most important industrial undertakings and districts, and of members of various political tendencies. The conference further passed resolutions of protest for **Thaelmann** and **Rakosi**, and a message of greeting to the Paris congress and the World Committee holding simultaneous conferences. The conference declared itself agreed in principle with the issue of appeals to the social-democratic and national socialist workers, as also those organised in the reformist trade unions. This important decision was specially emphasised at the meeting of the non-Communist delegates, held immediately after the main conference. The newly-elected National Committee was entrusted with drawing up and issuing these appeals.

Great enthusiasm was aroused by the appearance at the conference of three Austrian Schutzbündlers, who reported on their resignation from the Austrian S.P. and their entry into the Communist Party.

No exact figures are as yet available with regard to the composition of the Youth Congress, but the reports show that the delegates, included 19 social-democratic youth workers, 25 Y.C.L., 7 members of the Czech social-democratic athletes, 21 Red trade unionists, 6 reformist trade unionists, 12 representatives of bourgeois sport and cultural organisations, students, etc. The Youth Congress, too, passed off most successfully.

The National Conference was followed by a meeting of the women delegates, at which it was resolved to call a **Women's Congress Against Fascism and Imperialist War** on 14th and 15th July in Prague, and to utilise the campaign for this congress at the same time for comprehensive propaganda for the sending of delegates to the International Women's Congress in Paris.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

The Problems of Machine-Tool Construction in the Soviet Union

By E. A.

The manufacture of machine tools was only started in the first years of the first Five-Year Plan; at the end of the first Five-Year Plan it had developed into an independent branch of the engineering industry.

The production programme for the year 1934 for the ten factories combined in the "Glavstankoinstrument" Trust provides for the output of 8,760 machine tools of an aggregate value of 105 million roubles. The whole machine-tool industry of the Soviet Union is to supply 19,000 machines. For the year 1935 it is proposed to increase the output to 28,000 machines.

In addition, there is an increased import of machine tools from abroad. In the year 1929 the Soviet Union imported about 5,000 machine tools to the value of 21 million gold roubles; in the year 1930, 9,000 machine tools for 58 million gold roubles; in the year 1931, 14,000 machine tools for 102 million gold roubles, and even in the year 1932—the first year of essential decrease in the import of machine tools—12,000 machine tools for 72.7 million gold roubles in value were imported. From this it can be seen that in spite of the rapid growth of our own machine-tool industry, the import of these machines did not decrease during the first Five-Year Plan.

The Soviet Union is not yet by a long way producing all the necessary machine tools, and has not yet reached the necessary technical level of this industry. But in the year 1933 a big advance was made in this direction. The exhibition organised during the Seventeenth Party Congress, under the title of "Our Achievements," showed dozens of new and modern types of machine tools. But they are only the first steps in the direction of satisfying the tremendous demand of Soviet industry, in particular of the motor-car industry and of the aeroplane industry.

The machine tools for the mass manufacture of automobiles and motors, not only in the Soviet Union but also in the European countries, are supplied by the United States. The United States required twenty years in order to build up its machine-tool industry. Machine-tool construction in the Soviet Union must reach the level of American technique already in the course of the realisation of the second Five-Year Plan.

The "Glavstankoinstrument" Trust has, together with the respective factory managements, prepared a list of the machine tools necessary for the motor-car industry of the Soviet Union. They succeeded in reducing the number of types to 240, whilst at present there exists 500 types in the "Stalin" auto factory alone. Factories engaged in machine-tool construction in the Soviet Union will have to take up the manufacture of no less than 80 new machines in the course of the next 18 to 20 months.

The main problem of mastering the technique of machine-tool construction consists in normalisation and standardisation. The majority of the new machine tools are not original machines, but copied from European and American models. But the Soviet industry cannot simply copy the foreign machines; it must adapt them to the requirements of machine construction of the Soviet Union and the conditions of the Soviet factories. Consequently, the process of mastering the technique of the respective machines will last longer, but at the same time will achieve greater advantages for our industry.

The machine-tool factories of the Soviet Union are aiming at a

high degree of organisation and collaboration of all the works. With regard to the organisation of machine-tool construction, we cannot take the European or the American industries as our model, because neither in regard to their output or methods can they meet the requirements of the Soviet Union. The "Krasnij Proletarij" works in Moscow, for instance, is already now constructing 200 to 300 lathes a month, and has therefore an annual output capacity of 3,000 complicated machine tools. The largest works in the world for the manufacture of lathes, "John Lang" (England), has an annual output capacity of 1,500 to 1,800 lathes, but only in times of trade boom does it utilise its output capacity to the full. Of the 2,500 workers employed in the "Krasnij Proletarij" works, only 30 to 40 are old cadre workers, and these are exclusively employed as foremen and instructors. The whole production process of "Krasnij Proletarij" lies in the hands of young, not very skilled workers, who have mastered only individual operations in the process of production. In this respect we lag behind the industry of the U.S.A. and Germany. Also for this reason the Soviet machine-tool industry had to organise production in a manner different from the leading capitalist firms abroad.

The Week in the Soviet Union

The Agricultural Tax for 1934

According to the decision of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union and the Council of People's Commissars, the agricultural tax for 1934 will remain at the same level as last year, but a number of privileges have been granted the collective peasants and tolling individual peasants. Such exemptions are granted in order to encourage the cultivation of certain trade plants, cattle-breeding, the extension of collective-farm trade. Special consideration is given the victims of natural disaster. Tax remissions are granted former red army men and partisans as well as heroes of labour.

The greater part of the revenue from the agricultural tax goes to the village budget, which is administered by the village Soviet. Thus the tax benefits the village population and serves directly to raise the level of agriculture and improve the material and cultural position of the toilers in the rural districts.

A New Stage of the Soviet School

A decree of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and of the Council of People's Commissars regarding the schools introduces a new stage in the development of education in the socialist country. All organs of people's education are called upon to work for the realisation of a uniform structure of the Soviet schools. School life will be subjected to greater discipline. The "wandering groups" will be liquidated and each school class will obtain a permanent school-room.

The decree stresses the responsibility of the headmaster. For the school year 1935-36 a new syllabus is being worked out, in which the teaching of history and geography, Russian language and literature will play a bigger role than hitherto. New text-books will be published for these subjects, special teachers' courses in history will be organised, and the history text-books will be written by authors specially authorised by the C.C. of the Party. The network of geographical departments and faculties of the pedagogic high schools will be extended so that a larger number of geography teachers will be trained.

The preparations for the new school year make higher demands on the industry for the manufacture of school supplies. In the period between June 1 and August 1 the respective factories have to produce 110 million exercise books, at least 25 million pencils and 30 million pens.

All-Union Conference for the Training of Physicians

The conference of the directors of medical institutes of the Soviet Union has concluded its deliberations. The conference dealt with the question, how the tasks set by Comrade Stalin at the Seventeenth Party Congress in regard to the training of physicians can be best and most rapidly realised. The reorganisation programme of the government commission, which was enthusiastically approved by the conference, formed the basis of these deliberations.

The whole system of medical training was subjected to a thorough examination. The commission advocated the specialisation of physicians in the high schools. A five-year course for all faculties was laid down, the first five terms of which will have a uniform syllabus. The general theoretical education of the physicians is to be raised to a higher level. In the last school year the student can choose practical occupation in any special sphere.

The authoritative commission of professors has drawn up a plan for the publication of some dozens of standard text-books of medical science. The medical high schools must become the centres of medical theory on a high scientific basis and have a number of scientific research institutes at their disposal. The oldest medical institutes in Moscow, Leningrad, Tomsk, Kasan, Rostov and Voronezh are to be developed into medical universities. The conference proposed an increase in the salaries of the professors, the assigning of special flats to the specialists and the improvement of the material position of the students.

In autumn, 1934, the medical high schools will receive 9,500 new students. In the course of the second Five-Year Plan the high schools of the R.S.F.S.R. alone will receive 61,000 students.

New Motor Roads

New motor roads are being built in the whole of the Soviet Union. Between the towns of Frunse and Osch the great Kirgiz Road, having a length of 700 kilometres and connecting the northern with the southern part of Kirgiz, is being built. In Chakidstan the new modern high road running from Ura-Tjube to Stalinabad is being completed. This motor road runs through deep gullies and ten tunnels.

Much work is being put in to improve the roads in the neighbourhood of Moscow. About 250 kilometres of roads are being asphalted. In Western Siberia a new bridge is being built near the town of Bijsk.

A big motor road running from Leningrad via Moscow-Kharkov-Rostov-Ordjonnikidse to Tiflis is being planned. Surveying work has already commenced on the projected motor road connecting Moscow with Sverdlovsk.

Against Counter-Revolutionary Social Democracy

The Socialist Party of France in a State of Disintegration

By J. Berlioz (Paris)

The resolution adopted by the National Council of the Socialist Party of France on May 11, which mingled phrases about the seizure of power with assurances of love for Republican liberties, ended with a great fanfare: "*The party feels itself to be strong, it looks with confidence to the future.*"

This bluff was intended to conceal the commencing and serious disintegration of the socialist party resulting from the fighting spirit of the workers and their orientation to the Communist Party. The events which occurred at the beginning of the present year, which revealed to many workers the unexpected fascist danger, the rapid advance of fascisation under the ægis of the government of national unity, have opened the eyes of large sections of the working population. The treachery of the socialist party, which is sacrificing all its election promises of May, 1932, in order to support the radical socialist Ministers, its continued sabotage of united front actions against capitalism, have become plainly evident.

Dozens of sections of the socialist party and thousands of its members, in defiance of the orders of their leaders, have joined the anti-fascist committees and fought side by side with Communist workers against the fascist bands and against the police. Our agitation, our ruthless exposure of the policy of the socialist party and our simultaneous efforts to approach the socialist workers in a brotherly manner, our organisation work for the fight against the offensive of the State and of the employers, have called forth a profound ferment in the lower socialist organisations. In order to maintain a part of their influence, the leaders of the socialist party of France were compelled to manoeuvre in two different spheres. First they made use of sham revolutionary phrases: seizure of power, dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. Then it became impossible to maintain the prohibition of the united front and they had to allow "approachment on a local basis," whilst they redoubled their Jesuitical efforts to sabotage the united front.

All this, however, was of no avail. The crisis of the socialist party is becoming still more acute, as is clearly shown by the socialist party congress which took place from May 20 to 23 in Toulouse. According to the intentions of the party leaders, this Congress was to "create something new," to draw up a miraculous programme or plans for social transformation calculated to allure the disappointed masses. It only served, however, to patch up a

leaky ship into which water is penetrating from all sides. As a bourgeois paper wrote: *The Babel-like Congress of Toulouse has left the socialist party in a state of hopeless confusion.*

There is a tremendous ferment in the sections of the socialist party. In three-quarters of the organisations the membership is declining. Of the 130,000 members which the party had last year, about 40,000 have in the meantime resigned. More than one delegate expressed regret that the party did not after February 6 do everything it should have done and did not issue any definite slogans.

The authority of the leaders is in question. The old tendencies in the party are now forming into groups and sub-groups calling themselves fractions of the extreme Left, of the Left, the Centre-Left, the Right Centre, the Right, etc. The herd no longer follows the voice of the old shepherds, and the general secretary, *Raul Faure*, who has been severely attacked, even threatened to resign. The confusion is such that the commission appointed by the National Council to draw up the programme of action was not able to present the result of its work.

At the Conference of the Seine department there were eight different resolutions brought forward, and 20 votes had to be taken; at the commencement of the party congress in Toulouse there were six different texts of the main resolution.

In order to keep up the outer appearance of unity a synthesis of the various opinions had to be found. But what a miserable hotch-potch the political resolution passed by 360,000 votes (against 237 for the extreme Left) represents! In order to achieve a sham unity the Congress had to avoid giving any exact answers to the questions put by the socialist workers. As regards the programme of action *Blum* declared that it was only necessary to bring forward the old election programme, and the resolution consisted of a number of platitudes, such as for example, "work for the unemployed, marketing possibilities for the peasants, security of the future for all."

Capture of power, it is true, was proclaimed, but nothing was said about the means in order to attain this power, or rather fifty different things were said in order to please everybody. "Capture the minds by propaganda" (*Vincente Aurio*); "mass movement" (*Leon Blum*); "our action must extend from the ballot box to the general strike" (*Boville*), etc.

To whom is the party to appeal? Not to the proletariat, which is more and more turning away from the socialist party. "The working class is not increasing in numbers," declared *Philippe du Rhone*, the party must therefore seek to win the middle classes and finally the "millions of people of all social categories." Nothing whatever was said regarding the main problem of national defence and war. It could not be admitted that all sections, from the Right to the Left, stand for national defence under the pretext of the necessity of defending democracy against fascism. The emergency decrees, the attacks on wages and on the rights of the trade unions, the increased repressive measures were not included in the agenda. It would have been dangerous to call upon the masses to defend their daily demands, for the movement would get beyond the control of the leaders.

It is this danger which determined the final text of the resolution adopted. The socialist party declares itself without shame to be the last hope of democracy. The resolution adopted on the approaching Cantonal elections, under the classical pretext of fighting against reaction, permits the dirtiest alliances to be concluded with candidates of the radical socialist party and the continuation of the disastrous tactic of the Left Bloc. It is no wonder, therefore, that *Frossard*, who openly advocates a bloc with the so-called Left bourgeoisie, played a big role at the Congress.

The leaders are developing towards the Right whilst the masses are turning to the Left. The problem of unity of action was predominant at the Congress. On the question of the elections many delegates expressed the opinion that the party should withdraw its candidate in favour of Communist or proletarian unity candidates. Several delegates expressed regret that the party did not take part in the Amsterdam movement; 1,286 votes were given in favour of co-operating with it and the resolution which was adopted, far from condemning the Amsterdam movement as formerly, presupposes the possibility of occasional co-operation "for definite actions" and "establishing contact with it as far as possible." It was decided to re-admit the members who had been expelled from the party for participating in the actions of the National Anti-Fascist Committee.

A great number of delegates were in favour of sending a dele-

gation to Moscow in order to discuss the conditions for union with the Communist International, and a proposal to this effect received more than a third of the votes. It is true, a large number of the leaders attempted to make use of the desire of the masses for unity of action in order to manoeuvre with our Party and make it responsible for the split in the working class for which they themselves are to blame. It is a significant fact, however, that the socialist leaders had to take into account the strong desire of the workers for contact with Moscow, i.e., for the revolutionary fighting methods of the Communist International.

The Congress of Toulouse is a confession of the ideological and organisational disintegration of the socialist party, which is taking place under the pressure of the masses, whilst, on the other hand,

Twenty Years Ago

The Imperialist Antagonisms Before the World War

The capitalism of free competition developed into monopoly capitalism. Industry and bank capital fused into finance-capital. The export of capital outstripped the export of commodities and became the decisive factor. International monopolist organisations fought for the economic division of the world. There were no longer any free colonies, the world was already divided up amongst the great imperialist robbers. The thunder of the guns in the Spanish-American war ushered in the new era of imperialism.

Great Britain was the leading imperialist Power. British imperialism was above all "colonial imperialism." (Engels.) The development of monopolies in Great Britain itself was comparatively weak, but in the colonies it was stronger. In Great Britain itself the process of the fusion of industry and bank capital was only beginning, but in the colonies it was already well advanced. London was the financial centre of the world. Foreign capital investments amounted to 80 milliard marks. British shipping and insurance capital was world dominant. British imperialism oppressed and exploited 450 million colonial slaves. The British navy was the strongest in the world; stronger than the next two fleets taken together. And, nevertheless, British imperialism already showed signs of age and decay. Parasitism and decay were to be seen most clearly in Great Britain. Great Britain's industry was relatively backward and Great Britain's share of world trade began to decline.

German imperialism was "younger, fresher and better organised" (Lenin) than British imperialism, and in some branches of production, for instance, electricity and chemicals, it is fresher and better organised than even the rapidly-advancing imperialism of the United States. Monopolies were most highly developed in Germany and in the United States. Germany enjoyed monopolist positions on the world market with regard to chemicals, electrical appliances, etc., the production of potash, engineering, optics, fine mechanics. Capital export from Germany was growing. It had risen already to 28 milliard marks. Germany's share of world trade grew rapidly and had already risen to 12-14 per cent. German imperialism had the biggest and best organised army in the world. The strength of the German fleet grew rapidly. But Germany had very few colonies. Germany was fighting for its "place in the sun."

French imperialism was chiefly "usury imperialism" (Lenin). Heavy industries were relatively backward. Middle and small-scale industry was predominant, whilst bank capital was enormously concentrated. The coupon clipping class played a tremendous role. With regard to the export of capital, France occupied second place. However, the French investor put comparatively little into industrial and trading undertakings and preferred State papers. After Great Britain, however, France was the second colonial Power and exploited almost 60 million colonial slaves.

Russia and Japan were the representatives of military-feudal imperialism. In both countries finance-capital was encrusted with feudal remnants. A favourable geographical situation, a monopoly of military strength and the ease with which China and the other Asiatic countries could be plundered, partly replaced, and partly supplemented the monopoly of modern finance-capital.

In the United States the highest form of monopoly, the trusts,

the ideological unity of our Party is becoming stronger and its influence is increasing.

The leaders of the socialist party will do everything in order to keep the disappointed socialist workers, who are seeking a new way out, away from us. The socialist leaders are supported in these efforts by the bourgeoisie, who wish to isolate us from the masses, and by the renegades of the Party and the opportunists who, like Doriot, are spreading dirty slanders against us by seeking to represent us as the enemies of the united front, whilst the united front has always been our slogan. We must therefore fight still more energetically, on the one hand, against Right opportunism and, on the other hand, against the remnants of sectarianism, which still often prevent us from finding the way to the socialist workers who are disgusted with their party.

were most highly developed. The speciality of its historical development, the colossal territory at its disposal, the American method of developing agriculture—feudalism was destroyed—although the remnants of slavery remained in the Southern States—guaranteed American finance-capital a rich internal market. In the 'nineties Engels wrote that the economic system of the United States showed many colonial characteristics. But the twentieth century witnessed the beginning of American capital exportation although foreign capital invested in the United States outweighed the amount of capital exported. The first colonies had already been won. The Monroe Doctrine developed into the dominance of American finance-capital in Central and South America. Whilst the guns were thundering in the European War the Panama Canal was opened and President Roosevelt announced that a new era had begun for humanity, the era of the Pacific Ocean. Marx prophesied this shift in the balance of world capital in the 'fifties of the previous century.

Austria-Hungary was decaying but still thinking of Balkan conquests.

Italian imperialism, weak and unconsolidated, was fighting for power in North Africa and the Balkans.

The national question was already a thing of the past in Western Europe. It still existed for Eastern and Central Europe. It was a matter of the future for Asia and Africa. The Russian Revolution of 1905-6 gave an impetus to a series of bourgeois-democratic national revolutions. Persia, Turkey, India and China were beginning to awaken. The Chinese Revolution of 1911 was the last echo of the Russian Revolution of 1905-6. The working class was not in a position to lead these national movements. In many cases the imperialist Powers seized on these national movements to exploit them against their competitors.

In Eastern and Southern Europe there existed three tremendous prisons for the nationalities living in them: Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey.

The basic law of imperialism, the law of the irregular development of capitalism, had tremendous effect. Germany, the United States and Japan were developing rapidly. Great Britain, France and, to a great extent, Russia, remained stationary in their development or even declined. The relation of forces between the imperialist Powers was changing with tremendous speed, but Great Britain was still the leading Power, whilst Germany was putting forward its claims.

The fundamental imperialist contradiction which determined the grouping of the Powers was the struggle for world dominance between German and British imperialism. The system of alliances formed around this nucleus. From 1907-8 two firm groups of Powers had been formed: the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and the Entente Cordiale (Great Britain, France and Russia). During the course of the world war changes took place. Italy went over to the Entente, Bulgaria and Turkey went over to the Triple Alliance. Before the war Rumania was in league with Germany, but during the war it turned against the German alliance. "Imperialist alliances are broken up when the holy interests of private property demand it." (Lenin.)

The division of the world was no longer in accordance with the rapidly changing relations of power. The question of the re-division of the world was assuming more and more threatening proportions. Militarism indulged in orgies of insane armament competition. Germany aimed at catching up with Great Britain's fleet and even outstripping it. Two world disarmament conferences were held in the Hague. They broke off without result.

The map of the world revealed more and more clearly the danger spots: Alsace-Lorraine, where Franco-German imperialism was fighting for coal, iron and potash. Constantinople and the Dardanelles, where Great Britain and Russia fought for the partition of Turkey, and Germany fought for the way to Bagdad, which is also the way to Suez and India. Persia had already been divided up between Great Britain and Russia. In Petersburg the rulers of Russia dreamt of taking Constantinople, Armenia, Galicia, of the dominating hand in the Balkans and Asia Minor. In Vienna the rulers of the Austria-Hungarian Empire dreamt of the control of the Balkans and the solution of the Ukrainian question under the sceptre of the Habsburgs. In Berlin plans were being drawn up: Hamburg-Bagdad, Brieg-Longwy, Poland under the sceptre of the Hohenzollerns. A Hohenzollern in Kiev, not a Habsburg, and German princes in the Baltic States and perhaps Finland. Wilhelm II. made speeches and demanded a German protectorate over the Mussulman world. Morocco was a danger spot, because Mannesmann was looking for ores there. And the little States, Serbia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Montenegro, all had their territorial demands cloaked under the national flag. The national efforts of the little States were exploited by the big States. France wanted Alsace-Lorraine, Italy Trentino and Trieste, Rumania Transylvania, Serbia the Slav districts of Austria-Hungary, and Turkey wanted Bulgaria and Thrace. Italy wanted to turn the Adriatic into an Italian lake, whilst Austria-Hungary wanted to turn it into an Austrian lake.

In China the fight for concessions proceeded. Great Britain, Russia, Japan, France and Germany all tore great lumps out of China. And everywhere the struggle for markets proceeded, for raw materials, for spheres of influence, strategic positions, naval bases. And the struggle was most violent where there was iron ore, coal and oil.

The Second International adopted one resolution after the other against armaments, colonialism, the danger of war, etc. It "threatened" to organise a general strike against war. The whole international situation was pregnant with war. Any incident might lead to the great explosion. That was the situation on the eve of this epoch. An incident occurred at Fashoda, and the result was almost an Anglo-French war. Colonial wars are the order of the day. The epoch of imperialism was dawning. Russian princes wanted forest concessions near the Yalu river, and the result was the Russo-Japanese War in 1904. The Russia of Tsarism was defeated in the Far East. Russian imperialism turned to Europe and the Near East. The Franco-Russian alliance was weakened by the defeat of Russia. Germany provoked the first Moroccan conflict. An agreement was made between Great Britain and Russia, the Entente Cordiale was formed. Russia's weakness was exploited by Austria-Hungary to announce the formal annexation of Bosnia and Hercegovina. Bulgaria declared itself independent. Russia and Serbia protested against the annexation of Bosnia and carried out a partial mobilisation. Germany declared that it would support Austria-Hungary with all its military power. Russia withdrew, and the danger of war was put into the background again.

The following year saw a second Moroccan conflict and an immediate danger of war between Germany and France. Great Britain intervened, and the conflict was settled by a compromise.

In 1911 Italy opened up hostilities against Turkey in Tripolis. In the Balkans Russia, with the assistance of Great Britain and France, had forged the Balkan alliance of Serbia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Greece.

In 1912 the first Balkan war broke out. Germany's ally, Turkey, was disastrously beaten. The Balkans were redivided.

In 1913 a war between the Balkan allies of yesterday broke out over the division of the spoils. Serbia, Rumania and Greece defeated Bulgaria, which was supported by Germany and Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary and Italy succeeded in securing the formation of a new State—Albania. Because they wished to give Scutari to Albania, whilst Russia wished to give it to Montenegro,

the danger of war again cropped up, but was again settled by a compromise.

Until on the 28th of July, 1914, the Austrian heir-apparent Franz Ferdinand was murdered in Sarajevo. The world war broke out.

The "Pravda" on the Basle Congress

The Central Organ of the Bolsheviki Takes the Leaders of the Second International at Their Word

The International and Peace

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

There is no time to lose, for the crisis called forth by the Balkan war is becoming more and more acute. Reports regarding the armaments of Austria, Russia, France and Germany are appearing more frequently in the European press and are becoming increasingly plain, in spite of all official denials.

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

At the head of the Basle Manifesto there stands the well-known resolution adopted at the Stuttgart Congress.

The Basle Manifesto speaks in plain and decisive language regarding the tasks of the socialists and the class-conscious workers in the Balkan countries, in Austria-Hungary, in Germany, France, England and in the other countries. Unfortunately we are prevented from publishing the passages in question.

The Basle Congress shows the whole world once again with what energy, with what solidarity, with what determination the workers in the whole world are fighting to maintain peace. Nationalism and chauvinism in all its forms, from the most brutal to the most cunning and "liberal," finds in the united proletariat its most pitiless enemy.

"Pravda," No. 112, of November 18, 1912.)

Proletarian Youth Movement

Leftward Development of the British Youth Movement

By O. Bell (London)

Important decisions were taken at the I.L.P. Guild of Youth Conference at Norwich on May 20.

The decision to affiliate as a sympathetic organisation to the Young Communist International is a lead to all those youth organisations who in the past, or even now, were affiliated to the Young Socialist International.

Not the least factor in hastening such developments was the united front manifesto of the C.I., but what has to be noted again and again is, that the joint work of the members of the Guild and Y.C.L., based on the working agreement proposed by the Y.C.I. actually decided the question at issue. It was the actual work done to build up the resistance of the British young workers against wage-cuts, unemployment, fascism and war, which was the decisive factor in the formulation of the Guild's new policy and international connections. Where co-operation went unhindered by sectarian or personal squabbles, there the militant movement of the young workers has grown, and precisely there can be noted the strong movement towards the Young Communist International.

By 18 votes to 12 the decision was taken to affiliate in the teeth of a carefully-worded speech by Brockway, of the I.L.P., clothing with sly words the mailed fist of the threat to interfere in the whole decisions of the conference.

That the vigilance of the militants is not yet keen enough, and not co-ordinated throughout the country, can be seen from the fact that so many elements opposed to close association with Communists were elected on the new National Guild Committee. The carrying out of the conference decisions will have to be checked up.

Much practical joint work still remains to be done, especially in the Midlands, Lancashire and London. Here the old prejudices are still strong. Even Scotland is not 100 per cent. on the question of sympathetic affiliation.

An examination of the membership behind the votes for and against sympathetic affiliation shows that out of a roughly-estimated figure of 1,000 members, 400 are for the majority vote, about 250 definitely against, and the rest did not voice their

opinions at the conference in any way, it being a poorer conference than that in Liverpool a year ago.

Much can be seen from the conference, and in the year's activity leading up to it, to show that the fundamental principles of a youth revolutionary movement are finding a place in the minds of the British young workers. The principle of workshop organisation is becoming accepted, the importance of trade unionism for the young workers, the necessity of a hard fight against the old reactionary leaders of workers' organisations, the Leninist idea of the organisational independence of the young workers' political movement—as Brockway found to his cost—and as the Labour Party is also beginning to find out, these and many such questions are becoming increasingly prominent in the politics of the young workers, revealed most sharply and clearly in this conference.

The Y.C.L.G.B., with many hesitations, weaknesses and mistakes, ably guided by the Young Communist International, is learning much during its efforts to establish a united front of the young workers.

In the Midlands the sectarian habits of our League created big barriers between us and the Guild members, and in combating these we will bring our League much nearer to the young workers. Such views as getting "majorities" on united front committees, thinking the Guild is a "social club," looking down on them because they are not "so advanced" as us, etc., will be fought sharply, since they threaten to keep the League in those areas hopelessly isolated and sectarian.

This Guild conference gives a lead to all young "Left" Socialist Leagues. It declares, in effect, that there is no half-way house between the bankrupt Young "Socialist" International and the Young Communist International.

It places the followers of Trotsky where we have always said he was—in the camp of the enemy, the chief vilifier and disrupter of all the forces moving towards the Communist International.

In the International

The C.P. of France in the Struggle for the United Front

By M. Thorez (Paris)

Since January last Doriot has been conducting an open struggle against the C.C. of the C.P. of France, accusing it of being an opponent of the proletarian united front against fascism.

Is this accusation made by Doriot against the Party correct? No, it is not correct. On the contrary, all the facts go to show that the C.P.F. is the only organisation which is sincerely striving to set up a real united front of struggle against fascism. If there now exists in France a broad united front movement, then it is the result not only of the objective conditions, but in the main of the intensive work which has been and is being daily carried on by the organisations of the C.P.F.

As is known, hundreds of socialist workers were expelled by the party congress of the socialist party in November, 1933, for participating in the fighting committees against war and fascism. It is further well known that the Communist Party succeeded, in spite of the prohibition of the social-democratic leaders, in drawing about 150 local branches of the socialist party, embracing about 10,000 members into the struggle against war.

It suffices for any unprejudiced observer to follow the work of the Party even only since January in order to see that we Communists were and remain unalterably the organisers of the united front of the workers of France. We organised this united front on January 14 by holding together with the socialist workers the first anti-fascist demonstration in the 20th Paris district. A week later we Communists attended a demonstration organised by the reformist C.G.T. on January 22 in front of the Town Hall. Would it have been possible for this demonstration, called by the reformists and uniting 50,000 demonstrators, to be held under the slogans of the Communist Party, if the Communists had opposed the united front of struggle? Did not the Communists of the unitary railway workers' union approach the reformist railway workers' union on February 9 last with the proposal to carry out jointly a 24-hour general strike on the railways? And the present allies of Doriot, the reformist and socialist leaders, rejected this proposal.

Did not the Communists, together with the socialist workers,

organise the demonstration on the Place de la Republic on February 9? The socialist party, however, sabotaged this joint action. And it was thanks to the participation of the Communists that the general strike on February 12 last embraced about four million workers and was accompanied by demonstrations in more than 300 towns with 1,500,000 participants. How would it have been possible for these demonstrations to be carried out under the Communist slogan: "All power to the Soviets!" if the Communists had sabotaged the united front, as Doriot maintains?

We could cite dozens and hundreds of cases in which the proposals made by the Communist organisations to the socialist organisation for united action were rudely rejected by the latter. This hostility towards the united front on the part of the socialist party is not a chance occurrence, but is in accordance with the decision issued by the Second International to all its sections in reply to the proposal of the Comintern on March 5, 1933.

If now, under the pressure of the rank and file, the socialist party of France is compelled to manoeuvre with the slogan of the united front, then it is the duty of all honest and sincere adherents of the unity of struggle of the working class not to attack the Party which is unswervingly fighting for the united front, but to open the eyes of the workers concerning the real meaning of the manoeuvres of the socialist party of France regarding the united front. Doriot, however, by his attacks on the Communist Party, only cloaks and camouflages these manoeuvres.

Is Doriot's other assertion correct that the C.C. of the C.P. rejects on principle any proposal to approach the leaders of the socialist party for the carrying out of the united front? No, this assertion of Doriot is also incorrect, because the actual facts speak against Doriot. The attitude of the Party to this question is laid down in Comrade Gitton's report to the last Plenum of the C.C. on March 14 last in which he said:—

"In the given conditions nobody in the Party rejected or rejects the possibility of making proposals to the leading bodies of the socialist party and of the reformist C.G.T. in addition to the concrete proposals addressed to the socialist workers and local branches in regard to immediate united action. We acted in this manner on March 6, 1933, without, however, receiving any reply. We can repeat the same tactics if conditions require it."

The situation in France is sharpening to such a degree that the C.C. is compelled again to make open proposals for joint actions against the fascist danger to the leaders of the socialist party and the reformist C.G.T., as the C.G.T.U. did on February 7 last. What is now left of Doriot's platform? It is perfectly clear that this platform aims at something else: **it is to become a bridge for Doriot's going over to other class positions.** Some years ago Doriot, after having made big political errors, had the courage to declare at the Party Congress in Saint-Denis:—

"To refuse to acknowledge one's mistakes means to become the centre of attraction for all opportunists, both inside and outside the Party. At the commencement there exists only a small difference of opinion; gradually the chasm becomes wider; and in a short time one is at the head of the opposition against the Communist International. I shall never play this role. The Right both in France and abroad must abandon any hopes they may have in me in this respect."

Now the chasm is already very wide: Doriot is already in opposition to the Communist Party of France, and thereby to the Comintern. Now not merely the Right opportunists but all renegades of Communism, all enemies of the labour movement, and the French bourgeoisie are looking with hope to Doriot.

The French proletarians will emphatically frustrate Doriot's attempts to carry a split into the Party and to shatter the united front of struggle against fascism.

Statement of the C.C. of the C.P. of Rumania

The C.C. of the C.P. of Rumania informs all Party and youth organisations, all revolutionary workers and all political prisoners that the former Party member **Rudolf Wurmbbrand**, a clerk, who came from a bourgeois family, when he was arrested at the end of January in Temesvar by the Siguranza, behaved in a manner unworthy of a revolutionary.

As he himself admitted, Wurmbbrand made an attempt, at the instigation of the commissars Gritta and Turku from Temesvar and the agent of the General-Siguranza Serghei Urbaciov (an agent-provocateur exposed by the Party), to launch a fraction

struggle in the Party on the basis of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism.

After Wurmbrand had received his instructions from the commissars of the Siguranza and from Urbaciov, he endeavoured, in collusion with the prison and Siguranza authorities, to influence the imprisoned comrades and those who were at liberty and to destroy the collective of the political prisoners.

It seems that the Siguranza wish to induce Wurmbrand to give evidence at the new trial of the railway workers and to incriminate the heroic railway workers of Grivitz and the C.P. of Rumania. The Siguranza wants by this means to take revenge for the political defeat inflicted on it by the toilers of Rumania, who launched a mass campaign in the country, and by the international proletarian solidarity campaign.

The provocation of the social-fascist leaders who, like Mirescu-Radaceanu, attempted to represent the heroic leaders of the railway workers, Comrades Doncea, Petrescu, Gheorgiu and others, as provocateurs, is now being supplemented by the provocation of the Siguranza, which wants to use the agent Wurmbrand as an "ideological" weapon against Communism.

At the same time as the Siguranza suborned Wurmbrand there was published in Bucharest a manifesto, signed by the so-called Communist League, propagating the same ideas which Urbaciov is instilling into the mind of Wurmbrand and which the latter has to spread. This shameful document is supposed to inform the world of the "complete failure of the C.P. of Rumania and of the Communist International." And this at a moment when even the most faithful followers of Trotsky, Christian Rakovski and Sosnovski, have been compelled to recognise again the authority of the Communist International and of the C.P. of the Soviet Union.

The C.C. of the C.P. of Rumania warns the Party members and sympathisers with the Party not to believe any rumours invented and spread by the Siguranza regarding alleged differences and struggles within the C.C. of the Party, regarding alleged dissatisfaction of the Comintern with the work of the C.C.

The enemies of Communism are increasingly resorting to political provocation against our Party. In spite of the repression and mass terror, in spite of the torture and exceptional laws, the Communist Party of Rumania is growing in strength and compelling the hangmen and enemies of the working class to resort to more cunning methods of fighting it. But neither political provocation nor the methods of physical annihilation of the Communists will be able to destroy the iron unity of the ranks of the C.P. of Rumania.

Progress in the Philippines

By Pedro G.

When in the Philippine elections of 1931, American agents surrounded the El Retono Building in Manila and arrested 300 Communists, under a sedition charge in conformity with a law decreed by the Spanish monarchy nearly 250 years before, the bourgeois press hailed the inauguration of white terror as an "end" to Communism in the Philippines.

When, after farcical trials and a sorting out of all responsible leaders for special persecution, sixteen uncompromising leaders of the C.P. and the revolutionary trade unions (K.A.P.) were sent into Bilibid Prison and banishment to the remote provinces for long years, the imperialists and the native bourgeoisie cheered this as a "final" disposal of "red activity." They were cheered with the—rather poor—success of getting four or five out of all those hundreds arrested to turn renegade under the lead of the careerist, Jacinto G. Manahan.

But on February 25, this year, in the same El Retono Building at Manila, 21 delegates gathered from shops and factories in Manila, from the provinces of Bulcan, Pampanga, Nueva Ecija, Bataan, Rizal, Tayabas, Laguna, Batangas and Iloilo, to participate in a revolutionary United front election movement as the **Worker and Peasant Bloc**.

The convention received numerous greetings and letters from mass organisations and the imprisoned and banished revolutionary leaders, drafted a platform and manifesto, elected a National Election Council and made some of the essential nominations for the

bourgeois election. The nominated workers include the imprisoned secretary of the Communist Party, **Crisanto Evangelista**, standing for the Fourth Senatorial District; the imprisoned secretary of the Red Trade Union Centre, **G. Capadocia**, standing for Representative, and many others. Seven delegates from reformist organisations in Manila participated in the convention, indicating that the long neglected task of penetrating the reformist trade unions is being at last given some attention, though insufficient as yet.

Reports are arriving from many provinces of the organisation of local worker-peasant blocs and the nomination of outstanding worker and peasant revolutionaries for municipal and provincial posts. The Communist Party is participating in the worker-peasant bloc despite illegality, under its own name and in such way as to maintain its independent position within the bloc, issuing its own Communist Party manifestoes, etc.

It is clear that the imperialists of Wall Street and the native bourgeoisie did not gain anything by their attempt to behead the Communist Party. The new leadership has taken up its tasks with energy somewhat unusual to bourgeois experience and reformist tradition—hence the bourgeois press and reformist servants of the bourgeoisie are expressing astonishment that the "reds" are still active, in fact more active than ever before.

A mass strike of seamen and dock workers declared on February 20, was won. And on February 28 the seamen of one inter-island ship in another strike won their demands 100 per cent. The authority of the Communist Party and the revolutionary K.A.P. trade unions is very strong among these basic elements of the proletariat.

Genuine advance is also marked in the ideological campaign being made for a revolutionary line in the important sugar area of the Visayan region, where, although the Visayan Labour Federation of 10,000 members was affiliated last year to the K.A.P., the chairman of the Federation, Jose Nava, continued to pursue a reformist policy, endorsing the fake "independence" plan of the bourgeois leader, Quezon, and actually betraying the struggles of the Iloilo transport workers. The Party and the K.A.P. have engaged in a struggle to clarify the Federation membership, and have succeeded in winning a majority for repudiation of Nava's reformist policies.

March 6 was marked by a mass demonstrative meeting against unemployment, and International Women's Day by another giant meeting. Indicative of the present comparative attraction of Communism and fascism is the fact that although thousands attended the two revolutionary meetings, a meeting called by the fascist party a few days later in the same place attracted only 100 people.

The most grievous weakness of the Party remains its **peasant work**. The National Confederation of Peasants fails to rally mass support, and the Party has not yet learned the lesson that peasant committees constitute a far better form of mobilising the poor peasant masses in struggle than rigid and formal organisations modelled after bourgeois organisations. But despite its many weaknesses, the C.P.P.I. is making distinct progress on many fronts. It is on the way to defeat the white terror of Yankee imperialism and the native exploiters.

The Agenda of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

Moscow, May 29.

In fulfilment of the decision of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (E.C.C.I.), the Presidium of the E.C.C.I., at its session on May 28, resolved upon the following agenda for the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern:—

- (1) Report on the activities of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. Reporter: Comrade **Pieck**.
- (2) The offensive of fascism and the tasks of the Comintern in the struggle for the unity of the working class against fascism. Reporter: Comrade **Dimitrov**.
- (3) The imperialist preparations for war and the tasks of the Comintern. Reporter: Comrade **Ercoli**.
- (4) The results of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Reporter: Comrade **Manuilski**.
- (5) Election of the leading bodies of the Comintern.

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

Published by WILLIAM MASSEY, 249, King Street, Hammersmith, London, W.6, and Printed by THE MARSTON PRINTING CO. (T.U.), 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.2.