

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 13 No. 38

PRESS

1st September 1933

CORRESPONDENCE

CONTENTS

Politics	The White Terror
J. Shields: Capitalists Aiming to Crush the Revolutionary Movement in Ireland 820	A. B.: The Verdict Against the Rumanian Railway Workers 830
Bosse: The National Recovery Act and the Workers .. 821	In the Camp of Social Democracy
V. Arroyo: Fight for the Class Amnesty in Spain 822	The Paris Conference of the Second International 831
Oesterreicher: The German Catholic Day in Vienna .. 823	China
Karl Fränz: Anti-Soviet Incitement at the XVIII. Zionist Congress 824	The Fight for Sinkiang 838
Germany	Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union
Letters from Berlin 825	L. F. Boross: The Way of the Soviet Village to Socialism and Prosperity 839
The Reichstag Arson Trial 826	Allan Vallenius: From the Baltic to the White Sea 840
The World Economic Crisis	Proletarian Youth Movement.
M. M.: The International Wheat Conference in London .. 827	Slogans of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International for the Nineteenth International Youth Day 841
Fight Against Imperialist War	The World Congress of Youth 842
J. Berlioz: French Imperialist War in Morocco 828	Young Social Democrats Call for Participation in the World Congress of Youth 842
The Labour Movement	
Growing Strike Movement of the Indian Textile Workers 829	
The Strike Movement in Fascist Bulgaria 829	

The Greatest Juridical Scandal in History

The International Movement to Save Comrades Thaelmann, Torgler, Dimitrov, Popov, Tanev, and all Imprisoned Anti-Fascists must be Intensified into a Storm of Protest from Every Quarter of the World!

By Ernst Bayer (Paris)

Since the night when the cupola and the assembly hall of the German Reichstag burst into flames, a wave of unbridled brown terror has swept across Germany. During the first few days after the burning of the Reichstag, Goebbels' previously prepared posters shrieked from the hoardings of the German cities: "Smash Communism! Crush social democracy!" Göring, foaming at the mouth, announced over the wireless that the Reichstag incendiaries had been arrested, and incited the Storm Troops to their murder drives against the workers and Jews by the slogan: "Even if you shoot too short or too wide, shoot in any case!" The bloody hand of terror descended upon Germany, determined to suppress the truth about the Reichstag arson. But even during these first few days, leading bourgeois newspapers wrote that nobody in the world believed the Reichstag fire to be the work of the Communists.

Six months have passed since then. The trial in Leipzig has been postponed eight times. Hitler, Göring, and Goebbels have not succeeded in deceiving the world. In all countries, just as among the tormented and heroically fighting workers of Germany, there is only one opinion to-day about the burning of the Reichstag: This act of incendiarism is one of the vilest provocations ever committed in the history of the proletarian emancipation

movement, though this history abounds with such provocations. This fire was lit on the orders of the national socialist police minister and Reichstag president, Göring. Göring had the Reichstag set on fire. Dimitrov, Torgler, Popov, and Tanev are to be delivered guiltless into the hands of the executioners! The conviction that this is the truth of the matter has spread far beyond the ranks of the anti-fascist workers, and is shared by wide circles of the bourgeoisie in many countries, who see that in Leipzig a juridical murder is being plotted on the commands of the Hitler government—a juridical crime which treads underfoot even the most elementary bourgeois conceptions of law and justice. From week to week even the bourgeois press abroad has accumulated the evidence against the real culprits in the Reichstag fire. An Inquiry Committee, consisting of prominent jurists, has been formed in order to investigate the burning of the Reichstag. The publication of the "Brown Book on the Reichstag Fire and Hitler Terror," declared by the whole press to be an unexpectedly powerful blow dealt to the fascist fire-raisers and their tool Martinus van der Lütte has further increased the strained attention of the international public.

The Hitler government has found it impossible to continue to ignore this mass of feeling abroad. It is able to impose cruel

penalties for "atrocious propaganda" on every worker expressing even the slightest doubt as to the guilt of the Communists in the burning of the Reichstag. It is able to order the brutal maltreatment, in the cellars of the Storm Divisions, of those who proclaim the truth. It can have them incarcerated in the concentration camps or murdered "while attempting to escape." But its power does not even reach so far, in spite of all terror, as to prevent the circulation of the truth in Germany itself by means of illegal Communist literature; nor does it suffice to impose silence on the informed and alarmed public all over the world. Therefore the Hitler government has been forced to resort to manoeuvres aiming at discrediting beforehand the parallel trial in London announced by the juridical Inquiry Committee.

In the first week of August a conference was held in Goebbels' State Ministry for Propaganda, and the trial and the publication of the Brown Book were discussed. This was followed a few days later by the letter from the fascist public prosecutor, **Werner** (who not so long ago held his protecting shield before the Boxheimer documents) to **Dr Branting** and **Romain Rolland**. Under the flag of "objectivity," the public prosecutor of blood-stained German fascism asks that the evidence in possession of the Committee be handed over to him. Hitler's lawyer attempts to give the impression that Hitler's court in Leipzig furnishes every bourgeois juridical guarantee that the real incendiaries of the Reichstag will be ascertained. He endeavours to camouflage the clear language of facts, that the Hitler government afraid of the truth, has so far prevented any real defence of the wrongfully accused defendants; that it treats its own laws with contempt; that it keeps Comrade Torgler in chains and has driven Comrade Tanev, known in Bulgaria as a steadfast revolutionist, to a desperate attempt at suicide by its barbarous prison regime. The letter from the public prosecutor reveals no legendary "objective justice," but the counter-propaganda of the guilt-laden Hitler government. **Under the pressure of the mobilised public opinion of the world,** the Hitler government has been forced to recognise the Inquiry Committee for the investigation of the Reichstag arson as an important body.

The reply sent to this letter by the Swedish barrister, Dr. Branting, though adhering strictly to the forms of bourgeois juridical language, makes it clear that the public prosecutor's letter simply furnishes a further proof that the Hitler court of justice is afraid that the world may not consider its "evidence" against Dimitrov, Torgler, Popov, and Tanev to be adequate. Branting goes to the main point at once, showing that there can be no thought of handing over to Hitler's public prosecution the proof of the innocence of the defendants and the guilt of the actual Reichstag incendiaries, and that nothing but an absolutely secured defence can guarantee the proper use of the material. Branting advances ten demands as "pre-requisites for a free and independent defence of the defendants": demands for the free choice of defending counsel, for permission for foreign barristers to undertake the defence, for treatment worthy of human beings for the defendants, for safe-conducts and security for the lives of all the witnesses.

The public prosecutor has replied as might be expected: With an air of injured innocence he refuses the most elementary guarantees for the safety of the lives of the anti-fascist witnesses against the real fire-raisers. With the sounding phrases of the "representative of objective justice" he affirms that all reports of inhuman treatment of the prisoners are "entirely unfounded." He conceals himself behind the alleged authorisations of the court of justice and behind the alleged rights of the defence. The public prosecutor Werner, the immediate representative of the indictment brought by the Hitler government makes it clear to the whole world in his reply to Branting and Rolland that his letter was merely a manoeuvre in order to exonerate the fascist incendiaries, and that the Hitler government fears any real defence of the defendants as it fears the plague. It fears it, for it means the exposure of the guilt of the Hitler government.

The international protest movement against the crime in Leipzig has forced the Hitler government to discuss the Reichstag arson and the parallel trial before the German public. It is a great success for the solidarity of the international proletariat, and of all sincere anti-fascists, that the Hitler government has been obliged to permit this discussion to appear in the columns of the German press. The heroic illegal fighters in Hitler Ger-

many, too, are looking towards the parallel trial. The international proletarian protest action against the Leipzig crime is for them a splendid encouragement in their struggle.

Now that the Hitler government has fixed the date of the Leipzig trial for 21st September, the whole international working class, and all anti-fascists, are faced with a great task: Every week, every day, every hour, must be utilised for intensifying the great protest movement all over the world. **Dimitrov, Torgler, Popov, and Tanev must be saved!**

The international working class must furnish a tremendous example of living proletarian internationalism by means of a flood of meetings and protest actions, and by combining these protests with all the anti-fascist and anti-capitalist militant movements. The struggle to save Dimitrov, Torgler, Tanev, and Popov, the struggle for the liberation of our Comrade Thälmann and all the imprisoned anti-fascists, is an important part of the struggle against international fascism. **Mass meetings, mass demonstrations and protest strikes, elected delegations to the German embassies and consulates, protest resolutions and protest telegrams—all these are means, not only of saving the Leipzig defendants, but of providing a mighty development of the anti-fascist resistance movement in all countries.** During the next few weeks the Hitler government must be made to realise that the whole world has been aroused by the demands of the millions.

The fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries is the sole power that can stay the axe of the German fascist executioners. It is of paramount importance that a conference of honourable bourgeois jurists proves the innocence of the Leipzig defendants and exposes the real incendiaries; but this alone does not suffice. The energetic action and inexorable determination of all anti-fascists must increase the world movement for saving Dimitrov, Torgler, Popov, and Tanev, for liberating Ernst Thälmann and all anti-fascists, to a world storm against the fascist incendiaries, against the Hitler government!

Politics

Capitalists Aiming to Crush the Revolutionary Movement in Ireland

By J. Shields (London)

Commenting on the situation now existing in Ireland, that notorious mouthpiece of British imperialism, the "Daily Mail," declared in its leading article of August 22:—

"Although the dispute in the Free State is at present in the nature of a 'private fight,' it may yet result in an upheaval which England could not ignore."

This blatant and cynical calculation of the British capitalist press reveals the perspective which British imperialism has mapped out for itself in relation to the Irish people. It clearly shows that it is aiming to stir up internal trouble through the hands of its fascist Blueshirt allies in Ireland with a view to bringing about a repetition of the Black-and-Tan days in order to enforce its brutal domination over the Irish masses.

The attitude shown at the moment by British imperialism towards Ireland gives clear proof of this contention.

Ruthless economic warfare is being conducted against the Irish Free State, with the cold-blooded design of compelling the Irish masses to submit to the complete yoke of imperialist robber domination. In addition to this, assistance is being poured out from British capitalist sources in support of the reactionary forces which are active in Ireland under the leadership of **Cosgrave** and **O'Duffy**, the organisers of the fascist Blueshirt gangsters.

The British ruling class are not only providing moral and agitational support for the forces of the Blueshirt fascists in Ireland, but support of a more material and sinister character. Last week, for instance, yet another cargo of arms and equipment was smuggled into Ireland for the purpose of supplying O'Duffy's "National" Guard. This cargo, which has been reported to consist of some 2,500 rifles and a large quantity of ammunition, was conveyed from Antwerp to a lonely part of the Irish coast in an English vessel which had been secretly chartered in London.

It is not difficult to grasp the character of the stakes which British imperialism is striving for, when it is recognised that more and more capitalist Britain is confronted by ever-increasing

difficulties, both at home and abroad, difficulties the attempted solution of which is driving it at accelerated speed along the path to war. Precisely in this latter connection however, its position in relation to Ireland becomes a matter of vital importance.

The British bourgeoisie are afraid of the danger of Ireland constituting itself a vulnerable spot in Britain's rear in the event of a new war taking place. They are well aware of the fact that the Irish masses who have suffered under its age-long oppression, hate and detest British imperialism, and are lined up against it. They remember what happened in 1916, and tremble to think of a similar occurrence taking place in the future while Britain has a war on its hands.

Because of this their aim is to crush down the revolutionary mass movement in Ireland and impose a crippling stranglehold on the country which can keep it firmly bound to the saddle of imperialist domination.

The big obstacle in the way of these imperialist schemes, however, is the rapidly-rising struggle of the Irish masses. The Irish toilers are determined to smash the grip of the imperialists and their allies and achieve complete Irish independence.

It was the growing mass movement of the Irish workers and poor farmers, which swept away the regime of the Cosgrave government. To-day this movement is advancing forward with rapid strides as disillusionment becomes ever more widespread in the role played by the national reformist De Valera.

In face of the advancing revolutionary mass movement in Ireland, the forces of capitalist reaction are desperately striving to consolidate themselves. The latest development in this direction is the agreement which has now been reported to have been decided upon to bring about a fusion of the "National" Guard (Blueshirts), the Cosgrave Party, and the Centre Party under one head, which shall be known in future as the National Party.

At the head of this National Party will stand Messrs. O'Duffy, Cosgrave, McDermott, and their lieutenants, and according to reports appearing in the press:—

"The great aim above all others of the National Party will be to secure a reconciliation with England."

Whilst this development is taking place on the one hand, the De Valera government is tightening up the State dictatorship on the other. De Valera has now lifted the Cosgrave Terror Acts from the cold storage into which his government had placed them, and brought them back into use again.

Under these Acts the Blueshirt organisation has been declared illegal, and the Military Tribunal has been revived. The personnel of this Tribunal, it is significant to note, is exactly the same as that of the old court which was appointed by Cosgrave in October, 1931. It consists of the new army colonels, Bennett and McKenna, Major Joyce, and Commandants Whelan and Tuite.

The Military Tribunal has the widest powers. It can inflict the death sentence, and no appeal is possible against its judgment.

It will be remembered that both the Coercion Act and the Military Tribunal was extensively used under the Cosgrave regime against the Irish republican and revolutionary movements. The danger that this may again become the rule is being pointed out by the **Irish Communist Party**, which is leading the struggle against the growing forces of capitalist reaction. In this connection the following facts have to be noted:—

The economic crisis in Ireland is becoming worse. The burdens of this crisis are being unloaded on to the shoulders of the workers and working farmers, and the latter are expressing a growing revolt against this, to the alarm of the De Valera government.

From various parts of the country reports are forthcoming of **strikes** breaking out, in which the workers are struggling to obtain increased wages and improved working conditions. Only last week, for instance, the Government's own organ, the Irish Press, carried a report of a builders' strike which broke out in County Galway, which testified to the appalling wage rates that are often to be met with.

According to this report, the men employed on the building scheme in question were only receiving the sum of 24s. a week. They downed tools and put forward a demand for an increase.

In the rural areas the struggle is also becoming sharper, as the following instance from N. Tipperary shows:—

"Mr. M. F. Duggan, poor rate collector, reported that when he proceeded to distraint on the lands of Thomas Kennedy,

Borrisbeg, Templemore, for £4 2s. 8d. poor rate, he seized two yearling cattle, but they were at once rescued by two men; with the assistance of extra guards he got the cattle again. When half way to Thurles Pound, assisted by the Sheriff and three Guards, they were met by six men and the cattle rescued again. The men told them they would not allow any cattle to be seized for rates." (Irish Press, August 25.)

In these circumstances it is not surprisng to find Blueshirts, clergy, and leaders of the Government concentrating their attention on the "Communist menace."

De Valera has certainly banned the "National" Guard from holding parades, but it is significant that whilst he has so far carefully avoided taking any decisive action against its members, his police have seized and deported the Communist, **Jim Gralton**, on account of his revolutionary working class activities in Leitrim.

It must also be further noted that the Government is carefully checking up on Communist and Republican activities. This was disclosed by **Mr. De Valera** himself in a public speech which he made at Thurles on August 20, when he stated:—

"Since we got into office I have repeatedly myself got from the Department of Justice reports which are submitted from time to time by the police on Communism and other activities which might be dangerous to peace and order."

From these facts it becomes obvious that the warning note struck by the Irish Communist Party is at once timely and necessary.

No greater mistake could be made by the Irish revolutionary and republican masses than to place faith in anything other than their own mass strength and unity in action, as the means for effectively combating and defeating the growing forces of reaction.

It is along the path of revolutionary struggle, under the leadership of the Irish Communist Party, that the fascist menace in Ireland can be met and overcome, and Ireland's complete national and social emancipation achieved.

In this fight the Irish workers and toilers will receive the fullest solidarity support from the workers of Britain in the struggle against the common enemy—British imperialism.

Roosevelt's National Recovery Act and the Workers

By A. G. Bosse (New York)

The wave of *strikes* following the passage of the National Recovery Act (N.R.A.) is to a great extent a blind lashing out of the workers against the further worsening of their working and living conditions at a time when it seemed hardly possible for these to become worse. In *Pennsylvania* and adjoining states during the last few months nearly 200,000 workers have struck, and hardly an industry or a state anywhere in the country can be mentioned which has not had or does not have its strikes.

The government has relied hitherto chiefly on its Department of Labour conciliation agents to disintegrate and break strikes, but with the advent of the "new deal" and its bastard child, the N.R.A., the A.F.L. leadership has been given the first place in this dirty work. The most enthusiastic advocates of the N.R.A. are the A.F.L. bureaucrats. As early as the end of June 106 leaders of the A.F.L. endorsed the N.R.A., and since then practically every one has fallen in line. The A.F.L. was losing its membership in every union, but under the N.R.A. it claims to have recouped much of these losses in what are virtually company unions.

Green's latest stunt is to organise "unions" in individual plants, with no relation to other shops of the same companies, nor to other workers in the same industry. This conception of "industrial unionism," within the confines of single plants, is the A.F.L. contribution to the struggle against the slavery of the new deal. A correspondent of the N.Y. "World Telegram" (7/26) calls it "an abandonment by labour of collective bargaining rights guaranteed under the Industrial Recovery Act." These unions, called for no good reason federal unions, are in mass production industries which the A.F.L. has been unable or unwilling to organise, such as automobiles, rubber, steel, lumber, etc.

Fifty of these plant unions have already been organised and chartered by the A.F.L. They are not free to select any member of the A.F.L. outside the plant to organise or negotiate for them. Yet the N.R.A. officials are reluctant to admit that even these unions will receive their endorsement. The N.Y. "Times" (8/6) has remarked as follows upon the degree of class collaboration

which this or any other type of new unionism evolved under the Act will develop:

"Moreover the very nature of the codes must tend to change the policies and attitudes of labour unions. The object is not to set up hostile organisations of labour and employers which will arrive at decisions by trial of strength, but to introduce the element of peaceful co-operation. Labour will become to a far greater degree than before, if the codes are successful, a partner in business enterprises."

This sums up beautifully the expectation and the task of the A.F.L. leaders.

Green has expressed boundless enthusiasm for the N.R.A. He calls it, just as the "Times" editor does,

"a very definite step forward in industrial stabilisation, rationalisation, and economic planning. . . . It is, in the judgment of labour, the most outstanding, advanced and forward-looking legislation designed to promote economic recovery that thus far has been proposed. . . . Here we have the beginnings of a real partnership in industry with the government, in the interests of the nation, sitting in to supervise and direct." ("Daily Worker," 7/10, 7/15.)

McGrady was sent to Pennsylvania to persuade the 60,000-70,000 coalminers to return to work, and to settle a number of other strikes. This fellow is well known to the fur and garment workers of New York City for his sell-out and gangster tactics. Similarly the railroad unions, not in the A.F.L., but with leaders of not different stripe, have just put through a 10 per cent. wage cut. The press was completely surprised at this easy victory of the railroad magnates, the N.Y. "Herald-Tribune" calling it "a victory for the managements, for few of them seriously thought they would be able to achieve this action without a prolonged struggle." (6/22.)

The Socialist Party has leaped to the aid of the government, as it usually does in a crisis. Its National Executive Committee recently decided to support the N.R.A., continuing the action of Morris Hillquit and Norman Thomas, its leaders, who visited Roosevelt soon after his inauguration to give him a less than qualified endorsement. Thomas has written thus about the Act: "My own prediction is that it may suffice to bring us out of this particular depression, but it cannot bring us real prosperity or deal adequately with the threat of war." ("Times," 7/10.)

Even after Roosevelt had used the N.R.A. to smash the coal strike and other strikes, Thomas went on record as opposing the banning of strikes, unless an acceptable substitute were found for striking. What alternative there could be for a strike under capitalism, and especially under the attacks of the N.R.A., was not specified. But Thomas continued to see a social revolution in Roosevelt's emergency legislation:

"America has just passed through a genuine revolution. It will move forward toward a definite goal, either socialism, co-operative government, or fascism"; though the threat of fascism is "non-existent under the present administration." ("Times," 8/8.)

In its actions as well as statements the S.P. has carried out this abject form of class collaboration. In Milwaukee the mayor, who is a member of the N.E.C. of the S.P., has actually joined the local N.R.A., just as he sold out to Wilson in 1916. Where socialist-controlled unions have threatened strikes these have been called off. Where they were already in process, as with the thousands of hosiery workers in Pennsylvania, they were ended in obedience to N.R.A. "mediation."

The Communist Party and the revolutionary unions under the leadership of the Trade Union Unity League (T.U.U.L.) have combated the N.R.A. with all the means in their power. The Left wing textile union was heard at the hearings on that industry, putting before the workers its demand for a guaranteed minimum annual wage, etc. These demands were rejected, of course. Similar workers' codes will be drawn up in other industries and made the basis for struggle against the slavery act.

A united front conference has been called in Cleveland for the end of August, to rally the masses of workers and farmers for a militant counter-attack to the N.R.A. In it will be represented, in addition to the Left wing unions, the Musteite unions (Left wing S.P.), unemployed councils, A.F.L. local unions, and some independent unions. Its manifesto analysed the new deal and set forth a programme of action against it. This contained the following points: (1) organisation of workers in shops and unions to unite

the masses in class struggle; (2) intensification of the fight against the betrayals of the union bureaucracy, especially in the A.F.L.; (3) building up mass organisations of the unemployed and uniting them in struggle together with the employed; (4) organisation and support of strikes and demonstrations of employed and unemployed; (5) organising a broad campaign for federal social insurance.

Its demands will be based upon a struggle for immediate wage increases; shorter hours without wage cuts; a fight against wage cuts under the guise of "minimum" rates; a struggle against relief cuts, evictions, foreclosures, etc.; preservation of the right to strike; against the forced labour camps; for cash payment at full trade union rates on all public works; for federal social insurance paid for by the bosses and government; for freedom of speech and press; complete equality for Negroes; the abolition of discrimination against the foreign-born; for the release of political prisoners, etc.

The many spontaneous strikes that have broken out show that the masses are ready to struggle against the new slave act. This is the time to root the Party in the basic industries, if there ever was a time. The discussions and decisions of the last Party Conference showed that it is aware of the situation and of the measures necessary to cope with it.

Fight for the Class Amnesty in Spain

By Vicente Arroyo (Madrid)

The "left" republican government with its three socialist ministers has transformed Spain into an enormous prison.

Just as in the best times of the brutal dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, a wave of terror flows from one point of the peninsula to the other. The brutal suppression of strike movements, the ill-treatment of revolutionary workers on a mass scale, streams of workers' and peasants' blood in all districts of Spain, the systematic persecution of revolutionary workers and peasants, the bringing of charges against, and the confiscation of, the entire working-class press, the closing of trade union premises—all the forms of an unbridled terror have been employed by the republican-socialist government in an attempt to check the revolutionary upsurge of the workers and peasants of Spain, who, impoverished and starving as they are, are seeking a revolutionary way out of the crisis. And to crown all this campaign of persecution, 9,000 workers and peasants are languishing in the prisons of the Spanish Republic.

This number includes workers and peasants of all tendencies: socialist workers or workers belonging to the Union General de Trabajadores (General Workers' Union, a reformist trade union)—and this while there are three socialist ministers in the government—such as the workers from Hermigua and Castilblanco some of whom have been sentenced to death, others to penal servitude for life: anarchist workers, such as those from Tarrasa who have had sentences of penal servitude up to twenty years; Communist workers such as those from Villa de D. Fadrique who have been sentenced to penal servitude for life; soldiers and sailors, who have been sentenced to varying terms of penal servitude, because they protested against the bad quality of their food.

The policy of oppression has called forth a movement of protest among the workers and peasants of Spain, which the Communist Party of Spain has known how to awaken, to organise and to lead.

On June 21, 1933, the leadership of the Communist Party presented to the Communist deputy in Parliament the draft of a bill for a class amnesty, in which the immediate release of all workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors who were in prison owing to social and political questions was demanded and from which the imprisoned monarchists were excluded. At the same time they published the text of this draft bill.

Simultaneously a broad campaign of agitation was inaugurated, through the medium of the "Mundo Obrero" and by means of meetings, which has not since then abated for one single moment. Repeated appeals were made to the workers of Spain to join in and support the campaign. In all parts of the country "committees for the amnesty" were set up, and hundreds of activities in favour of the class amnesty were entered upon.

The trade union organisations which include hundreds of

thousands of workers and peasants, amongst them a large number of organisations affiliated to the reformist trade union federation, have sent in hundreds of protests in support of the amnesty bill of the Communist Party.

At first the government and the Speaker, the socialist *Besteiro*, shelved the Communist Party's bill for an amnesty. They doubtless did not expect that the Communist Party would succeed in mobilising such large numbers of the workers and peasants around this question.

Later on, when the call for an amnesty was resounding in all parts of the country, when declarations in support of the amnesty bill of the Communist Party were pouring in from everywhere, the government could not preserve its silence; the first to speak for the government were the "socialist" Minister *Prieto* in Salamanca, and, later, the Socialist-Radical *Marcelino Domingo*, who declared that it "was not a suitable moment to grant an amnesty."

On the other hand the Speaker, the "socialist" *Besteiro*, refused to place the Communist Party's bill for an amnesty on the agenda, and still has not done so.

There was no lack of manoeuvres, too, on the part of other fractions in Parliament to sabotage the Communist Party's bill.

The former socialist *Algora*, a deputy, who is now on good terms with the anarchists, introduced another bill for an amnesty at the same time as that of the Communist Party—in agreement with the anarchists—in which an amnesty was also demanded for the imprisoned monarchists. And it was this fact that the government used as an excuse for saying that the moment was not suitable for granting an amnesty, since the monarchists were continuing their conspiracies, and for saying that "there was no feeling in favour of an amnesty," for the government was aware of the hatred which the majority of the Spanish people cherished towards the monarchists. The motion of the anarchists introduced by the deputy *Algora*, therefore, was favourable to the plans of the government not to grant an amnesty for the revolutionary workers and peasants.

At the time that the Communist Party published the draft of their bill for an amnesty, the anarchist leaders also began a campaign for an amnesty, for a broad amnesty for all political and social prisoners without distinction of political creed, to include also the monarchists, for, as they said, *Sanzurjo* and the entire monarchist rabble are also "victims of society."

This was a campaign that was received with acclamation by the entire fascist and monarchist press and it disgusted the revolutionary workers.

The facts have demonstrated that the anarchist leaders of Spain were not inclined to enter upon any action to achieve the release of the imprisoned workers and peasants.

The Communist Party has not been content to carry on a platonic campaign for the class amnesty.

In addition to the meetings and the press campaign, in addition to the creation of a network of local committees for the amnesty and of a national committee, in addition to a systematic campaign for the holding of a national congress for the amnesty, called by the International Red Aid (several district congresses have already taken place) the Communist Party has appealed to all the workers' organisations to organise a 24 hours' general strike in support of the class amnesty.

The socialist leaders have, as was to be expected, maintained complete silence with regard to this question. Not only are they not disposed to support this movement (which was proposed by the Communist Party for the second half of August), but they have even exerted pressure on subordinate organisations which have declared their readiness to support the class amnesty bill introduced by the Communist Party.

Despite all these hindrances and difficulties the Communist Party is untringly pursuing its campaign for the release of the 9,000 imprisoned workers and peasants of Spain. Their campaign has succeeded in interesting tens of thousands of workers who have joined in it and adopted the slogan of the Communist Party against the government terror of the "democratic" Spanish Republic. This is one of the mightiest mass campaigns that has ever been carried on by the Communist Party and the international revolutionary proletariat must support it, for the fight for the class amnesty in Spain is a fight between revolution and counter-revolution.

The German Catholic Day in Vienna

By Oesterreicher (Vienna)

In the week from the 7th to the 13th of September there will be held in Vienna a General German Catholic Day, which is deserving of more attention than is usually accorded such Church festivals. It is already quite clear that the object of this day is nothing else but a general mobilisation of the Church against the Soviet Union.

It is exceedingly significant that such big delegations from Poland, Hungary, Croatia and other countries in Eastern Europe are taking part in this German Catholic Day; that on September 12 there is to be a special service on the *Kahlenberg*, the spot from which, 250 years ago, 20,000 Polish warriors of King *Sobjeski* attacked the Turkish army which was besieging Vienna, and at which the Polish Cardinal *Hlond* will preach the sermon.

The Pope has appointed the Patriarch of Venice, Cardinal *la Fontaine*, as his delegate to represent him at the "Celebration of the deliverance of Vienna from the Turks and at the Catholic Day."

The "*Osservatore Romano*" of the 19th inst. contains a leading article written by its chief editor, *De la Torre*, in which he states:—

"The hour is similar to that which saw the fearful trial, everywhere giving rise to fear. . . . The enemy is no longer the same. No longer are the banners unfurled in the field, but, like the underground work of the mine-layers of *Kara Moustafa*, he is undermining order and peace. . . . The moral and political crisis is upsetting everything and places everything in great danger, which now threatens the West from the East."

Thus we have it plainly stated beyond a doubt: the enemy is in the East; the Vienna Catholic Day constitutes a call to unity against Bolshevism, an appeal for a crusade against the Soviets. That is the meaning of the motto of the Catholic Day: "Christ redeemer of Western Europe and king of the whole of humanity!" The limitation of Christ's work of redemption to the West-European countries would be heresy if one did not understand that it was thereby meant to emphasise the contrast to the Eastern Europe.

The campaign which the Vienna "*Reichspost*" has been conducting for weeks past against the Soviet Union, and which reached its highest point in the reports of cannibalism in the Ukraine, is nothing else but a preparation for this Catholic Day. This campaign on account of the alleged famine in the Soviet Ukraine is officially led by the Church. It was supported by an appeal of the Greek-Catholic Episcopacy, which was signed by all the Greek-Catholic bishops, and by an appeal of the Vienna Cardinal *Innitzer*. Whilst the latter appealed for a boycott of all Powers having economic relations with the Soviet Union, the Polish bishops openly called for vengeance for the suppression of the Ukrainian kulaks:—

"The blood of the starving workers who are tilling the black earth of the Ukraine cries to heaven for vengeance, and the voice of the starving reapers is raised to the god of Sabaoth."

They say heaven, but they mean the French and Polish general staffs; they say god of Sabaoth, but they have in mind international finance capital.

The article in the "*Osservatore Romano*" contains the following regarding the historical importance and significance of Vienna:—

"Vienna, which at that time was worthy to be the shield of Europe, is to-day worthy of the high festival of Christian decisions and works. It is worthy on account of the unshakable faith of its people, on account of the piety of its eminent archbishop, who repeats the pastoral zeal of a *Kollonits*. It is worthy on account of the exemplary religious virtues of its State chief and its Chancellor."

The Austrian bourgeoisie see in their connection with the Catholic Church an increase of their own importance far beyond that which their small country would merit.

The Austrian bourgeoisie are expecting again to occupy a special position in Eastern Europe, in which expectations, however, they are threatened by the expansionist desires of Hitler Germany. This antagonism is also expressed on the occasion of the Vienna Catholic Day. Hitler has forbidden the Catholics of

Germany to participate in this day. The Vienna Cardinal Innitzer has replied to this with the words "Nunquam retrorsum!" We shall never retreat.

Thus this Catholic Day, which is to be an appeal for harmony between the imperialists and their vassals, does not present a picture of unity. At the same time, this fact should not deceive us regarding the dangerous significance of this Day.

Anti-Soviet Incitement at the XVIII. Zionist Congress

By Karl Franz

The President of the International Zionist Organisation, **Nahum Sokolov**, who opened the Eighteenth Zionist Congress in Prague on the 22nd August, turned to the representative of His Majesty the King of England, a high official of the British Embassy, and declared:—

"All our plans and all our wishes with regard to this great experiment depend upon the wisdom and the goodwill of the mandatory power."

Sokolov bowed to the representative of the British Empire and assured him of his (Sokolov's) "unfailing respect." This was no mere diplomatic formula, it was the open pledge of loyalty from the vassal to his lord and master.

The Zionist Movement is a pawn in the colonial game of British imperialism in the Near East. The Zionist leaders are playing a daring game. They know that in the hands of Great Britain Palestine will not be administered in the interests of Palestine (not to mention in the interests of the Jewish people), but exclusively in the interests of British imperialism, but at the same time they are doing their best to implant illusions in the minds of the Jewish masses with the slogan: "Palestine is our only hope!"

The political report delivered by Professor **Brodetzky**, showed involuntarily, but fairly clearly, how problematic is the position of the Jews in Palestine. He complained that the British Colonial Office was interesting itself in one problem only, namely, how to provide the dispossessed Arabs with new land by means of a government loan. The government, he complained, apparently is aware of only one problem in Palestine, namely, what to do with the Arabs. The Zionists demand the recognition of equal colonising rights for the Jews, but the government of Palestine refuses to recognise this right. Still further, the government intends to introduce another limitation of the possibility of land transfer. It can thus be seen that the pogroms in 1929 are having a great effect on the measures adopted by the Palestine government.

However, this speaker also thanked the British government for its noble attitude and for its sympathy with the suffering of the Jews, but in the same breath he asked: "Where is the practical reflection of this indignation in permitting the Jews to settle in Palestine?"

In reality Jewish immigration into Palestine is being throttled and fifty per cent. of the immigration certificates presented by the Jewish Agency are being struck out. Why? Because the British government fears the Arabs considerably more than it loves the Jews. The Arabs are numbered by the million, the Jews by the hundred thousand. The Arabs are Mohammedans, and everyone knows the extreme importance of the Mohammedan question for the very existence of the British Empire. What do the few hundred thousand Jews mean in comparison with that? Not much; and as a result the situation of the Jews in Palestine is extremely uncertain. The Zionists are strongly opposed to the setting up of a Palestine Parliament because, as the speaker frankly admitted, they were not prepared to subordinate themselves to a majority.

Palestine industry demands protective tariffs, but the British government does not intend to accede to this request. The British government has no interest in the building up of an industry in Palestine when its own industry at home is suffering a crisis and seeking frantically for new markets. The result is that Palestine is being flooded with cheap British industrial goods, whilst Palestine industry is wilting.

It is this hopeless situation which explains the rapid growth of Jewish fascism in Palestine. The Jewish fascists (Zionist Revisionists) of the Yabotinski type were represented at the congress with 43 delegates, and when their resolution was rejected they left the hall amidst noisy demonstrations. These fascists do no more than develop Zionist nationalism to its logical conclusion. If Palestine is to become a national home for the Jews then it is perfectly obvious that a Jewish State must fight an irreconcilable

struggle against the Arabs, must seek to annex Transjordan to a Jewish Palestine, must maintain a Jewish armed force, must smash the working class organisations, must forbid and crush strikes; in short, must introduce Jewish Hitlerism along the whole line. The Jewish fascists have a party army dressed in brown uniforms. They have their strong-armed columns. They break up the meetings of their opponents with violence and they also are now adopting the weapon of political murder. Dr. Arlosoroff was their latest victim.

Yabotinski fascism is not irreconcilable with Zionism, whose strongest party is the Palestine "Labour Party," it is merely its logical consequence. The Zionist Congress was a peculiar mixture of national and social fascism. Both mass movements are united under the roof of Zionism. The third group is the Jewish clerical group, whose fraction, the Misrachi, voted together with the national fascist wing in the presidential election.

The chief speech at the congress was delivered by the president of the congress, **Sokolov**, concerning the situation of the Jews all over the world. This report had three parts: a malicious attack on the Soviet Union, a deep bow before Pilsudski, and complaints about Hitler Germany.

The attack on the Soviet Union occupied first place. The protest against fascist Germany expected and demanded by the Jewish masses needed a counterweight. This counterweight was provided in the shape of anti-soviet incitement. Sokolov declared: "The attacks on the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union are reminiscent of the times of Hadrian. A great number of Zionists are lying in danger of death in the prisons of farthest Siberia. When a number of British engineers were wrongfully arrested the whole diplomatic apparatus was set in motion on their behalf. It was right to demand from Soviet Russia the freeing of the Jews, all the more as this is a State which regards itself as an opponent of despotism and injustice."

Sokolov had nothing whatever to say about the process of social transformation going on amongst the Jews in the Soviet Union. He wished the Jewish colonising plans being carried out by the Soviet government all success, but declared that a return to agriculture was a dead letter unless historical life was put into it.

In reality, however, exactly the opposite is true; a return to agriculture is a dead letter if it is only historically indicated and drags with it the old historic social forms. It is the new social form, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which by its expropriation of the capitalists creates the conditions for the social liquidation of that mass of semi-proletarian, semi-petty-bourgeois Jews and places them in the ranks of production.

During Sokolov's attack on the Soviet Union there was deep silence, but when he spoke the first word against Hitler Germany the whole hall rose to its feet. The anti-Hitler spirit is so strong even amongst the masses who are still under the influence of Zionism that the first word directed against Hitler Germany produced a storm of approval, but the speaker immediately put the brake on. He did not want to interfere in Germany's internal affairs. The Zionists spoke as Jews and as nothing else. He had not been sure that it was wise to mention the German question at all, but it had proved "impossible" to avoid it.

One could feel the discomfort of the speaker. Certainly, Hitler is the enemy of the Jews, but he is a national German and the Zionists are national Jews. In reality they talk the same language, and in fact the possibility of an understanding between Hitler and the Zionists is not out of the question. Already comes a report from Berlin that an agreement has been come to between the Zionists and the German government according to which emigrants to Palestine are to be granted a commodity transfer to the extent of 3 million marks, a sum to be extended at need. This is an indication that the point at issue between Hitler and the Zionists is not a matter of principle, but a question of a collision of interests only.

There is no doubt that as a result of the Jewish persecutions in Germany the Zionist movement has received a new impulse. Hitler is driving the masses of the Jewish intelligentsia into the arms of Zionism. It is necessary to pay greater attention to this confusion of ideas. In view of the flood of Jewish nationalism it is necessary to organise a powerful ideological counter-offensive amongst the Jewish masses, both of the intelligentsia and the working class.

The most effective weapon against the Zionist campaign will be the continuation of the work of socialist construction in the Soviet Union with its happy results for the masses of the toiling Jews also.

Germany

Letters from Berlin

I.

The Position of the Workers in the Ruhr District

The effect the policy of the Hitler government is having upon the working class is best seen in the Ruhr district, the main centre of German industry, where huge masses of workers are concentrated in a dozen towns. The Hitler government has been in power for six months. The workers of the Ruhr district have not experienced any improvement in their position. On the contrary, hunger has increased and misery has become unbearable.

The government district of Arnsberg embraces the most important towns of the Ruhr area. According to an official report of the government, twelve of the biggest towns are in debt to the amount of 327 million marks. There is no prospect whatever of these debts being paid. This view was expressed in an interview the President of the government of this district gave to the Dortmund press. He declared that only generous and extensive help from the Reichs government could save the towns from bankruptcy. In the meantime the towns are endeavouring to meet the extra expenses incurred in the upkeep of all the commissary national socialist mayors and magistrates by drastic economy measures. The industrial town of Bochum has a deficit of 10.3 million marks. In order partly to cover this, 3.5 million marks, which is intended for the unemployed, were struck from the poor law budget. This town, which has 323,000 inhabitants, has 57,000 unemployed. In Dortmund the poor law budget was reduced by 5.4 million marks. Homes for aged and destitute people were closed. Orphan homes and children's homes were likewise closed. The old folk were simply crowded together in one institution. In Bielefeld the amount expended on poor law relief amounted in 1931 to 6,208,000 marks. In the year 1933, in spite of increased distress, this sum was reduced to 5,576,000 marks. The expenditure on the police, on the other hand, was increased from 829,000 marks in the year 1932 to a million in 1933.

The effect of these reductions in the poor law budget is to be seen from an incident which recently occurred in Dortmund. An old age pensioner, 73 years of age, who had toiled hard the whole of his life, received a pension amounting to 29 marks a month. The lowest scale of relief granted to married couples by the poor law authorities is 51 marks a month. Hitherto this old man and his wife had received from the poor law authorities the difference between 51 and 29 marks. After the economy cuts they were deprived of this amount, and were simply told that their children must support them. Of the ten sons of the married couple, two are in the labour service camp, and seven are unemployed. The remaining son is on short time and earns so little that he is scarcely able to keep his four children. The protests of the old man were not listened to. On the next day he was found hanging in a wood in the North of Dortmund.

At the present time the fascist press in the Ruhr district is conducting a lively campaign regarding the question of providing work. All the measures of the national socialist government only show how helpless and impotent they are in the face of this problem. On August 14, the burgomaster of Dortmund gave a reception to the press in order to inform them of the measures he had adopted to provide work. At this interview the burgomaster himself admitted that he was unable to abolish unemployment in the Ruhr district, but declared that despite this the problem of unemployment must be solved, because otherwise Bolshevism would come. As a means of providing work he proposed in the first place that all those who had no rightful claim to poor relief should be deprived of it. That means that the unemployed will be simply struck off the register. As a second measure he proposed to do away with the unemployment of women whose husbands are working. Big placards were posted up on the hoardings with appeals against what is called "double-earnings."

In Buer the unemployed in receipt of poor law relief are being set to work to build roads. They are paid two marks more than they received formerly in the way of relief. They therefore receive

wages ranging from 9 to 15 marks a week. But in practice it is even worse, because as they are working they no longer receive any rent allowance from the poor law authorities. Thus the recipients of poor law relief, in spite of the hard work performed by them, earn less than the amount they were formerly drawing in relief.

A part of the unemployed in the Ruhr district have been sent to East Prussia to work on the land. These unemployed have simply fallen out of the frying pan into the fire, so to speak. One of these unemployed wrote a letter to his parents, which reads as follows:—

"My Dear Parents,—We Westphalians are not trusted here at all. We are under constant police supervision and our quarters are searched. We have to get up at half-past four in the morning and work till ten o'clock at night. One worker from Bochum committed suicide out of despair. One worker from Dortmund, in a fit of rage, stabbed the peasant for whom he had to work. I have not received a penny for the last two months. Others who have been here longer than I have have also not received a penny. It is no use our lodging complaints. It is just hell here. Communists are increasing here.

"With very best greetings, your son, K."

Dozens of such letters could be published. These facts show how the position of the working population of the Ruhr district is deteriorating. One of the results of this worsening situation is a growing discontent expressed in an underground ferment and steadily increasing revival of revolutionary work.

II.

The Class Antagonisms in the National Socialist Party and the N.S.B.O in the Ruhr District

The class antagonisms prevailing in the national socialist party and the N.S.B.O. (national socialist factory organisation) are revealed most clearly in the Ruhr district. Here it is seen that the workers who have joined the organisation of the fascists partly under compulsion and partly because they have been misled, have preserved their class instinct and are insisting on the fulfilment of their demands. The ferment is expressed most plainly in the N.S.B.O. in the Ruhr District. Wholesale expulsions have been carried out in Gelsenkirchen because the leaders can no longer maintain control of the organisation. In a sub-district organisation comprising 140 members, 97 were expelled. At the "Viktoria 3-4" pit there took place a meeting of members of the N.S.B.O. The meeting was very stormy and at the conclusion 43 miners flung their membership books on the table and declared their resignation from the N.S.B.O. At the "Friedrich the Great" pit the members of the N.S.B.O. pit council were dismissed at a moment's notice. An N.S.B.O. man went to the management in order to put forward a demand of the workers working above bank that, instead of 40 waggons the workers should unload only 35 waggons. In reply to this justified demand the N.S.B.O. man was dismissed.

On the railway lines connected with the "Schwerin" pit there was chalked up in big letters on a railway truck: "Adolf, be advised and show deeds!" It was found on investigation that a member of the N.S.B.O. factory council had written these words on the truck. He was dismissed at once and interned in a concentration camp.

The deputy-chairman of the factory council of the Dortmund tramways, who is in the N.S.B.O. and the Storm Troops, sent a letter to the leader of the N.S.B.O. demanding that the chairman of the factory council, who is also in the N.S.B.O., should be removed at once. He declared that the former chairman of the factory council, who was a Communist, really defended the interests of the staff and, for example, had seen to it that the workers were supplied with overalls and soap. In this letter he demanded that the red factory councillor be reinstated in his office. The result of this letter was that the writer was deprived of his position as deputy-chairman and expelled from the N.S.B.O.

The discontent among the Storm Troops is continually increasing. The older storm troopers in particular are exceedingly disappointed. In the Storm Troops barracks in Gelsenkirchen it has come to regular demonstrations. The storm troopers demanded that the government should keep its promises. The Special Troops (S.S.) were called in. It came to a sanguinary struggle as a result of which 14 Storm Troopers and 14 of the Special Troops had to be conveyed to the hospital. In Hamborn on July 23, it came to a fight between Special Troops who had forced their way into a Storm Troops' home. The Special Troops were overpowered by the S.A. and so knocked about that they all had to be conveyed to the Hamborn hospital.

The whole of the leaders of the Verden local group of the national-socialist party were arrested by a squad of Storm Troops on account of political unreliability. Two members of the Essen district leadership of the national-socialist party have likewise been arrested. They have been accused of Communist activity. The leaders of the national-socialist party in Essen are continually complaining of the bad attendance at the membership meetings. The members are now being forced to attend the meetings on pain of expulsion. The membership of the Essen Storm Troops is also declining.

The N.S.B.O. factory councillor in a Dortmund brewery demanded that a 46-year-old worker should be engaged. The manager refused to accede to this demand, whereupon the N.S.B.O. factory councillor went to the manager and asked him: "How old are you?" The manager replied: "63 years," whereupon the factory councillor said, "then you are too old and must be dismissed." The manager realised what they were driving at. He got into connection with the N.S.B.O. leaders and the factory councillor was dismissed.

In Hörde it came to an armed collision between Storm Troops and the Special Troops. The Storm Troops were indignant because a rich factory owner was accepted as member of the Special Troops. When the factory owner appeared in the street in his new uniform he was arrested by the Storm Troopers, taken to their barracks and there beaten up. When the Special Troops heard of this, they drove in a motor lorry, equipped with machine-guns and carbines, to the Storm Troops' home and captured it.

The Storm Troopers of Dortmund-Ebing were hitherto regarded as one of the most reliable and strongest of the Nazi forces. In the days of the "national uprising" this body played a special rôle. It has now been dissolved, after four new leaders attempted in vain to allay the discontent of the Storm Troopers.

A whole number of similar reports are to hand. Many things are happening of which the public knows nothing. All these events show in what direction the development in the ranks of the national socialists is tending. The members of the national-socialist party from among the working population are insisting upon the fulfilment of their demands, and that the national socialists keep their promises. In the coming autumn and winter this development, which is only in its initial stage, will reach maturity.

The Reichstag Arson Trial

Reichstag Arson Trial on 21st September

Berlin, 24th August.

Wolffs Telegraph Bureau reports from Leipzig:

"The President of the IV. Penal Senate of the Supreme Court has fixed the date of the trial in the Reichstag arson case for Thursday, September 21, 1933, at 9 o'clock in the morning. The trial itself will be held in Leipzig, but the evidence will be heard in the Reichstag buildings."

C.N.B. supplements this by the following:

"Ernst Torgler, the 40-year-old member of the Reichstag accused of burning the Reichstag, will be defended at the trial by the selected defending counsel lawyer Dr. Sack (Berlin). The 24-year-old mason Marinus van der Lütte will be defended by the obligatory defending counsel placed at his disposal by the Supreme Court, lawyer Dr. Seuffert (Leipzig), and the three other defendants, the writer Georgi Dimitrov (51 years of age), the student Blagoi Popov (31), and the shoemaker Vassil Tanev (36), will be represented by the barrister Dr. Teichert (Leipzig).

"The records of the case fill 35 thick files of documents.

The indictment forms a considerable volume of more than 230 pages. The public prosecution has cited a total of 110 witnesses and experts in support of its indictment. There is a possibility that this number will be considerably increased."

The C.N.B. further reports from Leipzig that at first the Supreme Court had intended to appoint the barrister Huber as defending counsel for Torgler, but that is no longer necessary, since the defendant has chosen his defending counsel for himself (?), the barrister Dr. Sack (Berlin), who will be permitted to act."

Dr. Sack is a reactionary of many years standing, and has acted as defending counsel for numerous national socialists, so that the statement that Torgler has "chosen" Dr. Sack as defender is extremely remarkable.

Now that the trial has been fixed for September 21, this must be a signal for a sharper struggle against the planned judicial murder.

Evasive Reply by German Public Prosecutor to Branting and Romain Rolland

Leipzig, 23rd August.

The public prosecutor has replied to the Swedish barrister Branting and to Romain Rolland. In his letter to Branting he states that the intermediary through which the material is submitted to the Supreme Court is of minor importance to him. He agrees to its being submitted through the defence.

With regard to the ten demands, the public prosecutor states that the defendants are free to choose their defending counsel from among the lawyers admitted to practice at German courts of justice or from the teachers of law in the German colleges, and that the admission of foreign barristers depends on the permission of the court and on the agreement of the German defending counsel. The defending barrister has the right to see the documents connected with the case, and after the indictment has been submitted; he has the right to consult with the defendants without the presence of third persons. The decision as to whether the public is to be excluded from the main proceedings, or from a part of them, is in the hands of the court; the public prosecutor is not aware of any circumstance inducing him to apply for the exclusion of the public.

With regard to demand 6, the prosecutor declares: "The insinuation that the defendants in custody on remand are not being treated in a 'manner worthy of human beings' must be emphatically denied as utterly unfounded." The court can only be applied to for safe conducts when the public prosecutor has been informed for what persons, and on account of what punishable actions, safe conducts are demanded (Branting and Rolland had demanded safe conducts for witnesses cited by the defence or by the Inquiry Committee). There is no reason whatever for anxiety for the lives of the defending counsel or of witnesses cited by the Committee. He is expressly in favour of the hearing of all witnesses whose depositions are likely to throw light on the matter. The granting of permission to officials and former officials to give evidence on circumstances about which it is their duty to preserve silence in their official capacity, is a matter to be decided upon by their superiors, and their decision can only be obtained after the officials in question have been named, and the circumstances stated with regard to which they are to give evidence.

It will be observed that the reply of the public prosecutor is extremely evasive and nebulous. He knows his reasons for this.

Awkward Questions in the Reichstag Affair

Berlin, 24th August.

There are certain questions which may be opportunely put to the German public prosecutor in connection with the correspondence between him and the barrister Branting and Romain Rolland:

Is it true or not that not only the Communist Party of Holland states that van der Lütte was expelled from the Dutch C.P. as provocateur in 1929, but that van der Lütte himself, in his deposition made before the state councillor of justice Vogt, in the presence of an interpreter sent for from the Dutch embassy in Berlin, stated that he had had no intercourse with members of the C.P.G., and did not hold Communist views?

Is it true or not that at this hearing the judge of the court of inquiry refused repeatedly to protocol this statement of van der Lütte that he had nothing to do with the C.P.G., and that this

statement was not protocolled until the Dutch interpreter, an employee of the Dutch embassy, refused to sign the protocol under these circumstances?

Is it true or not that since this hearing the court of inquiry has not applied again to the Dutch embassy for an interpreter?

Is it true or not that in the middle of 1932, according to the statements of the mayor of Sönnewitz, in Saxony, Albert Sommer, and of the market garden proprietor Schumann of Sönnewitz, an active member of the National Socialist Party, van der Lübbe gave himself out as an adherent of the National Socialist Party whilst staying temporarily in Sönnewitz as journeyman?

Is it true or not that on the day of the burning of the Reichstag, February 27, 1932, no meetings were held in the Reichstag buildings, and therefore no meetings of the Communist Reichstag fraction?

Is it true or not that the Communist Reichstag member Torgler, alleged to have co-operated with van der Lübbe in setting the Reichstag on fire, was having his supper at Ashinger's restaurant in the Friedrichstrasse at a quarter-past eight on the evening in question, and remained there till after the time when the fire broke out in the Reichstag (10 o'clock).

Is it true that the inspector of the Reichstag building shut off certain parts of the building personally on the day of the fire, and made inspections generally carried out by other officials? that this inspector was a member of the National Socialist Party before the Reichstag affair, and that he had in his possession the keys of the subterranean heating passage leading from the Reichstag to the residence of the president of the Reichstag, Göring, on the other side of the street?

Is it true or not that this subterranean passage is the only means of entering or leaving the Reichstag buildings without coming in contact with the watchmen?

But there are still more questions with regard to which the public prosecutor and the judge of the court of inquiry have every reason to evade the truth.

What is the reason of the sudden suspension and dismissal of the former fire brigade director Gempp and his deputy, who conducted the work of extinguishing the Reichstag fire, and observed that the fire had been laid in 27 different places by obvious technical experts, that doors important for the extinguishing work were locked, showing that the incendiaries must have had the keys, and that no traces of the incendiaries led to the rooms of the Communist Reichstag fraction?

Is it true or not that Bell, subsequently murdered at Kufstein by Storm Troopers, appeared in the editorial offices of the "Vorwärts" after the burning of the Reichstag, and offered to make a statement about the Reichstag being set on fire by national socialists, but was refused a hearing by the editors, who feared a provocation?

Is it true or not that this same Bell, shortly before the Reichstag arson, hinted to the Legation Secretary of the Foreign Office, Prince von Waldeck-Pyrmont, at the Hotel Adlon, that something special was going to happen on the night of February 27 in the Reichstag?

Is it true or not that the former secretary of state in the Reichs Chancellory, Planck, stated in so many words a week before the fire: "I know for certain that the Nazis will carry out a great provocation against the Communists shortly before the election. Either a feigned attempt on Hitler's life or something similar, in order to create a real pogrom atmosphere for the election"?

Is it true or not that the Reichs Chancellor Hitler, when he appeared on the scene of the fire, declared: "This is a God-given signal. If it has been done by Communists, as I believe it has, we must crush the murderous pestilence with an iron fist" (published in "New York Evening Post," February 28, 1933)?

Is it true or not that Hitler personally re-edited the article on the Reichstag arson in the Berlin "Völkischer Beobachter," and that the editors of this paper discussed the fact that just before the Reichstag arson Göring demanded especially solemn oaths from reliable members of the Storm Troops and Special Troops?

Finally, is it true or not that a secret agent of the police, working under the service designation of G.38, purloined important documents dealing with the background of the Reichstag burning, and that the State Secret Police has promised a large reward,

and even exemption from punishment, for the return of these documents?

Perhaps the public prosecutor Werner, or the judge of the court of inquiry Vogt, who will probably not venture to give a truthful answer to the above questions, will state what reasons induced no fewer than three Reich councillors of justice to leave the service quite suddenly—an extremely unusual occurrence—"in accordanc with their own wish" as the official notice states.

The World Economic Crisis

The International Wheat Conference in London

By M. M.

The question of wheat is the central point of the agricultural problem. It is one of the most serious questions with which all capitalist countries are faced.

The international Wheat Conference met in London on the 21st August. Thirty countries were represented at its deliberations, including the Soviet Union. This conference was the continuation of the one which took place in May in Geneva, at which experts from the United States, Canada, the Argentine and Australia were present and which ended without producing any results. The task of the new conference was to secure a limitation of the production and the export of wheat, to dispose of the stocks in storage, to fix a "reasonable" import quota for the importing countries and to secure the lowering of customs duties in these countries.

At the world economic conference in London the four big capitalist wheat-producing countries came to an agreement to lower production by 15 per cent., but before this agreement came into operation it required the consent of the importing countries, who were also to undertake to limit their own production and at the same time to increase consumption, whilst keeping the quotas elastic and sinking the import duties immediately the market price of wheat reached a certain level.

The new conference in London aimed at securing agreement on all these points among the countries represented at it. The four big capitalist wheat-producing countries (the United States, Canada, the Argentine and Australia) introduced the draft of a resolution. The first point of this resolution recommended that the importing countries should do nothing to increase their own area under wheat, and the second point recommended the greatest increase of the consumption of wheat possible.

It is calculated that the world stocks of wheat will increase by 30 million cwts. this year. According to the first statistical material to hand there has been a certain limitation of production in the United States this year, but on the other hand there has been a bumper harvest in Europe which will result in a diminution of Europe's wheat imports. As further unemployment is increasing and the impoverishment of the masses is growing greater and greater, it will not be possible to secure any great increase of consumption.

On the other hand, the great wheat-producing countries which produce almost solely for export will not be able to keep the undertakings they have made. The authorities in the Argentine have already announced that they "cannot limit the area under wheat without involving social danger." And as far as Europe is concerned, Hungary and Rumania, whose chief source of income is wheat export, cannot dream of reducing their exports owing to their critical financial situation. Each capitalist country will try to slit the neck of its competitors by dumping wheat in the importing countries.

And as far as the undertaking demanded from the importing countries that they should lower their import duties is concerned, it is hardly possible to reckon with its fulfilment. Belgium has already increased the duties on imported wheat. France is surrounded by a high wall of import duties on foodstuffs and the condition of French agriculture does not permit this wall to be lowered. Further, France has even become a country which exports wheat. At the moment no foreign wheat of any kind is being imported into France.

Intimidated by an ultimatum put forward by the American Secretary of State for Agriculture, who threatened them with wheat dumping on a tremendous scale, the representatives of the other capitalist countries finally agreed on an ambiguous text.

As far as the international minimum price is concerned, the parties have agreed to one of 12 gold francs or 60 paper francs per

cwt. This basic price is to be accompanied by a lowering of import duties on the part of the importing countries.

However, all the delegations accepted this minimum with reservations. In fact, they all reserved the final acceptance of the whole "agreement" reached in London to the governments of their respective countries.

The representative of the Soviet Union made reservations with regard to the export of wheat from his country. He pointed out that the Soviet government would be unable to sign any such agreement until it first of all knew how the export quotas were to be fixed. This was the clearest attitude taken up at the conference. The other countries have accepted the minimum price but with the idea at the back of their minds that it will be unable to be carried out. The export countries of America and Central Europe are convinced that as a result of the great amount of wheat which will be poured into the world markets the price will collapse. On the other hand the importing countries have obviously no intention of lowering their import duties.

It has been agreed that all those countries whose representatives initialled the agreement shall have the right to withdraw their signatures within a limit laid down prior to the official signing of the agreement. This means that the "pact" will not be signed at all and will never be carried out, and that it was initialled at all only to prevent the United States carrying out the threat of its Secretary for Agriculture.

The chairman of the conference, the Prime Minister of Canada, Bennett, announced that the exporting countries had agreed to divide an export amount of 560 million bushels of wheat amongst themselves for the export year 1933-34, and that in the year 1934-35 the exporting countries, with the exception of the Soviet Union and the Danube States, would lower their export figures by fifteen per cent.

The result of the conference will nevertheless do nothing but intensify the imperialist contradictions.

Fight Against Imperialist War

French Imperialist War in Morocco

By J. Berlioz (Paris)

It may be safely stated that for about thirty years, ever since French imperialism laid its hands on Morocco on the pretext of protecting the Western frontier of its North African possessions, war has not ceased to devastate this country. With the exception of the great expeditions of 1905 and 1925, this war has been carried on on a small scale, but this has not prevented it from taking toll of as many victims as a big campaign. It was the government of the "Left" bloc, supported by the socialists, which undertook the extermination of the courageous insurgents of the Riff in 1925. And it is again a "Left" government, enjoying the full support of the Socialist Party, which has now been carrying on especially important military operations for some months past.

Many of the Moorish tribes have submitted to imperialist rule after a heroic struggle against overwhelmingly superior forces, but they have never reconciled themselves to this rule. In the mountainous regions of the High Atlas a constant struggle is going on between them and the intruders. Between 1907 and 1930 the regular African army lost more than 30,000 killed in this region, and between July and October, 1932, the French troops, always headed by the Foreign Legion, lost 2,000 killed and wounded. The losses suffered by the Moors have not been counted, but they must be frightful. Whole villages are destroyed by artillery fire; assemblies of human beings and herds of cattle are torn to pieces by tons of bombs from aeroplanes; often the natives are exterminated by starvation by means of raids on their cattle, burning down their villages, cutting off their sources of water.

Of late years special efforts have been made to "pacify" the Tafilalet district by these barbaric methods. This spring Daladier's armies operated in Jebel Sagho. During the last few weeks fresh massacres have been going on in the Marrakesh district, and in Great Atlas French imperialism encounters a **determined resistance, much greater than it expected.** French imperialism is also very uneasy on account of the Riff, where fresh tribes are rebelling after succeeding in providing themselves with arms, and where there is widespread ferment in view of the expectation that a new Abd-el-Krim is preparing to preach mass insurrection against the intruders.

It was certainly somewhat presumptuous for the resident general, Saint, to announce last winter that by 1935 there would not be a single insurgent left in Morocco! But the government of French democracy is absolutely determined to employ every available means to crush the rebellions which have already broken out and the more serious ones which they anticipate. Troops and aeroplanes are being sent and the general staff has ordered the mobilisation of all men in the nomad tribes capable of military service for an extermination campaign in the higher mountain ranges.

Why such a decision? Chiefly because French imperialism is placing great hopes on the increased exploitation of its colonies, which is to compensate for the effects of the economic crisis. It must not be forgotten that French imperialism was able to increase France's foreign trade to the colonies from 16 per cent. in 1930 to 26 per cent. in 1932. C. A. Neveu, General Director of the Union Coloniale Française, wrote in the "*Revue des Vivants*," July number:—

"Circumstances render it imperatively necessary to-day to secure the stability of our colonial market. Without it the whole economy of France would collapse."

It is therefore necessary to rob the tribes of their best land and to give it to the big colonists and capitalist groups.

But an even more imperative reason urges the government to prompt action. Lieutenant-Colonel Magne indicates this in an article in the "*Petit Journal*" of 26th July:—

"We must deduct from our peace army the mobile forces stationed in the South of France but intended for the defence of our possessions overseas. It would be rash to calculate with their presence on the Rhine frontier and to employ them there from the first moment onwards. The feeling among the native peoples has developed greatly since 1914, and it may easily be foreseen that an attack by Germany would certainly be preceded and accompanied by energetic action for the stirring up of unrest in extra-European France."

When we remember that at the beginning of the war in 1914 thousands of French soldiers were held fast by the sporadic risings in North Africa, but that France was subsequently able to throw at least 300,000 North African soldiers on to the battlefields, then we realise the significance for France of the maintenance of "peace and order" in these regions, where the national movement is spreading rapidly at the present juncture, simultaneously with the struggles of the proletariat. And it is not only the inevitable "Hitler agents" who are working in Morocco; the "*Cri Marocain*" has repeatedly pointed to the suspicious activities of the "intense propaganda" of the Italian consul in Tetuan, and the periodical "*Maghreb*" published an article entitled "The Italian Danger," stating that leaflets of Italian origin have been published in the Arabic language, that agents of Mussolini have attempted to push their way in everywhere, etc.

French imperialism is anxious to have all its forces at its disposal for the European scene of war for which it is feverishly arming. It is to be made possible to bring troops without hindrance across the Mediterranean, from the depths of Mohammedan and black Africa. What is going on in Morocco at the present time is the preparation of the hinterland of the next front.

The "*Monde Colonial*" points out that:—

"insurrections may always be expected from the desert. Our possessions in North Africa and French Central Africa cannot be secured absolutely unless the nomads are subjugated and disarmed."

Therefore special efforts have been made for a predatory raid into the territories dominating the Sahara, whence several Moorish tribes have fled, preferring the hard life of the desert to submission. This raid includes the Spanish possessions of Rio del Oro and Mauritania, where French imperialism is anxious to possess safe and certain centres for the air transport, at present disturbed by the rebels.

For this reason Herriot paid an official visit to Madrid in October, 1932, in order to consult with the republican and socialist government of Spain with regard to military collaboration. There have been rumours of bargaining between the two imperialisms, of an arrangement by which France was to cede its rights in Tangier in return for Rio del Oro and the Ifni district. But Italy and Great Britain would have at once opposed this alteration of the statutes of Algerclras. However this may be, the joint

operations contemplated would require a combined army of 25,000 men.

The socialist press cannot but raise a voice in protest against the recent massacre of the "dissidents," but it has been very careful not to attack the Daladier government. On the contrary, it hastens to whitewash it by stating that the instigators of the campaigns in Morocco are officers endeavouring "to gain spurs and distinctions," and contents itself with demanding what the "Populaire" calls a "humane gesture"; the immediate publication of the names of the victims, in order to pacify their families!

But the central organ of the Socialist Party of France is equally indignant that the natives who have not been subjugated have been able to obtain arms with which to defend themselves. It would be glad if the "pacification" process could be carried out at less expense to French imperialism.

The Communist Party of France has come out openly in support of the struggle of the population of Morocco, for the evacuation of the country by the French troops, and for the immediate independence of Morocco. But it has not yet mobilised the proletariat of France against French imperialism as it did in 1925. This mobilisation should be closely bound up with a similar mobilisation of the toilers of Spain by the Spanish Communist Party. In 1925 the French C.P., after a broad campaign of agitation and after organising the masses in committees of action, district congresses, and a national congress, succeeded in organising thousands of toilers for a 24-hour strike and for street demonstrations. The present moment is even more serious, and the C.P. must redouble its efforts in this direction. In particular its functionaries in the Amsterdam Anti-War Committee must win over this movement for an energetic action, which we are convinced the socialist workers will take part in to a wide extent.

The Labour Movement

Growing Strike Movement of the Indian Textile Workers

The International Committee of the Textile Workers (of the R.I.L.U.) publishes in its Information Service detailed reports on the strike movement of the Indian textile workers. The Information Service states:—

Sixteen thousand fresh workers have been dismissed in the last two months in **Bombay**. Severe rationalisation measures are being introduced by which wages are reduced 20 to 30 per cent.

In **Ahmedabad** the factory owners' association has officially announced to the workers a 12 per cent. wage cut in all mills. In **Biramhaon** the wages of the textile workers have been reduced by 35 per cent. In **Nagpur** the employers have notified the workers of their intention to reduce wages by 20 per cent. In **Akhol** 5,000 workers have been dismissed. One can observe the same thing in all the other textile towns.

This fresh attack on the already extremely wretched standard of living of the textile workers condemns hundreds of thousands of workers and their wives and children to death from starvation. It is not surprising therefore that, as a reply to the rationalisation measures, the fresh wholesale dismissals and the further wage cuts, the textile workers in a number of cotton centres have taken up the fight. At the present time about ten mills are on strike in **Bombay**; three mills in **Ahmedabad**, while in many other towns, including **Cawnpore**, **Bhavanagara**, **Baroda** and **Hambey**, the workers have gone on strike. The strikes are in most cases partial strikes and isolated from one another, but among the working masses, especially in **Bombay**, there is a growing will and desire for united action. In **Bombay** mass meetings of workers are taking place every day, at which the textile workers demand the proclamation of a general strike. A general strike committee, elected by workers in the factories on the basis of the united front from below, has been created for the carrying out of the general strike. The workers in the other cotton centres are also advocating the general strike. The strike of the workers in the **Eldschin** and **Cawnpore** mills threatened to become a general strike of the workers in the whole town, and it was only the most drastic repressive measures on the part of the police that prevented this. Particularly characteristic is the growth of the spontaneous strike movement in **Ahmedabad**, in the town which, according to the declaration of **Gandhi**, is a happy island in the raging sea of class passions in India. The workers of **Ahmedabad** are more and more freeing them-

selves from the influence of the **Gandhi**-ist workers' association, which succeeded for a long time in holding back the workers from struggle and betraying their interests with the aid of arbitration. The **Ahmedabad** workers are offering energetic resistance to the attempts to reduce their wages. In the course of the present year they have carried out fourteen strikes. The association openly opposed strikes as a weapon against the employers. At the present time the workers of three factories in **Ahmedabad** are on strike, and the general feeling is in favour of converting the strike into a general strike.

A characteristic and important feature of the present situation in the cotton industry in India is the simultaneous development of the strike struggle in many big centres. The fight of the workers is developing in spite of the savage white terror, with the aid of which the government wish to crush any attempt of the workers to repel the fresh attacks of the employers.

The Strike Movement in Fascist Bulgaria

The Bulgarian bourgeoisie, in its search for a way out of the crisis, is developing an insane offensive against the standard of living of the working class and of the toiling masses in town and country. In the course of the crisis real wages have fallen 50 per cent. and at present amount to only 30 per cent. of pre-war wages. The working day has been lengthened, intensity of work increased. The attacks of the bourgeoisie are accompanied by an unbridled police-fascist reaction—the best revolutionaries have been murdered, meetings and conferences prohibited, demonstrations broken up, strikes forcibly suppressed, and the legal class organisations of the proletariat are threatened with destruction.

The offensive of the employers, however, does not remain unanswered. The class struggle in the country is increasing, the number of strikes and strikers is uninterruptedly growing.

Thus in the year 1932 and the first half of 1933 the following strikes took place: Two tramway workers' strikes in **Sofia**, general strike of the taxi-drivers in **Jambol**, strike of the electricians at the biggest power station (**Batcha**), strike of 400 metal workers of the ship repairing works in **Varna**, strike of 700 sugar workers in **Kaeli**, of 500 food workers in **Levski**, of 400 land workers in **Pasardshik**, 400 in **Sestrimolo**, etc.

The strike movement has reached a higher stage; the fights for the most part have the character of a counter-offensive, but at the same time the number of strikes in which the workers have gone over to the offensive is growing.

In the year 1932, out of 249 strikes, 117 (47 per cent.) had the character of a counter-offensive (against wage cuts, for wage increases, etc.), 81 strikes (33 per cent.) were offensive strikes for wage increases, etc., and only 51 strikes (20 per cent.) were defensive strikes against attacks on wages, etc. In the first half of 1933, 19 strikes (22 per cent.) out of 85 were directed against wage cuts, 31 (37 per cent.) bore the character of a counter-offensive, and 35 (41 per cent.) were offensive strikes.

An eloquent proof of the militancy and pertinacity of the working masses is the fact that strikes were several times repeated in the same factories, and also that the women and youths actively participated in these fights. Thus, for instance, 150 painters in the **Stojanov** factory in **Sofia** struck work four times in the course of three months, 500 tobacco workers employed by the Italian firm of **Regia** in **Sofia** struck three times, 700 tobacco workers of the Austrian firm of **Regia** in **Sofia** struck twice, 500 food workers in **Levski** struck twice, 450 miners of the **Tverliza** pit struck three times, the tramway workers of **Sofia** twice.

The organisational role of the independent revolutionary unions in the preparation and independent leadership of the strike struggles has likewise grown. In the year 1932, 168 (67 per cent.) out of 249 strikes were prepared by them and 75 (30 per cent.) of the spontaneous strikes were led by them; in the first six months in 1933, 73 (86 per cent.) of the strikes were prepared and only 12 (14 per cent.) broke out spontaneously and were led by them.

In the year 1933, the revolutionary unions have led all strikes without exception. It was precisely in the course of these struggles, through the independent preparation and leadership of all forms of the economic and political struggle, that the revolutionary organisations of Bulgaria have captured the majority of the working class.

As the leadership of the struggles was mainly concentrated in the hands of the revolutionary trade union organisations, the percentage of the successful strikes increased. Thus in the year

1932, 176 (more than 70 per cent.) out of 249 strikes ended successfully, and in the year 1933, 68 strikes (80 per cent.) out of 85 strikes.

The strikes are characterised by long duration and intensity. Thus the strike of 457 workers in the "Zebra" rubber factory lasted five months, the strike of the textile workers in Sliven 85 days, the strike of the tobacco workers of Pasardshik 46 days, of the printing workers of Sofia 60 days, etc.

The present strikes bear a definitely fighting character and increased political importance. In the course of the majority of strikes there have been arrests of strike pickets and strike committees, as well as revolutionary demonstrations, meetings and open collisions with the police and the fascists.

The independent unions have to record indisputable successes in regard to the application of united front tactics in almost all branches of industry, in particular among the tobacco workers, the textile workers, the building workers, the leather workers, the garment workers, the food workers, the timber workers, etc.

In spite of these great achievements spontaneous strikes, such as in Kaeli (700 sugar workers), Levski (500 food workers), Gabrovo (354 textile workers), etc., are still taking place.

The greatest shortcoming, which was particularly noticeable during the strike movement, is the organisational weakness of the independent revolutionary unions as well as the weak position of or the complete lack of trade union groups in various big undertakings.

The weakest point of the strike movement consists in the fact that a great strata of the proletariat, such as the railway men, dock workers, miners, the workers in the metal and war industry, agricultural labourers, civil servants, teachers, etc., are lagging behind the strike movement. The Red Trade Union Opposition is frequently following in the wake of the social fascist trade union bureaucrats instead of taking over the leadership of their discontented members and launching a fight for the independent organisation and leadership of the struggles, in the course of which the treacherous role of the trade union bureaucrats can be exposed. The whole attention and efforts of the independent revolutionary unions must be concentrated on these sectors of the front which are lagging behind.

The White Terror

The Verdict Against the Rumanian Railway Workers

By A. B.

The Bucharest Military Court has pronounced a sentence on the railway workers charged in connection with the February disturbances which in its cruelty gives full expression to the spirit of vengeance of the ruling class.

Of the 108 accused, two were sentenced to penal servitude for life, 12 (in contumaciam) to twenty years' penal servitude, two to fifteen years, two to 10 years' imprisonment, and many others to sentences of imprisonment up to 5 years. Fifty-nine of the accused were acquitted.

In connection with this monstrous judgment it is fitting to return once more to the history of the events preceding the February struggles of the Rumanian proletarian workers. At the end of January of this year a violent spirit of unrest became apparent in the whole of Rumania in connection with the so-called "Geneva reconstruction plan." This plan was worked out by the Rumanian government in co-operation with the foreign creditors of Rumania and contained projects for an unbridled attack on the standard of life of the Rumanian working population. The wretched wages of tens of thousands of workers and employees were to be further reduced by as much as 40 per cent.; so radical a limitation of the cultural and social expenditure of the state was contemplated that hundreds of schools and hospitals would have had to be closed.

It is well known that the civil servants and employees, particularly the teachers, whose salaries were withheld for months on end, held discussions during these weeks with regard to a general strike. The workers in the railway workshops struck the first blow and took up the struggle against the reconstruction plan, which was to bring about the lowering of their wages by 34 per cent. and the dismissal of 11,000 of them. On January 28 the workers of the railway works "Privita," in Bucharest, placed their demands before the government, among which were the raising of wages,

the reinstatement of dismissed workers, etc. In the event of these demands not being complied with, the workers would down tools.

The government relied on the social democratic trades union bureaucracy, which they trusted would know how to prevent the strike, and refused these demands. But on February 2 the railway workers struck in Bucharest, Jassy, Galatz, Cluj, and Paschkassy against the will of the social democrats and their trade unions, and the government found itself compelled to fulfil the demands of the railway workers.

The king, the government and the whole bourgeoisie formed a united front, from which the social democrats were not missing. Parliament immediately proclaimed martial law in all the towns. Relying on this decree, the government dissolved all the proletarian organisations with the exception of the social democratic ones, and proscribed the revolutionary papers, meetings and strikes.

In this atmosphere of terror the government and the capitalists once more felt strong enough to withdraw their concessions. Hundreds of workers were delivered over to the military prisons, the strike leaders were arrested and cruelly ill-treated and some of them ambushed and shot.

The railway workers rose up to undertake a new defensive struggle. On February 15 and 16, political strikes against martial law and the terror, for the release of the prisoners, for the restoration of the legality of the revolutionary workers' organisations took place in Cluj, Jassy, Galatz, Plösti and Bucharest. In Cluj and Bucharest the workers in almost all the workshops joined the striking railway workers. In Cluj and Bucharest the strikers took possession of the railway works, while the rest of the workers demonstrated in the streets.

The military, with machine-guns and artillery, were called out against the struggling workers. In Bucharest and in Cluj serious barricade fights took place, which were particularly violent in Bucharest. The machine-guns rattled the whole night, and in the morning rifle fire was opened against the besieged railway workers. When the military penetrated into the railway works and opened fire with their machine-guns on the workers assembled there, the latter heroically defended themselves against these overwhelming forces.

Five hundred workers were left dead in the courtyard. The survivors, several hundreds in number, were carried off to prison. It was a part of these revolutionary workers that were tried.

The proceedings in the trial of the 108 accused began on July 17. The indictment was incitement to rebellion and conspiracy against the government, communist plans for a revolution. During the proceedings, which lasted a month, 600 witnesses were heard. The Military Court and Siguranza took every measure to preserve "order and peace" during the trial.

The principal accused were, besides the leaders of the revolutionary trades union opposition of the railway workers, the most active leaders of the revolutionary trades unions, of the W.I.R., as well as the leaders of the juridical bureau of the International Lawyers' Union, with Patrascanu at the head. It was admitted in the charge that the attack of the military and police forces on the railway workshops had resulted in the death of 7 and the wounding of 44 workers. But the correspondent of the bourgeois "Sunday Express" telegraphed in February from Bucharest that on February 17 the corpses of 120 workers in the railway works were secretly conveyed during the night to the crematorium, with a military escort, and cremated. Amongst these were no doubt those who have now been sentenced "in contumaciam."

A few words must be devoted to pointing out the sorry role that the social democratic leaders have played, not only during the strike struggles, but recently during the trial. They designated the movement of the railway workers as the work of agents provocateurs; it was they who maintained that "Moscow had an interest in the events in the railway works in Bucharest." The social democrat deputy, Mirescu, was not afraid of reminding the public of the fact that he had already, two years ago, when the first conflict broke out with the railway workers, submitted to the Minister of the Interior a list of Communists who had, unfortunately, not been arrested.

The course of the trial was in accordance with the wishes of its organisers. The accused were delivered up to them, and they were able to pass their judgment without the great mass of the public being able to obtain an insight into the trial. But the revolutionary workers of Rumania, and particularly the railway workers, have not forgotten their comrades; they are standing by their side and will release them as soon as their hour has come.

In the Camp of Social Democracy

The Paris Conference of the II. International

The Pacemakers of Fascism and Intervention in Conference

A special conference of the Second (Labour and Socialist) International began in Paris on the 21st August, two days after the Executive Committee of the International had held a session. One hundred and forty-two delegates were present at the conference, representing 36 parties in 30 countries. The spirit which dominated the proceedings of the conference was one of impotence, defeat, and bankruptcy. All the speeches delivered at the conference betrayed the efforts of the assembled Ministers and ex-Ministers to overcome the crisis which exists in the ranks of the social-democratic workers all over the world and to restore confidence in the leadership by means of new manoeuvres and tricks.

The opening speech delivered by Adler was in harmony with the speech delivered by Vandervelde in the discussion in the attempt to discover new "radical" manoeuvres in order to counteract the catastrophic effect of the treachery of the German social democracy on all the supporters of the Second International. Adler placed the responsibility for the defeat on the two "extremes," namely, Communism and reformism. There is nothing either new or interesting in the fact that Adler slanders Communism, but that he places at least part of the guilt on "reformism" and declares it to have been the pacemaker of fascism is more than amusing. Since Adler left prison in 1918 he has always been a defender of reformism, and in the Executive Committee of the Second International he has always done his utmost to crush all opposition, whether it arose in the ranks of the British Labour Party or in the ranks of the German Social Democratic Party. Vandervelde confirmed this fact in his speech, so that if reformism is the pacemaker of fascism Fritz Adler must take his full share of the responsibility for the work it did to pave the way for fascism.

The Paris conference of the bankrupts is a conference of anti-Soviet war and intervention. The delegation of Russian and Georgian Mensheviks is one of the strongest delegations at the conference. One speaker after the other abused the Soviet Union in the usual fashion. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the one country in the world without fascism was described as a dictatorship over the proletariat.

Otto Wels demanded that the conference should show "understanding" for the attitude of the German social democracy, just as ten years ago at the Hamburg congress Léon Blum got up and called for "understanding" for the support accorded by the French Socialist Party to French imperialism. It is true, the pacemakers of fascism and the banner bearers of imperialism "understand" each other. But their newest manoeuvres against the fighting unity of the working class, their attempts to give their old policy a new ideological cloak, will not alter the annihilating condemnation of the Second International by the masses so long as we Communists are at our posts!

Detailed Report of our Special Correspondent at the Paris Conference of the Second "Labour and Socialist" International

First Day of the Conference. Paris, 21st August, 1933.

Despite the extraordinary measures taken by the Bureau of the conference of the Second International to close the Paris conference completely against the representatives of the revolutionary press, our correspondent is able to report from the conference hall itself the contents of the most important of those speeches which were not intended for the ears of the revolutionary working class, and not even for the broad masses of the members of the parties of the Second International.

The atmosphere which dominated the sessions showed clearly enough what an urgent necessity it was for the leaders of the Second International to take these precautions. Every speech, the attitude of the delegates, and the spirit in which the speeches

were received demonstrated the hopeless bankruptcy and impotence of this defeated conglomeration which calls itself an international. The forced "optimism" tagged on to the end of most of the speeches did no more than stress the discrepancy between the contents of the speeches and the "optimistic expectations" expressed.

The social-democratic leaders assembled in Paris were furiously intent on securing the prolongation of their own political lives by discovering new manoeuvres and tricks to deceive the social-democratic workers and by indulging in an even more than usually pyrotechnical anti-Bolshevist campaign of incitement.

At the beginning of the conference proceedings Friedrich Adler pointed out that the framework of the conference had deliberately been kept as narrow as possible and that only persons introduced by the delegates themselves could be permitted to be present at the proceedings. Everything possible would be done to assure the success of these measures.

In a speech lasting three-quarters of an hour Adler then made the report on behalf of the Bureau. He began with a short account of the history of the International since its foundation ten years ago in Hamburg, and then divided the countries into three categories: (1) countries in which democracy had not been shaken; (2) countries which were threatened by fascism; and (3) countries in which fascism had already obtained power.

During the past ten years the German social democracy had not paid sufficient attention to a programmatic statement of its aims. After the German defeat the workers must be given a wide perspective by a programme of the international. This programme would have to be built on a more solid basis than that of ten years ago, which had represented only a beginning. However, Adler then declared that the working out of this programme could not be the work of the conference. He then went on to criticise the lack of understanding shown by many of the parties of the international for the problems brought forward by the development in Germany. The working class was not so much interested in what would have to be done after the victory of the social revolution, but it did want a complete answer to the question of how power was to be obtained. There were, in fact, various ways of obtaining power, according to the conditions existing in the various countries.

As a reaction to the events in Germany some comrades were adopting the theory that the path of democracy was no longer possible. This was an error. However, democracy was not the only way to socialism, as had been believed widely after the war. Where democracy existed it must be defended. In those countries in which fascism had been victorious revolutionary means would have to be adopted. However, Adler then attacked what he termed "unsophisticated slogans and unsophisticated solutions," by which he meant the idea that there could be no other way out than the struggle for the socialist revolution and the struggle for full power. In Germany—despite the serious differences of opinion in its ranks the whole German social democracy was united on the point—there could be no question of a resuscitation of the democratic Weimar constitution, but only a question of social revolution. In other countries, however, the situation was different. One must avoid the exaggeration of regarding all other countries as though the conditions existing in them were the same as those at present existing in Germany.

Adler then went on to express the hope that Moscow would also recognise the necessity for a change of tactics. Up to the present there had existed two mutually exclusive solutions, the solution of Moscow, the solution of the Bolshevists, and the solution of democracy. But the truth lay between the two, and all possibilities must be taken into account according to the existing conditions. In his opinion the responsibility for the development in Germany rested not on the fact that mistakes had been made, but on the hard and fast theories which had been maintained. To find the causes one would have to go back to the days of the

Independent Social Democratic Party, to the split, and to the war. All possible resistance must be offered to the united front manoeuvre of Moscow which attempted to misuse the workers for other ends. He was in favour of a real unity of action, but so long as Moscow maintained the theory that the workers must first go through Hitler's hell before they could arrive at the socialist paradise, no unity of action would be possible. Adler then went off into an anti-Communist gallop, declaring that the Communists had always sabotaged democracy and worked with the enemies of democracy to bring about its fall. In conclusion he polemised against Renaudel and Loebe and declared that more internationalism, an unshakeable maintenance of the class standpoint, and more Marxism must be the slogans of the Second International.

Emile Vandervelde addressed the conference in the afternoon session. He declared himself in favour of international action even after the destruction of such a powerful party as the German Social Democratic Party. In a little country like Belgium the question of socialism in one country alone was not the same as it was in Russia which stretched over one-sixth of the earth's surface. In Russia a State economic system existed and democracy had been excluded. In France also the policy of "national socialism" or national limitation was not possible. Vandervelde performed the conjurer's trick of placing the policy of the Soviet power on a level with the "national socialism" of Renaudel, in order then to present himself demagogically as a defender of internationalism. With pathos in his voice he declared that the international had twice been defeated and had twice revived, and that after a new catastrophe there would still be comrades who would place themselves in the van with the shout: "Long live the International!" He then attacked the Communists who, he declared, preached the inevitability of world war. The Second International must work to increase the anti-war spirit and, if necessary, it must develop the national war into a civil war. He then quoted Lincoln's definition of democracy as being government of the people, for the people, by the people. To put it plainly and abandon idealistic formulations, democracy was the sum of the achievements won by the proletariat in a decade of struggle on the streets. It was not, as many comrades thought, merely bourgeois freedom and bourgeois legality. In those countries where fascism had been victorious there could be no return to the status quo ante, but a fight for revolutionary socialist democracy. In those countries which were threatened with fascism there must be not only a defensive struggle against fascism, but also as offensive in the spirit of social democracy. In conclusion he demanded the drawing up of a guide to international action in order to fight with all possible means against fascism and to carry out the boycott of Hitler Germany.

Pietro Nenni, the Italian representative, then addressed the conference. He declared that the events in Germany meant the end of the reformist and revisionist policy of the post-war period. The responsibility for the defeat rested on the fact that everything possible had been done to hold back the revolution of 1918 instead of driving it forward. Nenni then discussed a series of what he termed intermediate stages to socialism. Although they would remain enemies of Bolshevism because it put the social democrats outside the law whilst concluding agreements of friendship with anti-proletarian governments, Bolshevism must be appreciated as an attempt. The Bolshevik economic system was not yet socialism, but it was no longer capitalism. The attempt at present being made in the United States was one of the intermediate stages of capitalism. Nenni then demanded that the State should be placed in the service of the defence of the workers and the establishment of socialism. Socialism must be the immediate present aim. In the question of democracy Nenni declared himself in agreement with Vandervelde. How much democracy was worth could be seen clearly in those countries where it still existed. However, the crisis of democracy was a social fact. It was a result of the contradictions having become so strong that a secure political regime was no longer possible for the bourgeoisie, and not the result of the adventures of Mussolini and Hitler. Either Wels or Stampfer had declared in the executive session that it had possibly been an error that the German social democracy had not said to the workers that they should abandon a part of their socio-political gains in order to defend their political freedom. Had they said that to the workers they would in

that moment have ceased to be socialists. (Protests from Wels and Stampfer.) Nenni then praised the Linz Programme of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. In 1918 the German social democrats did not utilise their power because they practised a sort of fetishism with the election figures. He was in favour of unity of action, although the answer of Moscow was unsatisfactory and in a sense even provocative.

Nenni then spoke in support of the motion of the Social Democratic Party of Italy in favour of:—

(1) A joint conference of the Second and Third Internationals to study the possibility of joint proletarian action; and

(2) An international conference of all anti-fascist and anti-capitalist organisations to lay down the immediate aims of the counter-offensive of the masses, the question of the petty-bourgeoisie to be dealt with at this conference.

Unity of action must be established in order that after the overthrow of the Hitler government social-democratic and Communist workers should not fight each other. **Could Moscow, which concludes agreements of friendship with the Italy of Mussolini and the Poland of Pilsudski, refuse the offer of an agreement of friendship with the social-democratic workers?** In conclusion Nenni warned those who found satisfaction in declaring that France was not Germany, just as formerly others had declared that Germany was not Italy.

Grimm of Switzerland then took the floor. He gave a depressing summary of the ten years' history of the international, and declared that whilst the conference did not want to look for scapegoats, it must frankly be admitted that the events in Germany were not without their effect on the situation of the social-democratic parties in all other countries. Many honest fighters were perplexed and confused. They were asking themselves the question: Are we on the right road? Will not the very same thing happen to us? They do not understand why despite the powerful party apparatus the Hitler dictatorship was accepted apparently without the least resistance. The workers are asking: How can we destroy the causes of fascism? How can we overcome the economic crisis? The conference must answer: The crisis is the crisis of capitalism. Grimm then expressed doubt that the unemployed and the young generation to-day regarded socialism as the solution of the economic crisis. However, it was not merely a question of preaching faith in socialism. The masses demand an answer to the question: How are we to get socialism? If socialism did not develop out of the highest stage of bourgeois culture, but out of the capitalist crisis, then revolutionary methods would have to be adopted according to the conditions existing in the various countries. It was a great mistake to take over the conception of democracy without recognising the difference between the past and the present—that is to say, to regard democracy solely as the heir of the bourgeois revolution, and to fail to see its present-day form. This error was made during the war and the post-war period. For the first time a conference of the Labour and Socialist International has drawn a distinction between bourgeois and proletarian democracy, although up to the present proletarian democracy existed nowhere. Grimm then described the former features of Swiss reaction and the present intensified reaction of Swiss democracy. A congress of Swiss socialists had decided to go farther than merely defending formal democracy, to answer the misuse of democracy with illegal counter-measures up to and including the mass strike. One of the chief errors of the International had been to make an appearance of unity and strength where in fact neither existed. Opposition had been rigidly excluded from the surface of the congresses and there had often then been insufficient power to carry the congress decisions into action. The German social democracy was the best example of this confusion of the appearance with the reality. Internationally the situation was no different to-day than it was in 1914, when the same thing occurred. Hard facts would have to be realised clearly if the present crisis in the International was to be overcome and the workers were to retain their belief in socialism. Therefore there should be no attempt to make the International appear stronger than it actually was. In conclusion Grimm demanded that the International should be more than a mere sum of its parties and that it should develop a firm unity of activity and action.

At the end of the session **Stampfer** then asked for the floor to make a personal declaration. He declared that Nenni as a re-

sult of an error of translation had, to say the least of it, misunderstood him. In the executive session he had referred exclusively to the example of the Czechoslovakian social democrats who, in order to maintain the positions of democracy in Czechoslovakia, had sacrificed certain socio-political gains of the workers. He had declared that the German social democrats had not done that, and that perhaps it had been an error to harbour the illusion that when capitalism was collapsing all the socio-political gains of the workers could still be kept whilst maintaining a socio-political defensive instead of taking up a political offensive for socialism and freedom. At the time when the Hermann Mueller government had been overthrown the German Social Democratic Party had remained adamant in socio-political questions.

In his declaration Stampfer did no more than confirm in a complicated form exactly that which Nenni had attacked, and that which the social-democratic leader Hilferding propagated in innumerable articles at the time of the Bruening emergency decrees.

Second Day of the Conference. Paris, 22nd August, 1933.

Renaudel (France) was the first speaker. He spoke on behalf of the "Neo-Socialists" inside the Socialist Party of France. Renaudel and his supporters, Déat, Marquet and Co., the "Neo-Socialists," were declared by the Italian fascist press to be real fascists, even if they disliked the term, a dislike understandable for tactical reasons, but one which made no difference to the fascist essence of their position and their demands. Renaudel began by declaring himself in express agreement with the Adler-Vandervelde policy, and then used the arguments of these two in order to justify his own policy.

He attacked the German social democracy for adopting too closely the slogans of the bourgeoisie and because they also declared themselves in favour of the revision of the Versailles Treaty. He was also in favour of dividing the countries of the world into three categories: countries in which freedom never existed; countries in which freedom had been destroyed; and countries in which freedom still existed and must be defended. Under the conditions which existed in France, his own policy was the best one. Only when democracy had been attacked should any appeal be made outside parliament to the masses, including the masses of the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and the youth. He rejected the appeal to brutal terroristic violence as the common ideology of Bolshevism and fascism. One should not place oneself outside the life of the nation. He had to direct the same reproach towards the International as towards his own party: it was hiding itself behind old formulations, in order to avoid acting. It was true that fascism meant war. If Hitler Germany declared war on France, and the attacker were pilloried by the international organisations, he would claim the right to defend his own country. Whoever declared that there was no possibility of a defence of the fatherland under a capitalist system of society had already adopted a part of the Bolshevik ideology. Renaudel then repeated this statement several times. In conclusion, Renaudel attacked the old formulas of social democratic policy, which he declared had been made for a period other than the one in which we were now living.

Alter, of the Polish "Bund," then followed, and declared that the very backbone of the social democratic movement was being shaken by a crisis; the confidence of the social democratic workers was shaken. The German social democracy must face the question: if the German social democrats declare to-day that only the social revolution comes into question in Germany, why did they not say that fifteen years ago when the old imperial empire lay in ruins? Events in Germany had shown that the democratic path was not the right one. One should not wait until the enemy thought the time ripe to abandon the basis of legality, but one should choose the moment oneself when the working class was strong enough. He was in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that which existed in Russia was not a dictatorship of the proletariat, but a dictatorship over the proletariat.

Dalton, of the British Labour Party, then took the floor. He permitted himself the safe luxury of declaring that the German Communists, after having talked loudly about offering resistance to fascism, had scuttled away like rats when the moment came to resist. To-day, he declared, it was a crime to talk about any revision of the Versailles Treaty, as any such revision could benefit only Hitler. There could also be no disarmament so long as Germany was arming, as was the case to-day.

Otto Wels spoke in the afternoon session as the representative

of the German social democracy. In the secret executive session which was held on the 19th August, he placed the blame for the German collapse on Leipart, who, he declared, had steadfastly refused to countenance a general strike, but in his speech at the conference he placed all the blame on the shoulders of the Communists and onto "objective circumstances." He knew, he declared, that in the situation which had been created by the collapse of the German social democracy he would meet with nothing but bitter and disappointed criticism. Up to the present the criticism had been of a comradely nature. The difference lay above all in the fact that each one was seeking the mistakes in a different place. In reply to Alter's question, he declared that in fact, in 1919, the German social democracy had not had power. In reply to Grimm's declaration that since Hamburg the International had become weaker and weaker, he "recalled the critical situation" which existed at the time of the Hamburg congress in 1923. At the time of the congress, 12,000 members of the social democratic association "Republic" had had to guard the congress day and night against the threat of a Communist attack, whilst in the Ruhr district nationalists like Schlageter and Communists had driven the workers against the French machine-guns. Hitler's victory had not been won without meeting with resistance. The German social democracy had fought to maintain the Republic for fourteen years until the economic crisis had rendered the working class helpless. He pleaded for understanding for the situation of the German social democracy and reminded the conference that ten years ago Léon Blum had also pleaded for an understanding of the fear of France that a coming militarist Germany would attack it. Even at that time he had pointed out the danger of fascism. Wels then quoted from his speech at the time which had culminated in the declaration that Moscow's communism and Paris' militarism were the two assistants of the German reaction. In the executive session he had answered the question as to the 20th July by declaring that even in the inflation the workers had been so weakened that they were hardly in a situation to defend the Republic. Differences of opinion between the Party and the trade unions had often to be straightened out. Wels then reminded the conference that the conference of ambassadors had bargained over each rifle that Severing needed for use against the Communist and fascist enemies of the State, whilst at present the governments were not insisting so strictly on the maintenance of the letter of the Versailles Treaty.

The coalition policy had been adapted to the particular conditions existing in Germany. The Social Democratic Party had been compelled to look for allies despite the fact that it mistrusted these allies. The S.D.P. had been compelled to vote for Hindenburg, otherwise the Communists would have secured the election of Hitler in the first stage of the voting. Those who were now disappointed underestimated the difficulties which had existed in Germany. Wels then defended the policy of toleration against those who declared that it had undermined the basis of democracy. Replying to Grimm, he declared that the Party in each country must determine its own methods of work because everywhere political autarchy existed. The cry for unity was being raised more and more strongly in the ranks of the working class, but the illegal struggle in Germany was still being poisoned by the policy of the Communists. Leading Communist circles declared that the path to Communism must lead through fascism (!). Fascism waded through blood and over mounds of corpses, and so did Communism. (Wels was military commander of Berlin in the winter of 1918-1919, and the troops under his command murdered thousands of revolutionary Spartakists. For these exploits Wels became known to the Berlin workers as "Bloody Wels" and the "slaughterer"). When the governments of the west and the bourgeoisie saw that and were faced with a choice between a fascist and a Bolshevik Germany, no wonder they chose a fascist Germany.

At the executive session Wels delivered a very pessimistic speech, but he concluded his speech at the conference with a pathetic peroration about the "invincible idea of socialism," the "socialist revolution" and the "coming day of struggle and victory." The effect on the conference was that six delegates applauded.

The Polish delegate, **Niedzialowski**, then took the floor, and attacked the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He appealed to the League of Nations to protect the social democracy in Danzig.

The session was closed after a delegate from the United States had delivered a speech.

Third Day of the Conference

Paris, 23rd August, 1933.

In the morning session of the third day, the Menshevik, **Abramovitch**, took the floor with his usual bitter anti-Soviet incitement. He adopted the lies of the Hitler government's "Brothers in Need" campaign and thus openly entered the fascist front against the Soviet Union. The speech of Abramovitch, delivered at a moment of acute imperialist war danger, demonstrated that this international of the pacemakers of fascism is at the same time an International of interventionist social-imperialist warmongers.

The first speaker in the morning session was **Winter**, of Czechoslovakia, who complained about the attempts to draw a distinction between bourgeois and socialist democracy. The existing State was not always against the workers.

Abramovitch then began his speech. The ideology of the fighting proletariat could not be laid down according to decreed principles; it was determined by historical development. There was no clarity concerning the further development of the economic crisis and its liquidation. In the United States one was witnessing an experiment which represented a step towards a planned and controlled capitalism. On the other hand there was the brutal experiment of Bolshevism. Abramovitch then attacked the Communists who, he declared, regarded fascism as a sort of preventive war to prevent the proletariat taking power. If that were the case then fascism would be particularly strong in Denmark and Sweden, where the workers were nearer to taking over power than the German workers had been under Bruening. Nobody believes that Leipart wanted to carry through a social revolution in Germany. There were two tendencies in existence: the one consisted in making concessions to the middle classes, a sort of middle-class socialism, which was no socialism at all, and the second was to ignore completely the middle classes. This tendency was strongest under the Bolshevik dictatorship, which was a dictatorship of a minority. Leaving all theories aside, practical experience in the Soviet Union showed that this dictatorship of the minority was being tightened up step by step to the brutal and grotesque plan of letting millions of peasants literally die of starvation in order to drive forward the Bolshevik agricultural experiment. Starvation in the Soviet Union was so widespread that the corpses of the dead were very often not buried at all because the survivors were too weak to bury them. Millions had died in this way. Five millions had died in 1921 as the victims of Bolshevism and just as many had died this year. It was questionable whether this starvation could be overcome by the present good harvest. But even if that should prove to be the case, it would not restore the millions of victims to life. All this was not the result of the fact that devils were ruling the Soviet Union; they were human beings also, but they had manoeuvred themselves into an experiment which produced such results. That was the logical consequence of dictatorship.

Referring to the German problem, Abramovitch declared that the cardinal error which had been made was the failure to complete the revolution of 1918. He welcomed the self-criticism which had been exercised by Comrade Stampfer, and opposed those people who declared: We were always right, but peculiarly enough our opponents won! At the decisive moment the German social democracy had been struck with paralysis. It had been like a man in the top storey of a burning house: the saving jump was attached to a risk and it therefore preferred to remain in the burning house to be burnt. At every decisive moment the German social democracy had hesitated and in this way it had prepared its own defeat. The illusions still harboured by many German comrades in March, April and May had been astonishing. If he could talk to his murdered friend, Stelling, now, he would ask him whether it would not have been better to die fighting on the barricades than to be tortured to death in a cellar by Hitler's storm troops. (Applause amongst the guests.) Abramovitch closed his speech with a critical consideration of the events of the 20th July.

Kreuger then took the floor on behalf of the majority in the American delegation. He declared that socialists must be realists and see clearly the weaknesses of the International, and not let themselves be deceived by forced optimism. There was not only the German defeat and the increased danger of war to be considered, but also the collapse of the government policy of the British Labour Party. Kreuger then demanded direct negotiations with the Communist International on a basis of mutual recognition. Communists and social democrats were not enemies; their joint enemy was capitalism. The toleration of bourgeois governments should take place only under a special control exercised by

the International. The International had not yet recovered from the weaknesses which had caused its collapse during the world war. To-day the International was morally weaker than it had been before the world war and it was threatened with a new loss of strength. He was proud of the principles of the Vienna International (Second and a Half International) which, as Grimm said, had perhaps been buried too early, and he demanded a revision of the tactics and the ideology of the International.

Buchinger (Hungary) complained pathetically that after the murderous bestialities of the Hitler government it would be more difficult than ever to convince the proletariat that the way to socialism must be a bloodless one.

Léon Blum's speech in the afternoon provided a sensation when he revealed the fact that the executive session had decided to instruct all the parties of the International to refuse all direct negotiations with the Communist Parties of their countries, i.e., to refuse to take part in any joint action. Instead of such negotiations a new deceitful proposal is to be made by the Second International, together with the International Federation of Trade Unions to the Communist International for the formation of an "international united front." With this it is hoped that the international working class will overlook the bankruptcy of the whole previous policy of the Second International and support its future policy.

Another interesting speech in the afternoon session was that of the German representative, **Aufhaeuser**. Aufhaeuser has declared on other occasions that the whole Second International is hopelessly bankrupt, but for the benefit of the conference he delivered a pseudo-optimistic speech. He declared that one of the causes which led up to Hitler's accession to power was the consistent efforts of the German trade union leaders to place themselves in the service of any government and the nationalist opportunist policy of leading trade union circles in Germany.

Léon Blum (France) declared that the policy of the social democratic parties in France, Belgium and Great Britain was exemplary for the struggle against fascism. It was very understandable that the German social democracy had tried to bar the way to a fascist accession to power. In the question of democracy, Blum adopted the Adler-Vandervelde policy. Socialists rejected the illusion that socialism could be carried out within national boundaries. It was impossible to use the bourgeois governmental authority for the conquest of power. Blum then defended the support accorded to the Four-Power Pact by the French socialists, and declared that the Four-Power Pact, even in the bloody hands of Mussolini, offered at least a hope of peace. In case of war the attitude of each party would depend on the courage of the International. The most important point was the unity of the workers and the liquidation of the disruption. Blum then declared:—

"The executive has decided to make a proposal to this effect to Moscow. It rejects negotiations in the individual countries and is in favour of direct negotiations with Moscow, together with the International Federation of Trade Unions. Let the conference authorise the Executive to take this step. (Angry interruptions from Wels and Grumbach.)

"We are also well aware of the attitude of the Communists, but with our proposal we want to prevent that the two sections of the German proletariat which are being attacked by the same murderers, should at the same time fight each other."

The next speaker was **Vougt**, of Sweden, who declared that the strength of the International lay in the democratic countries. He asked whether it was wise to demand more Marxism and more internationalism. The International must declare without reservation that it defended democracy and opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat. Stressing the utterances of Renaudel and Dalton, he demanded that the International should pledge itself to legality, and concluded his speech with the words:

"Let us talk less of the seizure of power and revolution. Let us talk less of 'totality,' which is in any case a Bolshevik conception. Let us talk less of the class struggle, and let us represent the interests of the worker as a good citizen of the State. That is what we mean by socialism in Sweden."

The German representative **Aufhaeuser** then took the floor. After the terrible happenings of the immediate past the conference must draw a balance and make it clear that it was the centre of the will to overcome fascism and to win socialism. The points at issue which were engaging the attention of the conference had been fought over for years in the German social democracy which

had been something more than a mere block of reformists. In an estimation of the German errors individual tactical measures were not of decisive importance, even the toleration policy was not of decisive importance. Historically considered the events of 1933 had their basis in 1918. The point at issue was, what were the functions of democracy when the class struggles intensified? In 1918 the German social democracy had provided political power with no economic basis and as a consequence the social relation of forces had not been changed. The precipitate convocation of the National Assembly had shown that it was possible to adopt the methods of democracy too soon. Nothing fundamentally new had happened on the 20th July; all that was destroyed was the illusion that the occupation of political and administrative positions was sufficient without an economic basis. The tremendous electoral success of the German Social-Democratic Party in May, 1928, had been the beginning of the abandonment of democracy by the German bourgeoisie, the beginning of the adoption of illegal methods. It was an illusion to imagine that the bourgeoisie would tolerate the winning of the famous 51 per cent. of the electorate on parliamentary lines. The reason why the working class in Germany could not retain power was that it had been split up into three parties, and this had prevented the formation of a workers' government. The lesson of the German events was that the workers should not take over more State political administration than they had economic power to support. The reasons for the victory of fascism in Germany according to Aufhaeuser were: (1) the incitement of nationalist instincts by the Versailles treaty; (2) the uninspired policy of the German trade union leaders who had gone their own way and approached very near to nationalism. The attempts of the trade union leaders to adapt their policy to that of the bourgeoisie had been fatal and had provided national socialism with new impulse. Aufhaeuser then warned the political International against difficulties which would arise from the opportunist policy of the leading trade union circles in the various countries. The workers did not want a repetition of 1918; they wanted an answer to the new situation. Aufhaeuser then also delivered himself of a number of pathetic remarks about the "social and revolutionary" aims of the social democracy. The comrades fighting fascism in Germany had very little use for democracy. The democracy which must come would have to be a transitional democracy, a sort of educative dictatorship. He did not believe that the Communists would accept the united front proposal, but the splendid fighting youth in Germany, which was not so bound to the parties, would help to overcome the party-agitational attitude of the Communists. He appealed to the International: Help us in a manner worthy of the heroism of our unknown soldiers in Germany!

Fourth Day of the Conference

Paris, 24th August, 1933

Thursday morning's session on the fourth day of the conference revealed a general lack of interest on the part of the delegates and the speakers addressed a half-empty hall. The proceedings of the conference went on amidst general disturbance, with delegates constantly coming and going. The culminating point of the anti-Communist incitement appears to have been the culminating point of the conference.

The first speaker was Pivert of the left-wing of the French Socialist Party. He declared that he felt himself in disagreement with most of the other delegates. In view of the threatening danger of war he demanded a joint conference to decide on fighting measures, including an international general strike, to ward off imperialist war. Democracy was breaking down, governments were being overthrown and all that remained was the revolutionary action of the working class.

Cordero of Spain declared that the International could not lay down any hard and fast tactics which could be forced into definite formulas. The Spanish socialists also suffered from the defeat of the German S.D.P. Their pride had suffered a blow. Any attempt to come together with the Communists would only increase the confusion in the socialist ranks, therefore it would be better if the Communists stayed outside.

Anderson, of Denmark, delivered the report on behalf of the commission for political fugitives and prisoners and appealed for a collecting campaign. He then delivered a very right-wing reformist speech. Nothing, he declared, would be more dangerous than if the working class gained the impression from the conference that following on the German events completely new methods

of work were necessary and that the old parliamentary methods were to be abandoned. Influence on the government was of great importance. He warned the conference against being deceived by general phrases such as that the German events meant the end of reformism. The situation in Denmark proved that the position of the social democracy could be strengthened by influence on the government. He was not of the opinion that the revolution in the countries of dictatorship could only be a socialist one. Such an idea was utopian and dangerous; it might be interpreted by the opponents of socialism as bolshevism. Aufhaeuser's "educative dictatorship" was an echo of the "Third Reich" which also wanted to educate. In the name of his own party he rejected any such slogan and demanded from the conference that it should pledge itself unambiguously to a struggle on a democratic basis even for Germany. An improved democracy was necessary.

Gvardyaladze, of Georgia, then attacked Bolshevism, which he declared not only oppressed Russia but financed the disruption of the international working-class movement. Both in Italy and Germany Bolshevism had helped fascism to victory. Instead of exposing Moscow at every possible opportunity the International had protected and defended Moscow again and again. That had not been good for the working-class movement. The dictatorship of a minority, the terror, could never bring socialism. Democracy was also threatened by Bolshevism. Moscow destroyed the unity of the international working-class movement, and so long as this was the case they should have nothing to do with Moscow.

(In consequence of its clumsy brutality this speech was met with dissatisfaction by a section of the conference delegates and there were protests, particularly from the seats of the Austrian delegates.)

The division of rôles at the conference was clearly demonstrated. The Adler, Blum, Vandervelde and Aufhaeuser group supplied the new radical manoeuvres deemed to be necessary, whilst the Mensheviks and Social revolutionaries provided the usual campaign of incitement against the Soviet Union. And the Renaudel-Grumbach group exploited the intensified danger of war to propagate the defence of their imperialist fatherland.

The first speaker in the afternoon session was the Rumanian delegate, Radanceanu, who declared himself in favour of democratic tactics on the basis of legality.

Yarblum, of Palestine, declared himself in favour of defending democracy with every possible means, including coalition. He was not prepared to reproach the German social democracy with its coalition policy, but only for the fact that it had used this policy in the interests of the bourgeoisie. In face of the intensified danger of war he proposed that the conference should adopt Litvinov's definition of an aggressor. Despite the previous experiences of the International with the Communists he was in favour of negotiations with the Communist International.

The Social Revolutionary Sukhomlin indulged in a protracted speech of incitement against the Soviet Union. Democracy was the only correct form of struggle for socialism. The development of affairs in the Soviet Union proved that only a bourgeois revolution was possible there. He rejected not only the Bolshevik dictatorship as the dictatorship of a minority, but also the whole party State which Bolshevism had created and its whole bureaucracy. Sukhomlin then repeated the usual slogans of the Social Revolutionaries and concluded with the declaration that a united front with Moscow was not possible.

Saragat (Italy) declared that democracy was not bourgeois because the bourgeoisie was not really democratic. The International must fight for democracy. For years the workers of Italy had been taught that it was not important to defend democracy and afterwards it was seen how fatal it had been that the Italian workers had abandoned the basis of democracy. Democracy would defend the workers if the workers did not abandon democracy.

The last speaker in the afternoon session was Grumbach, of France, who began his speech by pointing out that socialism now had no influence whatever on three great countries, Russia, Italy and Germany. He then became sarcastic about the radical speech of the delegate from the United States where he pointed out there was no strong socialist movement. Continuing in the same strain Grumbach declared that the question of "the complete seizure of power" might just as well be postponed until the next congress of the International. There need be no fear that in the meantime events would render the problem out of date. He did not believe that Moscow wanted unity. Without even dealing with

the events in Germany, the example of the strike in Strassbourg demonstrated how the Communists attacked the socialists in the rear. It was encouraging a dangerous illusion to tell the millions of workers that unity was possible. He reminded his hearers that in this very hall a conference of Communist, syndicalist and socialist teachers had decided to sabotage the work of mobilisation in case of war, whilst at the same time the teachers in Hitler's "Third Reich" had declared themselves in favour of a chauvinist war of revenge.

Grumbach then argued against an article written by Otto Bauer and published in the Vienna "Kampf," declaring that Bauer's contention that in case of war socialists should oppose the capitalist governments was wrong. If it were a question of a preventive war, then Bauer's attitude would be correct, but if it were a question of a war begun by Hitler's "Third Reich" then, he would declare frankly, the situation would be quite different and quite a different attitude would have to be taken up.

Fifth Day of the Conference Paris, 25th August, 1933

On Friday morning the political commission of the conference sat and there were lively debates on the question of democracy and the united front manoeuvre of the International against the Communist International. The Renaudel-Vougt group demanded an unambiguous declaration in favour of democracy and opposed any negotiations with the C.I.

In the meantime the main session of the conference was going on before a half-empty hall. Marquet (France) spoke on the question of war and supported the attitude of Renaudel and Grumbach. The International might no longer be a very great political force, but it was a very great moral force still. Unless fascism was overthrown inside Germany war would come. He supported the contentions of Renaudel and Grumbach that in case of such a war the old formulas of the International from the years 1901 and 1912 would have to be abandoned. One must not carry on the old traditions of those days under completely altered circumstances. Marquet's speech showed the fear of the French reformists at adopting even demagogic anti-war resolutions.

Sakasoff (Bulgaria) declared that the situation of the middle classes was being left out of account. In Bulgaria also this was the cause of the growth of fascism. A section of the working class was going back to the land. He demanded a declaration with a view to winning the middle classes.

Spaak, the representative of the Belgian "left-wingers," declared that the conference was the traditional expression of reformist socialism, but in the meantime fascism had been victorious in Italy and Germany, and Austria was being threatened. There was a problem of generations in the International. The youthful generation had entered the movement at a different historical moment than had Adler and Vandervelde whose successes had been won in a democratic period. After the bankruptcy of democracy a new tactic in accordance with existing circumstances must be adopted. In Germany the strongest fortress of socialism had been taken and destroyed and a second big party which had been held up as a glowing example to the International, the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, was condemned to impotence. There were the beginnings of fascism in Belgium and the Belgian bourgeoisie would take the step towards fascism when it felt itself threatened. Whilst the socialists maintained the rules of democracy their opponents were defeating them with the rules of fascism. When fascism was already there it was too late to abandon the basis of legality and the defeat was already a fact. In view of the German events he doubted whether a party built up on democracy and parliamentarism could be reorganised for an illegal struggle. In Germany the S.D.P. had tried to remain legal till the last moment and had waited until it was helpless. All parties were faced with the same threat.

Ronay, of Hungary, declared that Hungarian fascism was the chief satellite of Italian fascism. The Communist International had abandoned its traditional foreign policy by signing agreements of friendship with Hitler Germany and Mussolini's Italy.

After a speech by Kalin, of Latvia, Vandervelde proposed in the name of the Bureau that a telegram of sympathy should be sent by the conference to "the Latvian party which is fighting against fascism."

The concluding session of the conference was to have begun in the evening at six o'clock, but owing to various postponements as a result of strong differences in the commission the concluding session actually began at about ten o'clock in the evening. The

chief speaker was Otto Bauer, who delivered the report of the commission and at the same time made his own contribution to the discussion. His speech betrayed intense pessimism and was a confession of the catastrophic situation in which the Second International has manoeuvred itself with its policy, and this despite the fact that Bauer did his best to propagate "socialist optimism." His whole speech was a confession of the impotence of the decisions of the conference. The most important event in the closing session was Bauer's announcement that the proposal of Nenni and Alter for immediate negotiations with the Communist International with a view to forming a united front had not obtained a majority in the commission. In the commission the right-wingers succeeded in obtaining a majority against the proposal arguing that such a step and the answer of the Communist International would intensify the radicalisation already proceeding in the ranks of the social-democratic workers.

Otto Bauer declared that the commission had had a hard task. The discussion had shown differences of opinion between the parties and in the parties. All the parties had been deeply shaken by recent events and in particular by the defeat of the strongest section of the International. The differences in the situation in the various countries had expressed themselves in differences of opinion amongst the delegates and had had their effect on the deliberations of the commission. The conference was not one which could adopt a majority decision and thereby lay down important questions of principle for the International. The conference served the purpose of discussion only.

The first question discussed by the commission had been, what do the working masses want, what do they need? As he had not yet spoken in the discussion he would like at this juncture to speak about the situation in his own country. A third of the workers of Austria had been unemployed for years. Despite their strong trade union organisations the workers were not in a position to resist the effects of the economic crisis successfully. As a result many of the workers were seized with despair and hopelessness. On top of this now came the defeat of the German social democracy with whom the Austrian workers felt themselves particularly closely connected. The Austrian working class was now between the fires of two competing fascisms. Austrian fascism was the hanger-on of Italian imperialist fascism and was serving to prepare the way for a restoration of the Habsburgs. The Austrian working class was in the tragic situation of having to fight on two fronts. When it turned to meet a threat from one front it was immediately attacked from the other. The working class was suffering from depression. It had not lost its belief in socialism, but it had lost its confidence in the victory of socialism. In many countries the chief dangers were faint-heartedness, confusion and despair. The commission therefore sought to encourage socialist optimism on three fields: firstly on the field of doctrine, secondly on the field of working methods, and thirdly on the field of action.

Bauer pointed out that British delegates and others had warned the commission against meddling with doctrine and had declared that any such attempts would be merely dramatising the politics of Central Europe. Bauer then described the illegal meetings of small groups of three and four in Germany and declared that at the moment only one thing could be done: learn and form the nucleus which later, when the crisis of fascism arrived, would win the masses. On the basis of the earlier discussions in the Russian social democracy one could see what tremendous value such a period of preparation had. One must strive to encourage the masses, to help them out of their depression. The masses were losing heart under the effects of economic need and under the effects of defeats on important battle fields. In order to encourage them the masses must be shown how weak in reality was the position of the enemy and the capitalist social order, how capitalism wished to bury the workers in its own ruins. An analysis of the situation should be given showing that the victory of the workers must result. The workers should be shown that the State domination of the economic system where fascism ruled was a despotism, the enslavement of the whole people. It should be shown how fascism increases the danger of war. All this was taken into consideration in the resolution. Still more should be said, but for that there were still too great differences of opinion and the discussion had not been sufficiently prepared. The resolution contained that which was common to the whole conference and which served the cause of socialist optimism.

As far as the methods of struggle were concerned, it had

already been said that new methods would have to be adopted where fascism had already been victorious. Much had been said which did not please the Swedish and other friends. We declared to the workers that in the fascist countries the struggle could only be a revolutionary one. When fascism fell it was not only necessary to disarm it, but to build up a socialist economic system in its place and then proceed to the establishment of a socialist democracy. Some delegates had expressed doubt both in the commission and in the conference concerning the correctness of these slogans. They should remember that in putting them forward the German and Italian workers had been chiefly considered. They should try to remember the spirit of these workers who were threatened with 15 years' hard labour, concentration camps and maltreatment for each leaflet. The second time the revolution must proceed far beyond 1918. The second time the roots of the counter-revolution would be torn up. Such slogans had to be put forward unless the International wanted to lose all connection with these workers. Such language had to be used in order to maintain a solidarity of thought and feeling with the workers living under such conditions.

Bauer then polemised against the Swiss delegate Grimm who had declared that democracy in Switzerland was so important that at a moment like the present when it was being threatened it was necessary to shelve all criticism of it until it was once again secure.

Dealing with the dispute in the French Socialist Party Bauer declared that parliamentarianism was not sufficient for the workers in the present difficult situation and in consequence many of them were being driven to adopt the fascist ideology of absolute leadership. He (Bauer) would be the last man to deny that situations could exist where it might be necessary to support a democratic government against fascism and even to take part in the government. On many occasions the German S.D.P. had been simply compelled to take part in coalition governments in which the forces were fairly evenly balanced and fought with each other, thus paralysing the power of the government. An even balance of forces created the idea amongst the masses that democracy was not able to master the situation and that a leader was necessary. It was necessary to defend democracy, but democracy would be able to maintain itself only if it could prove to the masses by the power of its measures that it could be an efficient instrument for the introduction of higher forms of society. It would be dangerous for the social democracy to appear to the masses merely as a part of that machine which served to maintain the existing social conditions. With regard to the methods to be adopted in those countries in which democracy was threatened, for instance, in Austria, all he could say was that the events in Germany had proved that the most terrible sacrifices were still less than the losses caused by a defeat without struggle. (Applause.)

Otto Bauer then dealt with the question of the united front. The working class was strongly desirous of overcoming the split in its ranks. The dispute between the Socialist and Communist Internationals since 1918 had become historical. Much had already been overtaken by events. The Communist International might shout as loudly as it liked against democracy, but the Communist workers who were experiencing fascism knew the value of democracy. On the other hand, it had also been shown that the path of democracy alone was not sufficient, other methods of struggle would have to be used also. In consequence the split was less justified to-day than at any other time. This was the feeling of millions of workers. Nothing would give the proletariat more courage than a decisive step towards obtaining international proletarian unity.

Strong differences of opinion had shown themselves in this question in the commission. Some of the delegates had recalled the supercilious answer returned by the Communist International in February. They reported that in those illegal Communist pamphlets and leaflets which are being distributed in Germany, very often on the public streets, by heroic and daring workers there were still the silliest slanders against the social democracy. The result was that no unity had been obtained in the commission on the proposal of Blum and Nenni and no decision in the spirit of their proposal had been adopted. However, the International was ready for anything which would serve the cause of unity.

With regard to the question of action, the commission proposed a special fighting day for November 9, and the material and

moral boycott of Hitler Germany. Apart from this action of the masses, the political influence of all sections should be used in order to place the following three points on the agenda of the League of Nations:

1. A control of Germany's armaments;
2. Germany's attack on Austria; and
3. The breach of international treaties in Danzig.

There was also the draft of a resolution on disarmament. He did not want to criticise what was in that resolution, for it was right enough, but to-day after recent events everyone had the feeling that it was not enough. However, this resolution went further than all earlier decisions on the point because, linking itself up with the resolution of the International Federation of Trade Unions, it declared the general strike to be a decisive weapon against war. He wanted to warn the workers of the democratic countries from this platform against permitting themselves to be led into war on the pretext of freeing the German people from the clutches of Hitler. He pointed out that many earlier wars had been begun as "wars for freedom." The resolution showed that would be necessary in case of the outbreak of war and stressed two points: the first that the workers must defend the freedom and independence of their organisations, and secondly that the international connections must not be broken off. He was of the opinion that this was not enough. The resolution ought to be developed still further. Bauer then dealt with the question of the German Reichswehr and the militia. By pointing out the insufficiency of the resolutions he wanted solely to put forward problems for further discussion. In the hour of heavy defeat one should prepare oneself by mental clarity to be the victor of the morrow. (Great applause.)

Zyromski (France) declared on behalf of the minority that it maintained its proposals and would not vote for the resolution. The resolution was insufficient, for even under democracy one should not abandon completely the use of revolutionary methods. One should not reject the dictatorship of the proletariat merely because it had been misused by the Bolsheviks and turned into a bureaucratic caricature. Even if the Bolsheviks did manoeuvre socialists should be in favour of unity. The minority would continue its support of unity despite the attitude of other delegations. The resolution was too reformist and the minority would not vote for it.

Vougt (Sweden) declared that the Danish and Swedish delegates would vote for the resolution, but only in order to maintain the broadest possible unity. They were not of the opinion that the cause of unity would be furthered by negotiations with the Communists. They interpreted the resolution to mean that the international executive was not empowered to open up negotiations with the Communist International.

Otto Bauer answered Vougt and declared that although the resolution did not empower the executive to open up such negotiations, it at the same time did not deprive the executive of such power. He did not know whether the moment was opportune for such an approach to the Communist International, but the executive had the power at any time to examine whether the moment was opportune.

The Voting.

The resolution against anti-semitic demagoguery was unanimously adopted. A long debate on a point of order then began before the voting took place on the resolution of Otto Bauer and the resolution of Alter and Nenni.

Finally Bauer's resolution received 291 votes. The resolution of Alter and Nenni received 18 votes and five delegates withheld their votes. The Georgian delegation refrained from voting because Bauer's resolution was too left-wing for them. Two Russian Mensheviks also refrained from voting.

The voting on the disarmament resolution showed that the Renaudel group oppose even a pseudo-demand for disarmament. The resolution was adopted with 283 votes in favour, and 19 votes against. Twenty-two votes were withheld. The French delegation, i.e., a delegation from a strongly armed country, voted as follows: five in favour of the resolution, nine against and 12 abstentions. The Georgian delegation refrained from voting. The Russian Mensheviks gave two votes against the resolution and four votes were withheld.

The whole character of the conference was typified by Vandervelde's closing speech in which he proclaimed Otto Wels and Stampfer to be martyrs of socialism.

The Anti-Fascist Struggle and Social Fascism

By A. Karolski

(Conclusion)

The clearer the fascist tendencies appear in the social democracy, the more energetically will these anti-fascist manoeuvres be conducted in order to deceive the masses. The congress of the I.F.T.U. in Brussels which has just ended was an introduction to these manoeuvres which will be continued at the special conference of the Second International in Paris. As a result of recent events, particularly in Germany, the social-democratic masses are approaching nearer and nearer to the problem of the causes of the bankruptcy of the Second International. The masses are comparing more and more the results of the policy of the Second International with the tremendous successes of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, and they are **inquiring more and more closely into the reasons for the tremendous differences they observe.** Was it an accident that in his recent article on the Paris conference of the Second International Vandervelde "condemned" the policy of the "lessér evil"? Was it an accident that Vandervelde even talked of the necessity of applying the methods used by the Bolsheviks in 1917 in a number of countries without democracy? No, **they are symptoms which show that the masses themselves are beginning to inquire into these problems, and that the ground is shaking under the feet of the reformist leaders.** Therefore they are now trying to deceive the masses into the belief that they will now try to change their policy.

In Sweden rebellious workers have compelled the social-democratic newspapers to print their sharp oppositional resolutions against the reformist trade union leaders. In Czechoslovakia, in Asch and other towns, the dissatisfaction of the masses is expressing itself in splits and in big united front demonstrations. In order to counter this process the leaders of the Second International are beginning to increase their "Left-wing" demagoguery tremendously. The reformist leaders have a keen sense for what is going on in the masses. It is the task of the anti-fascists to **give a political content to the least resistance of the masses and to the least movement of the masses, and to raise clearly at all times the problems of the seizure of power, of dictatorship and democracy.**

The social democracy is again raising the problem of the petty-bourgeoisie in connection with the intensification of the class contradictions. It is the task of the anti-fascists to raise clearly and unambiguously the problem of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, whilst at the same time stressing the necessity of winning the decisive sections of the petty-bourgeoisie by defending their interests and by securing their defection from the camp of the bourgeoisie.

With regard to the social-democratic slogan for a boycott of German goods, the task of the anti-fascists is not to open a campaign against this boycott, as certain of our friends in Holland and the United States did, but where this boycott movement really becomes a mass movement to give it class character and class content, and to oppose sharply and decisively the social-fascist chauvinists who exploit the boycott in order to advance the cause of their own bourgeoisie and who thus facilitate Hitler's murderous handiwork.

A second manoeuvre now being adopted to an increasing extent by the social-democratic leaders is the raising of the question of war danger for demagogic reasons. The Brussels congress of the I.F.T.U. adopted decisions with regard to the war danger with a view to guiding the revolutionary struggle against war into the channels of a "control" of the war industries by the reformist leaders. The anti-war campaign of the social-democratic leaders is based on the assumption that war threatens only from the side of fascism, in order in this way to whitewash the imperialist Powers who are presented to the masses as the bulwarks of democracy.

It is the task of the anti-fascists to expose this manoeuvre. This must be done, not by empty propaganda, but by intensifying the revolutionary struggle against the danger of war.

The best way to struggle against the anti-fascist manoeuvres of the social-fascist leaders is to **develop the daily anti-fascist struggle to the utmost extent.** Unfortunately it must be placed on record at this juncture that in a number of countries a sort of breathing space has been made in the anti-fascist struggle. In view of the intensification of the fascist terror in Germany this breathing space is quite impermissible.

The special conference of the Second International in Paris

must be utilised by all anti-fascists in order to make it clear to the social-democratic workers that behind all these new "radical" manoeuvres (the support given to President Roosevelt's plans) the **Second International is preparing for the proletariat of all other countries the fate which befell the German proletariat.** The policy of the German Social Democratic Party is still being pursued by the leaders of the Social Democratic Parties in other countries, including Otto Bauer, and "Left-wing" phrases are being used to conceal the similarity. One of the chief tasks of the anti-fascists is to expose these "Left-wing" manoeuvres. **This cannot be done by empty propaganda, but by drawing the broadest masses of the social-democratic workers into our anti-fascist united front.** The first preliminary for the achievement of this task is the creation of ideological clarity and the quickest possible abolition of all defects and weaknesses on the field of the anti-fascist struggle.

China

The Fight for Sinkiang

It is worth while turning our attention to the events which are taking place in Chinese Turkestan, or Sinkiang. In this far corner of the earth there is now going on a fight between Revolution and Counter-revolution, but at the same time also a fight of the various imperialist Powers for the further carving up of China. Here a new armed intervention against the Soviet Union is being prepared.

What is the social-economic background of these events? Sinkiang is a region in which the remnants of all those peoples who once played a big rôle in Central Asia live. In the oases and deserts of Sinkiang there live Uigures, Kasaks, Kirghiz, Mongols, Dungans, etc. All these peoples live under conditions of almost undisturbed feudalism. The feudal chiefs cruelly exploit both the settled cultivators of the soil and cattle breeders who still live as nomads. However, within the confines of the feudal social order there is already developing the beginnings of a mercantile economy, and alongside of feudal exploitation traders and money-lenders are springing up. Between the various peoples, or to be more correct, between the feudal heads, fierce and cruel fights are waged for the pasture lands, oases, drinking places, and for the control of the caravan and trade routes.

The whole of these various peoples are governed by Chinese rulers consisting of feudal landowners, traders, and money-lenders. There have been continual revolts of these peoples against the Chinese rulers, but without achieving any positive results because they have been conducted by the feudal chiefs. The Chinese rulers have always succeeded in playing off and inciting one people against the other.

The crisis has dealt severe blows to the economic life of Sinkiang; it has greatly increased the exploitation of the peasant masses by the feudal landowners and moneylenders, by the tax collector and the traders. As a result, the insurrections have become increasingly frequent with a consequent extraordinary weakening of Chinese government.

It was in this situation that the British and Japanese imperialists commenced to work. The Intelligence Service sent its agents to Sinkiang, who commenced to organise diversion detachments consisting of Russian and Kasak white guardist and Bas-matches who had fled from Sinkiang and, under the slogan of overthrow of the Chinese government and the setting up of a "Muslim state" in Sinkiang, developed a broad agitational and organisational activity. In their intrigues the English imperialists rely above all on the Kirghish and Uigurish feudal chiefs and advocate the setting up of a big Mussulman State—East Turkestan.

At the same time, however, Japan is advocating a plan for the creation of a big Dungan State in Sinkiang. The agents of the Japanese General Staff make use of the Dungans who after the abortive insurrection against Feng Yu Hsiang were driven to North-West China.

Up to the imperialist world war and the October Revolution Sinkiang, which is rich in gold, oil and other mineral wealth, was a part of the so-called "Dead Zone" in Asia. This "Dead Zone" was intended to separate the spheres of influence of Russian and English imperialism from each other and serve as a sort of barrier between Russian and English possessions.

In the post-war period this situation completely changed. The people's revolution triumphed in Mongolia and a people's revolu-

tionary government was set up. Afghanistan shook off the English yoke, became an independent state and tried to follow the path of progress. The "Dead Zone" in Asia began to awake. After the overthrow of Amanullah and the suppression of the revolt of Batchai Sakao, British imperialism endeavoured, through the medium of Nadir Pasha, to subjugate Afghanistan. British imperialism is subjugating Tibet. After the capture of Manchuria and the occupation of Jehol, Japanese imperialism has set itself the task of occupying the Mongolian People's Republic and restoring the counter-revolutionary régime. The imperialists are endeavouring to convert the "Dead Zone" into a barbed wire fence between the Soviet Union and revolutionary China and at the same time into a jumping off ground for armed intervention against the Soviet Union.

Supported by the Kirghiz and Uigurian feudal lords, English imperialism organised a revolt against the Chinese government which was carried out with the aid of armed Russian white guardists and led in places to the overthrow of the Chinese rule.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

The Way of the Soviet Village to Socialism and Prosperity

By Our Special Correspondent, L. F. BOROSS

II.—When the Fight against the Kulaks is Conducted by Themselves

The fight against the kulaks in the big kolchos (farmer) in the village of Grigorevka, proved particularly difficult this spring.

In Grigorevka the kulaks, of course, comprise only a very small percentage of the population. The majority of the collective farmers consist of former poor and middle peasants and land-workers who wish to struggle honestly for the development of their collective farm. The kulaks therefore decided on a bold move: they placed themselves at the head of the fight for the "Bolshevisation" of the collective farm and for purging it from the "kulaks." There was no law of the Soviet government, no slogan issued by the Bolshevik Party, which they would not have eagerly seized upon—of course in their sense.

What?! Socialist competition? We will show you what it means to organise a socialist competition. On April 6, the correspondent of the district paper, "Soliletzkaya Communa," reported: "The morale of the collective farmers is excellent, work is going full steam ahead." One collective farmer challenges another to socialist competition? The area sown per day amounts to 3 hectare per man? We will sow six, or even seven, hectares. And they did, too. There was only one thing that caused the enthusiastic, but naive village correspondent certain misgivings: "A big mistake" occurred. The agronomist had 65 kilogrammes of seed sown per hectare, whilst this land required at least 77 to 80 kilogrammes of seed corn. Now, as a matter of fact, this was of course not a "big mistake," but a deliberate act of sabotage which destroyed all the fruits of socialist competition which had commenced so beautifully.

When, in March last, the political department of the Machine and Tractor Station was formed, it discovered that the leadership of the collective farm and of the Cell were strongly permeated with hostile class elements. One of the first to be removed from the farm was the woman white guardist, Koslova, who had even crept into the Party, and there succeeded in obtaining the function of women's organiser. The kulaks allowed Koslova to go without raising any objection. The political department discovered that the deputy manager of the collective farm, who had managed to conceal his class character so well that it was thought that he was in a peasant's smock, was no less than the son of a Tsarist Privy Councillor. He, too, was kicked out of the collective farm, neck and crop, without any resistance on the part of the kulaks. But there now commenced the fight. What! Cleansing the kolchos from the kulaks? We will show you. Ridding the kolchos of the idlers? We will see to that all right. So spake the kulaks. And now the purging began. Over a 100 collective peasants were excluded from the collective farm in the course of April and the first part of May. The law regarding idlers provides that those members who repeatedly refuse, without reasonable ground, to take part in the work of the farm, shall be expelled.

At the same time, however, Japanese imperialism organised actions of the Dungans, and the counter-revolutionary revolt of the Dungans overthrew Chinese rule in the Northern part of Sinkiang. However, after temporary victories the English plan came into conflict with the Japanese plan. England is endeavouring to establish a Mussulman State in Sinkiang with an Indian prince at the head. Japan, on the other hand, is aiming at establishing a Dungan State in Sinkiang. As a result of the conflict between the English and Japanese imperialists, the agents of English and Japanese imperialism began fighting each other.

The fight in Sinkiang has not yet come to an end. But this fight is being complicated by a fresh factor, i.e., the peasant actions and revolts against their own feudal rulers. The masses of the people have started the fight for their national emancipation, for the confiscation of the big landed estates, the cancellation of the usurious debts and taxes, against compulsory military service; they are opposing both the English and Japanese imperialists and are fighting for the overthrow of their own feudal lords.

We will not wait for any repetition of the offence, said the kulaks. Anybody who absents himself from work even once will be thrown out. We shall decide what is or is not a reasonable ground. And if one of our kulaks is idle, he, of course, will have a reasonable ground. When one of those who is faithful to the Soviets is idle, then there can be no reasonable ground. But even this fight on the part of the kulaks, conducted with the "most modern" means, soon proved a failure. More than 100 expulsions from a collective farm—and in this case it meant at the same time more than a hundred appeals to the higher organs—are no trifle. A special representative of the district committee, Comrade Krassny, came to Grigorevka from Samara in order to investigate the situation. The investigation was very short, but very effective. Comrade Krassny asked only two questions:—

First question: What has been the effect of the expulsions on the sowing work? When will the spring sowing be ended?

Answer: About 10 days after the prescribed date (18 days after the conclusion of the sowing in the neighbouring kolchos of Isobilnoye).

The second question was not put to the management of the farm, but to a meeting to which the expelled peasants were invited. The question was: Who have been expelled, and what sort of people are they? It suffices to cite the first four cases looked into: **Tjeplakova**, a former landworker, her husband had served in the Red Army, she has three children. She was absent from work but once, because her child was ill.

Sakurshin, a former poor peasant, was expelled as an idler on the instigation of his brigadier, a returned white emigrant.

Two sixteen-years-old youths, one of them the son of a member of the Red Army, were expelled as "incorrigible idlers," without any details being given. And so it went on.

To-day the chairman under whom these expulsions took place is of course no longer chairman, and also no longer a member of the Communist Party. He was removed from this position and expelled from the Party on account of his conciliatory attitude towards the class enemy. Under the leadership of the new chairman, the energetic Comrade Mórosov, there commenced with the assistance of the political department and of the Party organisation of the district, a thorough clearing up, which this time in no way pleased the kulaks. Nevertheless, this clearing up is too late to make good the damage caused by the kulaks to the spring's sowing, and the collective farmers will have to pay dearly for this in the distribution of the coming harvest. At the same time, however, they have learned a valuable lesson in the class struggle which will accelerate them on the way to the realisation of Stalin's slogan: All collective farms must become Bolshevised, and all collective farmers must become prosperous.

From the Baltic to the White Sea

By Allan Vallenius

This summer the construction of the canal from the White Sea to Lake Onega was completed. It is 230 kilometres long, and was built in one year and nine months—a speed unsurpassed in history. Through it pass ships, without reloading, from Leningrad to Archangelsk, or from any European port to the White Sea. The long route, around the Scandinavian peninsula, passing Tromsø and North Cape has been eliminated. A route of 2,900 sea miles has been replaced by a sea route of only 675 sea miles. Tremendous stretches of waste land are now opened up for culture, unheard-of riches are now accessible, new views, new perspectives have been opened up, which will have far-reaching consequences, not only for the Soviet Union, but even for such countries as Finland and the other Baltic nations and for Scandinavia.

Karelia's endless primeval forests and Siberia's even greater stretches of forests have been opened up. The canal is the new sea route for exploration of these regions—but not only that, it is also important that it has strengthened the defence possibilities of the Soviet Union, and that minerals will now be mined, new towns, factories, while cities will grow up in the tracts of this canal. On the battlefield of socialism a great victory has been won.

It was one of the first days of July. Comrade Gylling, president of the Karelian Autonomous Republic, asked me if I wanted to see the newly-completed canal. And so I became a guest of the Karelian government, and on board the s.s. *Karl Marx*, together with members of the government, I was present on the occasion of the canal's official opening.

Our steamer is the canal's first regular traffic steamer, running between Povenets and Soroka, the two end points on the trip from Lake Onega to the White Sea. *Karl Marx* is an old boat with two engines, accommodation for 120 passengers and freight. Now it was clothed in festive garlands, flags and transparencies, slogans, etc. In the rear of the ship a colossal head of Stalin, carved in wood by an 18-year-old Karelian boy, held the dominating position.

As we neared Povenets we were met by two fast motor boats; in port were several ships flag-bedecked, the crew lined up the railings. Our band played, the bands from the other ships replied, hurrahs echoed over the lake, and even from the quays we could hear the music from still other bands. In Povenets port lay several tug-boats and barges—the first wayfarers on the canal, now ready to carry their share of the first year's freight: 1 million 140 thousand tons.

We glided forward towards the gate of the first lock, or sluice, which slowly opened up its two great swinging "doors." We steamed in, and behind us the "doors" were closed. We were imprisoned in a deep chamber, the walls of which reached over the mast-top of *Karl Marx*. Suddenly the water began to bubble and surge at the next gate. At an unusual speed *Karl Marx* was lifted up until the water stood only a couple of hand-lengths from the edge of the quay.

We were now in the first chamber of the first sluice. This sluice has three chambers—the canal has 19 such sluices in all, but the number of chambers to each sluice varies.

We were at the fourth sluice. We had caught up to a couple of tugs, trailing barges. Of course we had to wait, the government boat had to stand aside for work, which comes first in the land of workers' rule. When we were finally lifted up into the fourth sluice we saw a sight that none of us will soon forget. Below us Lake Onega, with its archipelago, glittering like silver ribbons. To the west, Bear Hills, grandiose, forest-clad hills, rolling upward, downward, far off in an endless chain. In the east, hills, forests and forests and forests.

We proceed, the sixth, seventh, and eighth sluices were passed at the same speed. According to calculations each sluice takes forty minutes to pass through, but it proved possible to reduce this time to thirty minutes. I timed our passage through the sluices with three chambers; 22 minutes was the fastest and 26 the slowest passing time. Here again we see a fulfilment of the plans faster than the original calculations.

How finely constructed the canal was! It was with such precision; the architecture of the cleanest, simplest lines on sluice gates and piers, in American style, but simpler. The whole canal

is built of stone, timber and cement. The sluices are mainly of wood. Not a single piece is imported, even the iron frames for the sluice gates are of Soviet make, being made at the Onega Iron Works of Petrosavodsk.

Who has built this canal? The answer to this question is the most interesting chapter of Belmorstroi. The G.P.U. was given the task of building this canal. In one year and nine months it was completed, built by "prisoners."

"Ah, ha! forced labour!" I hear someone shouting. Of course, if one insists on calling it by that term. But allow me to relate the true story of its construction—those "prisoners" who wanted to participate in socialist construction had the choice between working in one of the "rehabilitation" institutions or in building, for example, such a project as this canal. Only those "prisoners" who chose the latter—that is to say, volunteered—were transported to the canal territory. Almost two hundred thousand people who had been isolated from society arrived here and built the canal.

From the first lock to the seventh, several hours' trip, we were accompanied by a *troupe of actors* who played one improvisation after the other, mostly concerning the canal or something in connection with its construction. Every member of this troupe was a young "law-breaker." The leader of the troupe had murdered six people!

This group presented among other things a mass declamation of a poem written by the constructors of the canal. A collective poem, mighty and artistic. It told of those who came here to work, with heavy sentences. By good work they got their rehabilitation period considerably shortened. They were isolated from society, but they were not thrown out—cast aside. Here in connection with their work they came into contact with society, not the old, but the new, the socialist society. Then came socialist competition. They got together collectively, one discussed matters over with them, one wanted to hear their opinion. They themselves were allowed to organise and improve their work. Then, one of the groups was given the **Labour Order of the Red Banner!** These prisoners received, hundreds of them, a whole shock-brigade, Soviet society's honourable distinction. They got self-respect, their ties with the working class became real living. Their pride in and love for their work grew. Long before schedule the canal to the White Sea was completed. Now freedom awaits us. We are now skilled workers, we have been schooled—we know how canals are built. The Moscow canal job awaits us, we will now proceed there. Then comes the canal on the river Volga—the canal between the Black and Caspian Seas—socialism awaits us, the building of the classless society.

Even the music accompanying this poem was composed by the "prisoners" themselves.

It is only in the Soviet Union where thousands of prisoners can stand so close to members of the government—the members of the government shook hands with them, questioned them, answered them. Here one saw how deep in the masses of the workers the government has its roots. They were workers themselves, and therefore every worker is a comrade. Here one saw one feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But do not run away with the idea that all these hundreds of thousands of workers that G.P.U. sent here have been re-made overnight. Among them were many of our class enemies—kulaks, spies, wreckers, etc. But even hundreds of such were re-made, and this work of making them socially conscious members of a socialist society is being continued.

Earlier two comrades from Moscow had visited the canal during its construction, and as guide had had a "prisoner" who had been advanced as leader of one of the construction divisions. During this inspection tour this guide several times stopped to give orders as to the procedure of the work, but he did it with such skill, showing such technical ability and knowledge that the two guests from Moscow were astonished. After their inspection was completed these Moscow comrades urged that their guide should immediately be set free. He was already a worthy member of society. The political leader of this division answered: "Free him? We shall put the question to his division to-night."

In the evening a meeting was called. Finally it was proposed

by the meeting of about two hundred workers to set the prisoner free. A complete silence followed. Nobody desired the floor. At last one, without asking for the floor, said: "Yes, but the canal is not yet completed!" This broke the silence. Everybody considered that the question of freeing this comrade cannot be considered separate from the question of the completion of the canal. Then the man spoke himself: "The canal must be constructed. We need all forces, also mine. The canal has made me a new being. I want to finish the creation of the canal, to remain here until the job is done."

For the construction of the canal were used 390,000 cubic metres of cement and 5,300 kilometres of barbed wire, 21 million cubic metres of earth and rocks have been broken. Tremendous piles of stones stood piled high along the sides of the canal. Tons of it have already been shipped south, the piers along the canal are masoned in stone, and the masonry work is done in mosaic patterns of good taste.

With these broken up rocks and stones one would be able to build seven Cheop pyramids. It took more than a life-time to build Cheop's pyramid. It took not fully two years to build Belmorstroi.

Russia, as an imperialist Power, strived for ice-free ports in the north. Russian tsarism plundered and oppressed the people of Karelia. Now Karelia is an autonomous Republic of the Soviet Union, the Workers' State, which carries on a correct peace policy. It does not seek ports in other seas. It builds sea routes through the ice of the Arctic, it is building water routes through its whole tremendous territory. The Soviet Union is making of Moscow and other cities inland ports.

The revolution of the working class has changed society and the world. It is changing, for example, Karelia to a glorious land of the future. The blood arteries of Karelia are its water routes, water is its life power. Its marrow is its rocks and iron ore from its mountains. Fish teem in its lakes, fir and pine fill its endless, untouched forests. The coal from Spitzbergen will be carried through these new sluices, as also the grain from Ukraina, products of the Caucasus, petroleum oil, machines from Leningrad.

Socialism is forging a new culture. A long step on the road to a classless society has been taken. A long step nearer the world revolution has been taken in the building of this canal: flourishing socialist Karelia has much to teach the workers of other countries.

Declaration of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A. on the Insurrection in Cuba

The New York "Daily Worker" of August 14 publishes a declaration of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A. in which it is pointed out that the driving out of Machado is a great victory for the toiling masses of Cuba, but it is not the end of the Cuban revolution, but only the beginning. The declaration exposes the role of the U.S.A. imperialists and of the Cuban opposition leaders and sets forth the role of the C.P. of Cuba, whose manifesto of August 3 demands the most active support and assistance from the working class of the U.S.A. The declaration concludes with the following appeal:—

"The Communist Party of the U.S.A. calls for an energetic campaign to explain the truth of the Cuban struggle to the broadest masses, exposing the murderous hypocrisy of Roosevelt and American imperialism. We call upon the broadest masses to unite around the following demands:—

(1) Against imperialist intervention in Cuba; against the intervention of the "mediator" Welles; against the threatened despatch of warships and marines!

(2) Support the general strike against the rule of martial law, backed by all the landlord-bourgeois groups in Cuba!

(3) For nullification of the Platt Amendment and for evacuation of the Guantanamo naval base!

(4) Support the Communist Party of Cuba, which is leading the mass struggle of the Cuban toilers against American imperialism and all its native agents!

Immediate action is needed! Send a flood of telegrams of protest to Roosevelt and the Cuban government! Hold hundreds of open-air meetings to organise mass support for these demands! Hold mass demonstrations! Make collections to help financially the Cuban Party! Send resolutions and letters to the press!

Workers, show your full solidarity with the revolutionary Cuban workers and farmers!

Proletarian Youth Movement

Slogans of the E.C. of the Y.C.I. for the XIX. International Youth Day

1. Greetings to the 1st of September—the International Youth Day of struggle against imperialist war, against fascism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Socialism!
2. Down with the bourgeoisie who plunder the wages of the youth and withdraw relief from the unemployed!
3. Working youth! Widen the front of your participation in the strike struggle of the proletariat!
4. Demand relief for all the unemployed at the expense of the employers and the government! All military expenditure to be used for unemployment relief!
5. Down with slavish forced labour.
6. Unemployed youth! Fight in the united front with the working youth for your economic and political rights!
7. Peasant youth! Rise to the struggle against landlord slavery, against taxes, for land!
8. Students and scholars! Fight against the closing of schools and universities. For socialism, for proletarian culture!
9. Youth of the colonies and oppressed nations! Raise higher the standard of struggle against foreign oppressors and native exploiters!
10. Down with the hunger, poverty and exploitation of the children of the toilers!
11. Where capital rules, there is no democracy for the poor. Down with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie! Long live proletarian democracy!
12. Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat, which alone can liberate the toiling youth from unemployment, hunger and oppression!
13. Young proletarians! Rise to the struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for proletarian democracy!
14. Warmest greetings to Comrade Stalin, the leader of the proletariat and the oppressed of the entire world!
15. Long live the U.S.S.R., the base of the international proletarian revolution!
16. Greetings to the Leninist Y.C.L. and the toiling youth of the U.S.S.R., the shock brigade of the revolutionary youth of the entire world!
17. The imperialists are preparing a counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R. All for the defence of the country of victorious socialism!
18.
19.
20.
21. Greetings to the International Congress of Youth Against War and Fascism!
22. Youth! Elect delegates everywhere to the Anti-War Congress! Organise committees of struggle against war!
23. Down with chauvinism and nationalism. Long live proletarian internationalism!
24. Down with the militarisation and fascisation of the youth!
25. Youth, disrupt the forced labour camps! Drive out the officers and fascist overseers!
26. Fighting greetings to the Y.C.L.ers of Germany, Poland and Italy, fearless fighters against fascism!
27. Toiling youth! Join the ranks of the fighters against fascism! Join the ranks of the Y.C.L.!
28. Long live the Communist International, the staff of the international proletarian revolution!
29. Demand the liberation of Comrade Thaelmann, leader of the German proletariat, and all the proletarian fighters, from the bloody claws of the bourgeoisie!
30. Long live the Y.C.L. of China, the most active supporter of the Communist Party in the struggle against imperialism and for Soviet China!
31. Revolutionary greetings to the Y.C.L.ers of Japan who stand unwavering in the positions of proletarian internationalism!
32. Down with the social-fascists who split the working class!
33. Shame to the Second International which betrayed the working class together with German social-democracy!
34. Shame to the Young Socialist International which trains its members in a slavish nationalist spirit!

35. Toiling youth! Fight against the reformists and social-fascists who conduct an imperialist and chauvinist policy!

36. Long live the united front of the toiling youth in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the rule of capital!

Slogans of the E.C.Y.C.I. for XIII. International Children's week

1. Greetings to the XIII International Children's Week—the fighting rally of proletarian children throughout the world.

2. On with the struggle of the children of the toilers under the banner of the Pioneers of the world, together with the entire working class, under the leadership of the Comintern and the Y.C.I.

3. Down with the poverty and starvation of workers' children. For free compulsory education, food and school materials for all children at the expense of the government.

4. Down with the bandit exploitation of children of the toilers. For the prohibition of wage labour for children.

5. Down with the nationalist and militarist education of the children of the toilers. Form a united front struggle for the Communist education of children!

6. Down with the reactionary fascist teachers of Hitler and corporal punishment for school children. Fight against the dismissal and persecution of revolutionary teachers.

7. Down with national oppression, demand the opening of schools for national minorities with instruction in their own language.

8. Down with the fascist Hitlerite orgy of terror. Long live the heroic proletariat of Germany who are fighting against fascism, for Soviet Germany under the leadership of the C.P.G.

9. Warmest greetings to the German pioneers who have been driven underground and to the children of the proletariat who actively participate in the struggle against fascism under the leadership of the C.P. and Y.C.L.

10. In reply to the preparations for interventionist war against the U.S.S.R., increase our anti-war propaganda and the struggle against the militarisation of the children of the toilers.

11. Greetings to the six million Pioneers of the U.S.S.R. who actively participate in the struggle of the working class under the leadership of the C.P.S.U. for the new socialist type of men.

12. Children of the toilers of the whole world! Strengthen your international contacts and solidarity.

13. Organise the school children—the children of the toilers and their parents in the struggle against the attack of bourgeois reaction and fascism on the school. The school is the central sector of struggle of all the Y.C.L., Pioneer and revolutionary organisations for the children.

14. Organise into Pioneer detachments, children's groups, fore-posts, clubs, circles and various societies the millions of the children of the toilers.

15. Young Pioneers! Let us strengthen and reorganise our work to win new masses of the children of the toilers to the flag of the world Pioneers.

16. Children of the toilers—Red Scouts, Boy Scouts, children from Christian and other bourgeois organisations, fight together with us against fascism and the social-fascists. Join our Pioneer League, the only revolutionary organisation of the children of the toilers.

17. For the Y.C.L. and Pioneer organisations, XIII International Children's Week is a week of verification of the fulfilment of the decisions of the December Plenum of the Y.C.I., and for mobilising the masses of toilers to further carry them out.

18. Y.C.L.ers, remember that you are responsible for the fulfilment of the slogans of the December Plenum of the Y.C.I.—“a Pioneer detachment at every school” and “a children's group in every local group of mass revolutionary organisations.”

19. Workers, peasants and toilers of the whole world! Help and support the revolutionary struggle of your children! Include the demands of the children in the programme of your struggle.

20. Raise higher the banner of the education of the children of the toilers in the spirit of Bolshevik internationalism!

The World Congress of Youth

Every week delegates representing from 4,000 to 5,000 young workers in France are reporting for the World Congress and numerous initiative committees are being formed. Of the various youth organisations and groups sending delegates to the Congress mention should be made of the following: 1,100 socialist youth (two complete district organisations of the socialist labour youth: Aisne and Ardèche; the local groups in Nizza, Tunis, Ajaccio, Nantes, etc.; numerous minorities of local groups), 3,000 members of the secular and republican youth, members of the Christian working youth, young members of the reformist C.G.T., a boy scouts' group in Bordeaux, about 1,000 socialist and unorganised students, 5,000 youth from the Constitutional Party of Tunis, 8,000 unorganised, including 1,000 peasants. The majority of all the delegates reported (60 per cent.) consist of young workers.

The French Young Communist League, in its Open Letter to the Socialist Working Youth, has proposed a common fight:—

Against the offensive of the government which is being prepared; against any wage reduction; against compulsory labour for the unemployed; for increased unemployment benefit.

Against imperialist war; for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Against the war manoeuvres and against chauvinistic demonstrations; for the demands of the soldiers and the recruits.

For affiliation to the World Congress of Youth against war and fascism which will take place in Paris on September 22.

Young Social Democrats Call for Participation in The World Congress of Youth

Young socialists who have affiliated to the World Congress of Youth against fascism and war, at a meeting held on August 18 in Paris, adopted the draft of an appeal to all young workers of the world. This appeal, which was approved by an international meeting attended by 6,000 workers in Japy, states:

As members of the Socialist Youth International we call upon the whole of the toiling youth, and before all upon our socialist youth comrades, to conduct a genuine fight against fascism and against the threatening imperialist war and to affiliate to the World Congress of Youth against War and Fascism.

We welcome this Congress as the path to the realisation of unity in action of the toiling youth against fascism and war.

We appeal before all to the youth comrades in those countries which, under the cloak of bourgeois democracy, are preparing for war and fascism, bearing in mind at the same time that the bloody terror under which our brothers have now to suffer is the result of the policy of collaboration between the social democratic party of Germany and the bourgeoisie.

We oppose to the united front of our leaders with the bourgeoisie the united front of all toilers who are fighting for the overthrow of the capitalist system.

We must not forget that the fight of all young workers—no matter to what parties they belong or what political views they hold—for the improvement of their working and living conditions is the pre-requisite for the decisive fights for power.

Let us continue the heroic tradition of the socialist youth which, during the war, under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht and under the slogan: “the enemy is in our own country,” conducted the fight against imperialist war.

To-day as in the past, faithful to our class, there must exist for us only one discipline: the fight for the proletarian revolution. We, the inexorable enemies of bourgeois dictatorship, are ready to sacrifice our lives for the establishment and the defence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Down with the militarisation of youth! Down with the preparations for a fresh imperialist slaughter! Down with the bloody fascist terror! Against hunger and misery! Long live the revolutionary united front of the young toilers! Long live the World Congress of Youth!

For France: Augé, S.P.F., G. Charreron, Michel Lissanski, Marxist group of youths; Flochlay, socialist Youth of S.P.F.

For Germany: Fritz Meyer, Otto Schulz, Franz Müller, Irene Kunze, Walter Winter, Sauerbrei.

For Austria: Seppl Brandlinger, Ernst Stalling.

For Poland: Jan Podbielski.